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The meeting commenced at 8:32am on March 16, 2007.

Moment of Reflection

Chair Bill Redpath called for a moment of reflection, a practice at LNC meetings.

Opportunity for Public Comment

John Wayne Smith (FL) objected to Bob Barr’s selection as an LNC representative.
**Paperwork Check**

Chair Bill Redpath asked the Secretary to confirm the binder’s contents.

**Attendance and Credentials**

Secretary Bob Sullentrup confirmed the attendance of the members and alternates.

Attending the March 16, 2007 LNC meeting in Orlando, FL were:

- **Officers**: Bill Redpath, Chuck Moulton, Aaron Starr, Bob Sullentrup
- **At-Large Representatives**: Admiral Michael Colley, Pat Dixon, Angela Keaton, and Jeremy Keil. Dan Karlan did not attend.
- **Regional Representatives**: Tony Ryan (1), M Carling (2), Aaron Starr (2), Emily Salvette (3), Bob Barr (4), Dr. James Lark (5), Wes Benedict (6) and Hardy Machia (7).
- **Regional Alternates**: Julie Fox (1), Scott Lieberman (2), Richard Burke (2), Rebecca Sink-Burris (3), and Stewart Flood (4). Not attending were Steve Damerell (5), Nancy Neale (6) and Eric Sundwall (7).

Staff attendees included Executive Director Shane Cory, Operations Director Robert Kraus, Political Director Stephen Gordon, Sean Haugh and Louise Calise.

LNC counsel Bill Hall attended.

LP members included Rob Hodgkinson (KS Chair), Karl Dickey (FL), Jodi McMasters (FL), Bob Rettie (FL, Okaloosa Co.), Lee Jackson (FL, Okaloosa Co.), Doug Klippel (FL Chair), BetteRose Ryan (SD), Alicia Mattson (TN), Jim Duensing (NV), John Wayne Smith (FL), Ann Davis (FL), Vicki Kirkland (FL), John Enford (TN), Tony Wall (TN), Rob Oates (ID Chair), Pete Blome (FL, Okaloosa Co.), Darla Maloney (MO Chair), Lee Wrights (NC, former Vice-Chair) and Paul Frankel.

The following table lists the composition of the current LNC as accepted at the July 3, 2006 meeting, amended with the replacement of Bob Barr for Mark Bodenhausen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Affiliates</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region 1</td>
<td>Alaska, Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, South Dakota, Wisconsin, Wyoming, (maybe) North Dakota, Nebraska</td>
<td>Tony Ryan (SD)</td>
<td>Julie Fox (WI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 2</td>
<td>California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho</td>
<td>M Carling (CA), Aaron Starr (CA)</td>
<td>Richard Burke (OR), Scott Lieberman (CA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td>Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Indiana</td>
<td>Emily Salvette (MI)</td>
<td>Rebecca Sink-Burris (IN)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Alternate Scott Lieberman filled in for Aaron Starr in the morning, then Richard Burke in the afternoon.  
2 So we do not forget, Scott Kohlhaas (AK) has volunteered to become an alternate or representative for Region 1 should either Tony Ryan or Julie Fox resign. The Bylaws stipulate Region 1 is entitled to one representative and one alternate. A second alternate is not permitted. Footnotes in minutes have no limitation or restriction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Affiliates</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region 4</td>
<td>Florida, Tennessee, Alabama, South Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina</td>
<td>Bob Barr (GA)</td>
<td>Stewart Flood (SC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 5</td>
<td>Virginia, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, DC</td>
<td>James W. Lark, III, (VA)</td>
<td>Steve Damerell (VA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 6</td>
<td>Utah, New Mexico, Arkansas, Nevada, Louisiana, Arizona, Texas</td>
<td>Wes Benedict, (TX)</td>
<td>Nancy Neale (TX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 7</td>
<td>New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Vermont Connecticut, New Hampshire</td>
<td>Hardy Machia (VT)</td>
<td>Eric Sundwall (NY)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report of Potential Conflicts of Interest**

Bob Sullentrup and Chuck Moulton reported they are involved with RockTheDebates.org, a 527 organization devoted to allowing any third party candidate with a mathematical chance of winning into the 2008 presidential debates.

**Approval of the Agenda**

The group amended the agenda by adding and reordering items. The affected items appear in italics.

**Libertarian National Committee, Inc.**  
**March 16, 2007 Meeting Agenda**  
**Orlando, Florida**  
**Friday, March 16, 2007**

- Call to Order 8:30 a.m.
- Moment of Reflection 1 minute
- Opportunity for Public Comment 10 minutes
- Credentials Report and Paperwork Check (Secretary) 5 minutes
- Report of Potential Conflicts of Interest 5 minutes
- Approval of the Agenda 5 minutes

**Standing Reports**
- Chair's Report 20 minutes
- Treasurer's Report 30 minutes
- Secretary's Report 10 minutes

**Staff Report**
- Staff Report 60 minutes
- Counsel's Report 15 minutes

**Action Items Previously Submitted in Writing**
- Policy Manual (Colley)
Standing Convention Subcommittee (Salvette)  30 minutes

**Reports Previously Submitted in Writing**
Campus Organizing Report (Lark)  5 minutes
Various Regions  5 minutes per

**Action Items Not Previously Submitted in Writing**
LP 2008 Convention (Bette Rose Ryan)  30 minutes
Platform Committee Selection (Carling)  30 minutes
Audit Committee Selection (Lark)  15 minutes
Ballot Access Update (Redpath)  15 minutes
"Do Not Mail" Policy (Moulton)  15 minutes
Executive Director Contract, Executive Session  60 minutes
*E-mail privacy, 10 minutes, Stewart Flood*  10 minutes
*Information Technology Committee (Moulton)*  15 minutes

Opportunity for Public Comment  10 minutes

Adjournment  5:00 PM

The agenda as amended was approved without objection.

**Officer Reports**

**Chair’s Report**

Chair Bill Redpath provided an oral report that included the following highlights:

- Bill reported he has been busy in the four months since Alexandria in November, talking with Shane Cory typically one or more times per day. Communication with staff is excellent.
- He reported he has been on several talk shows the largest being Keith Larson’s show on WBT (AM) in Charlotte, North Carolina, followed by Eric Dondero’s show.
- He has attended along with vice chair Chuck Moulton the Federalist Society’s dinner in DC. The Federalist Society is a group of Libertarians and conservatives that would form a rich source of potential supporters and with useful legal knowledge and experience.
- He has been making “chairman’s calls” with donors who have given $5k/year. Five or six individuals have been on each call.
- He has done some fund raising by telephone, particularly for the NC petition drive.
- He has had dinner with LP donors and collected as much as $500 from a donor at one event.
- He reported the EC conference call 2-28 approved plans to assist the NC petition drive, having HQ pay petitioners directly for their services.
- He noted Nebraska has some ‘discrepancies’ in its accounting for its petitioning that is almost competed. Robert Kraus is assisting the NE treasurer work through the problems. Scott Kohlhaas is continuing to raise funds for NE.
- Finally, Bill noted he participated in a conference call to address the organization, structure and legalities of RockTheDebates.org, a 527 organization formed by Bob Sullentrup and Chuck Moulton to get any third party candidate with a mathematical chance of winning into the 2008 presidential debates.

Bill Redpath welcomed Congressman Bob Barr to the LNC.
**Treasurer’s Report**

The LNC’s treasurer, Aaron Starr, noted he will not run for state chair of CA in order to devote his attention to his new duties on the LNC.

Aaron noted highlights of the financials included as Appendix A:

- Although the 2007 budget was challenging, revenues are running $21k ahead of expenses as shown on page 3. Much of this is for ballot access.
- Aaron noted our goal of ballot access in all states is a noble one. Achieving such a goal will require tradeoffs and sacrifices in other areas.
- On the balance sheet on page 5, a large item is a liability to account for life members and their deferred dues and obligations. This item makes our ‘balance sheet look terrible’. According to GAAP, we must estimate this liability which is based on several unknowns such as the life expectancies of the donors. The number is $1.3M which is high but conservative.
- On page 5 the AR aging table shows an $8.5k item for the Badnarik congressional campaign. The item has remained on the books for some time without being reduced. The LNC will keep the item on the books.
- Aaron requested staff reverse the stacking order of the items on the payables graph on page 8.
- On page 9, the reserve is still not sufficient, the problem being revenue.

Finally, the Aaron said HQ will undergo an FEC ‘desk audit’ and has contracted with Koch and Hoos to perform this. This was an item previously negotiated with the FEC.

**Secretary’s Report**

Bob Sullentrup moved to approve the February 28 conference call minutes. Without objection the motion passed.

Bob noted he has started planning and preparation for the 2008 convention and that the Delegation Chair’s Manual is available in the Organization folder of lp.org. Of course, delegate allocations await sustaining membership totals from December 31, 2007.

Bob also reported he along with Chuck Moulton have formed RockTheDebates.org, an organization whose purpose is to get third party candidates who have a mathematical chance of winning into the 2008 debates. Seth Cohn from New Hampshire and Richard Winger of Ballot Access News are also members.

The group considered the legalities of the organization and concluded that due to the legalities, it would make much more sense for RockTheDebates.org to be organized and pursued completely independent of the LNC and without any LNC support.

In addition, the group considered the politics of the organization and concluded the project can benefit from broader support of all political partisans and for that reason as well, the LNC should not be involved in or fund the project.

People in New Hampshire have a verb for this activity – bird dogging – and consider it a participation sport.

RockTheDebates.org is looking for board members, particularly ones from other political parties.
Bob directed those with an interest in discussing aspects of the project including the legalities of the campaign finance system or how to make it successful to contact him outside of the LNC.

Finally, Bob stated for the record that he considers it the greatest honor of his life to be entrusted by fellow Party members to be its secretary for this Party's historic initiative to restore Liberty to America. Accordingly, "I don't have to write the minutes", he stated, "I get to write the minutes". Anyone who would throw away such an honor "is an idiot, and you can quote me if you wish".

Staff Reports

Executive Director's report

Shane Cory presented the Executive Director's and HQ reports attached as Appendix B. He noted the following highlights:

- He has been trying to improve the office and has recently added a new staffer, Louise Calise, whom he termed a ‘blessing’. In addition, Steve Gordon is migrating to becoming the LP’s Political Director which has been paying dividends.
- The LP will be outsourcing its in house call center operations since the most effective time to make calls for renewals is on the weekend. The Watergate charges $100/hour on the weekends for heat and air, and the activity would require staff to work weekends. The current bid is $4200 / month and may be negotiated lower.
- The 2007-2008 candidate tracker program is operating.
- Direct mail activities are solid with Louise Calise on board. Upcoming initiatives will include individuals identified by Target America, renewals and lapsed donors.
- The Annual Report is doing well with an $80 average donation. It is expected to return $160k.
- Internet fundraising is strong, but could be doing better.
- Our pledge income is steady at $26k-$27k / month. To increase this we will first need to increase the donor base.
- Scott Kohlhaas (AK) will be assisting on the LNC board “give or get program”. Scott will call prospective donors and arrange for meetings with board members.

Stephen Gordon noted he has not completed his transition from Communications Director to Political Director. For the former, he has become more involved in the DC community. This has resulted in arranging a panelist to show up at the LSLA conference and then “give us some ink”.

Stephen also noted there is a preponderance of members who complain and criticize HQ since that is easy to do. As a result any ‘kind word of support’ by the LNC would help assuage the criticism.

As Political Director, Stephen is trying to revive certain affiliates. Such affiliates range from the easy to the hard. Maine, for example, is close to being revived after a few phone calls. In other states, certain principals refuse to return phone calls. The affiliates targeted for resuscitation include MS, ME, NE, KY, WV, DC and ND.

Stephen noted there is a flurry of sentiment from party members expecting the Party to support Ron Paul for president.

The Oregon affiliate has recently experienced some factional disputes. Some aspects of this situation may need to be discussed in executive session.

Stephen is working on candidate recruitment with his goal of ’2008 in 2008’.

Robert Kraus reported payables for the LP are ‘in the best condition I’ve ever seen during my tenure’.
Louise Calise noted that direct mailing is on track and that staff is analyzing returns. She is negotiating with vendors and shopping for the best rates.

Louise is planning a cruise with LP presidential candidates for prospective donors slated for January 2008. This would afford one-on-one time and feature panel discussions and debates.

Sean Haugh has been working on the candidate tracker initiative. Sean noted more campaigns should ‘feel the pain of losing’, by which he means that more candidates should ‘do the things complete campaigns do’. No campaign, for example, rented a van to take voters to the polls. The stellar campaign in Sean’s experience was that of Sara Chambers in Alaska.

For a complete HQ report, see Appendix B.

**Counsel’s Report**

Bill Hall had submitted a report on legal matters and was willing to field questions. He devoted his allocated time to the upcoming executive session.

In September 2003 a hurricane delayed mail delivery, office operations and an FEC filing. This problem in turn caused an FEC filling to be delayed. Bill Hall appealed the fine, pointing out the effect of the hurricane on our ability to file the report. The last word from the FEC was about 18 months ago.

**Action Items Previously Submitted in Writing**

**Policy Manual**

Admiral Colley submitted the following to replace Section 2 in Article IV of the policy manual:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 2: Position Description of Executive Director (ED)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. General:</strong> The ED is the chief operating officer of the Party. The ED reports to the Chair, Libertarian National Committee (LNC). The ED is the public persona of the Party in the nation’s capital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Administration:</strong> The ED shall:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Establish the organizational structure of the staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Direct, coordinate and administer the activities of the staff within the parameters of the approved budget and established policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Develop the annual budget, in coordination with the Treasurer, for submission to the LNC for approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Personnel:</strong> The ED shall:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Recruit, train, and assign all staff members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Implement the Employee Manual; ensure that it is reviewed and modified as appropriate to continually reflect that all employees are highly valued and their rights are protected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Regularly evaluate the performance of all staff; counsel them regarding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
improvement and how to better contribute to staff effectiveness.

4. Appoint, employ and terminate staff.

D. Compensation: ED compensation will be specified in a contract negotiated by the LNC Chair; a bonus incentive structure will be included.

E. Communications: The ED shall:

1. Maintain frequent and substantive contact with the LNC Chair; keep members of the LNC informed as appropriate.

2. Provide data, information and other support to affiliates.

3. Reports:
   a. Monthly, provide a Membership Report and a Financial Report to the LNC.
   b. Two weeks prior to a scheduled LNC meeting, provide an Operational Report to include input from key staff members and a summary of staff personnel changes.
   c. At the LNC meeting following a general election, provide a summary of all elected and appointed Party officeholders.

4. Submit all public communications to the Advertising and Publication Review Committee (APRC) prior to printing and distribution.

F. Financial: The ED shall:

1. Execute the LNC approved annual budget; coordinate with the Chair and the Treasurer if available resources will not support budget execution.

2. Submit all contracts over $7500 to the Chair for approval prior to commitment.

3. Be responsible for soliciting major donor participation. Maintain a listing of major donors and grow that list.

4. Direct the development and execution of fundraising direct mail; assess and analyze the effectiveness of each mailing.

G. Outreach: The ED shall:

1. Represent the Party in the DC community and act as a spokesperson for the Party.

2. Develop and nurture effective working relationships with the news media, political entities and relevant think tanks.

M Carling moved to add in section E.3.C the phrase “make a best effort to” before the word “provide”.
Aaron Starr moved to amend Admiral Colley’s proposal to eliminate ‘and appointed’ in the same section, E.3.C, making the text read “At the LNC meeting following a general election, provide a summary of all elected Party officeholders”.

Aaron’s amendment carried.

M’s amendment would make the text “At the LNC meeting following a general election make a best effort to provide a summary of all elected Party officeholders”.

M’s amendment also passed 9-6.

Chuck Moulton moved to amend E.3.C by adding “all Party candidates for public office in that election and”, making the text read “At the LNC meeting following a general election, make a best effort to provide a summary of all Party candidates for public office in that election and all elected Party officeholders”.

Chuck’s motion died for lack of a second.

Dr. Lark then raised a question regarding section E.4 and its reference to the APRC. Admiral Colley stated he had inserted that to make “people understand we have an APRC”.

M Carling moved to strike “prior to printing and distribution” in section E.4.

Aaron Starr moved to insert the word “relevant” after “submit all”. There was no objection to this insertion and the amendment passed.

After some discussion, Admiral Colley moved to amend by striking section E.4 in its entirety. There was no objection, and the amendment carried. This rendered M’s amendment moot.

The main motion passed with three negative votes. Angela Keaton, Chuck Moulton and Bob Barr voted against the measure.

Voting in favor were Aaron Starr, Bob Sullentrup, Admiral Michael Colley, Pat Dixon, Jeremy Keil, Tony Ryan, M Carling, Emily Salvette, Dr. James Lark, Wes Benedict, Scott Lieberman and Hardy Machia.

**Reports Previously Submitted in Writing**

**Campus Organizing**

Dr. Lark submitted his report for organizing LP groups on campuses included as Appendix C. He expressed his willingness to answer any questions the Board might have.

**Regional Reports**

Regional reports are included as appendices as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region 1</td>
<td>Tony Ryan, Appendix F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 2</td>
<td>M Carling, Appendix G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td>Emily Salvette, Appendix H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 4</td>
<td>Stewart Flood, Appendix I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 5</td>
<td>Dr. Lark, Appendix J</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emily Salvette noted Region 3 will hold a meeting in Dayton, OH on August 4-5. Region 3 states include Ohio, Kentucky, Michigan and Indiana.

Hardy Machia noted he attended the Liberty Forum in New Hampshire in February sponsored by the Free State Project that attracted 260 attendees from across the country.

**Executive Session**

The LNC entered executive session for the purpose of addressing 2008 Convention issues, rental of mailing lists, employment issues, database security issues, receivables and the situation in the Oregon affiliate.

**Richard Burke Resigns from the LNC**

Richard Burke reported he is an employee of the Michael Jingozian campaign for President. Richard noted that after last week’s Oregon convention, he has determined his involvement in the campaign amounts to a conflict of interest. Accordingly, at midnight he would resign as first alternate on LNC for Region 2. He will run for an LNC position at the next convention in Denver.

**Standing Convention Subcommittee**

Emily Salvette moved to change the policy manual to form a convention oversight committee by adding a new paragraph to Article VI, Section 3 of the LNC Policy Manual:

> The Chair shall appoint a Convention Committee of three current members of the LNC, naming one of those members the committee’s chair. The committee acts on behalf of the LNC in issues regarding the Party’s bi-annual conventions. The committee conveys our requirements to the convention planners, ensures the convention meets our needs, reviews and approves major elements such as contracts, the convention budget, and the convention program in a timely manner, and advises the LNC in its decision making related to future conventions.

M Carling moved to amend by striking the very last clause. Ultimately M withdrew this amendment with approval of the body.

Without objection, Emily’s motion passed.

**Action Items Not Previously Submitted in Writing**

**LP 2008 Convention**

BetteRo Ryan gave a brief update on plans for the 2008 Convention in Denver:
• A task list is in place and being updated
• The work became four months behind schedule but is rapidly catching up
• With the Convention Oversight Committee now in place, speakers can be arranged and many detailed plans devised
• The logo and theme have been selected
• The vendor’s space diagram is in place having met with fire department specifications
• Vendor packages should be produced within the month
• Tentative prices for the convention are in place with minimum ticket prices set to cover convention basics
• Convention volunteers are keeping track of their hours as a means of setting expectations for professional convention organizers who might come on board for 2010 or later.

BetteRose requested the LNC determine how much time it expects to allocate for the various items of the orders of business, particularly for the Platform Committee Report, presidential debates and balloting.

Contact BetteRose at betterose@aol.com.

**Platform Committee Selection**

M Carling had requested the selection of the Platform Committee be placed on the agenda for this meeting.

Emily Salvette requested the LNC “regularize the process” of putting out the call for prospective convention committee members and to broaden the distribution of the notice.

Aaron Starr advised the body to carefully consider the question “who do we want” on the committees. He recommended we get “people who can work together and who can craft items that would appeal to 2/3rds of the delegates”.

Pat Dixon moved to postpone consideration of this matter to the next meeting. Without objection the matter was postponed.

**Audit Committee Selection**

At its July 3, 2006 meeting in Portland, the LNC:

> decided the Audit Committee would include Richard Morley, James Curtis and others to be named later. Should James Curtis not agree to serve, the matter will be brought up again in August.

Richard Morley resigned from the Audit Committee due to health reasons and James Curtis moved to Arizona and is not able to participate at this time due to job commitments.

The last item of the Alexandria minutes reminded the group:
Richard Morley has resigned from the Audit Committee and filling this vacancy must be on the Agenda for the March meeting.

The chair Bill Redpath will obtain (or will direct staff to obtain) quotes from auditors to provide either two audits prior to the 2008 convention or one audit conducted biannually.

**Ballot Access Update**

Chair Bill Redpath noted that with the Maryland petitioning complete, the LP stands at 26 states and counting. This is approximately where the Party was in the last election cycle.

The Executive Committee approved on February 28 $12.5k for North Carolina’s drive which is half way complete or more on its way to 69k valid signatures.

Nebraska is 80% complete, and financial questions being investigated and resolved as reported earlier in the staff report.

While no additional ballot access activity is currently planned for 2007, additional ballot access drives will be initiated as can be legally started.

Dr. Lark asked Mr. Redpath whether he could provide a list of the states where we do not yet have access, along with a description of the requirements needed to place the LP presidential ticket on the ballot in 2008. Mr. Redpath said that he would provide such a list.

**“Do Not Mail” Policy**

Chuck Moulton deemed his proposal regarding the “Do Not Mail” policy not appropriate at this time due to other actions taken at this meeting. He requested the LNC take the matter up at the next meeting.

**LNC Discuss List**

Stewart Flood raised the question what is the proper use of the LNC discussion list? Are posts confidential by default or not?

A suggestion to form two lists, one for confidential communications and another for general met with some resistance.

Bill Redpath’s recommendation was for the LNC to recognize that the list was confidential for the time being and for every member of committee to use their best judgment, that’s his policy.

Aaron Starr moved that all e-mail on the LNC discuss list be considered confidential by default, excepting ballots and excepting those marked otherwise, and should not be forwarded outside the list except with the permission of the sender.

Aaron’s motion failed with Angela Keaton, Hardy Machia and Aaron Starr voting in favor, Richard Burke and M Carling abstaining and the rest voting against.
Information Technology Committee

Chuck Moulton noted staff’s response to his inquiry was presented in the binder and he thanked staff for addressing the issues. This response is included as Appendix D (first IT report). He asked that in the future staff deliver their report earlier to afford more time to digest and respond to such matters.

Chuck recommended no action at this time.

The IT Committee produced a response to staff’s response over the weekend during the LSLA meeting in Orlando. This response is included as Appendix E (second IT report).

Opportunity for Public Comment

Bill Redpath read an e-mail from Dan Karlan who recommended selection of the ten members of Bylaws committee be put on the agenda at the next meeting.

Kansas Chair Rod Hodgkinson reported April 28 was the date of the Kansas Convention at Emporia State University. New York and North Carolina have conventions scheduled for the same date.

Pat Dixon reported tomorrow’s LSLA meeting featured a ‘packed agenda’ and that it would kick off promptly at 8:30 in the Grand Ballroom.

Chuck Moulton commended Bill Evers, an LP activist who had taken the lead in drafting the pre-Atlanta platform patterned after Murray Rothbard’s concepts. Evers has recently been nominated as Assistant Secretary of Education for Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development. He was on the LNC in the early 80’s and worked for the Hoover Institution.

Paul Frankel clarified Illinois’s petitioning in 2004 applied to both federal and state candidates. Moreover, he stated Nebraska needed less than 6000 valid signatures total. He noted presidential candidate Steve Kubby can travel but has no money to do so at the moment. Teleconferencing provides a technology to support his remote appearances.

Tony Wall, the vice chair of Tennessee, thanked the LNC for its work.

Rob Oates, Idaho chair, invited movie goers, as opposed to NCAA basketball tourney watchers, to go see “300” the movie later tonight.

Dr. Lark thanked this large crowd in the gallery, probably one of record of attendance, for their time in attending.

Next Meeting

Bob Sul lentrup and Pat Dixon lobbied for the next meeting being in Pittsburgh in June or July and M Carling recommended a Friday meeting in Dayton coinciding with the August Region 3 meeting.

A straw poll favored Pittsburgh over Dayton, though a plurality would be satisfied with either location.

The LNC settled on July 21-22 in Pittsburgh (Pirates play the Astros, for those who care).
**Executive Session**

The LNC entered executive session for the purpose of discussing the ED contract and to address an issue in New York.

**Executive Director Contract**

Pat Dixon moved to authorize the chair and the Employment and Performance Compensation Committee to negotiate a 2-year contract with Shane Cory starting 4-1-07; further, to determine the bonus due Shane Corey on the contract ending 3-31-07 and bonuses thereafter.

Without objection the motion passed.

**Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 6:28 pm.

**Next Meetings**

The schedule for subsequent LNC and national meetings is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2007 summer meeting</th>
<th>July 21-22, 2007</th>
<th>Pittsburgh, PA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Next meeting</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Libertarian National Committee, Inc.
Balance Sheet  As of February 28, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSETS</th>
<th>Feb 28, 07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking/Savings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 · Cash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111 · Checking Account #1 (Federal)</td>
<td>19,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112 · Convention Restricted Account</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 11 · Cash</td>
<td>19,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Checking/Savings</td>
<td>19,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 · Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>9,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>9,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Current Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 · Other Receivables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131 · Mail House Settlement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131R · Mail House Settlement</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131U · Allowance for Uncollectables</td>
<td>(6,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131D · Accumulated Discount</td>
<td>(721)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 131 · Mail House Settlement</td>
<td>3,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132 · Mailing List Receivables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132R · Mailing List Receivable</td>
<td>11,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132U · Mailing List Allowance</td>
<td>(330)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 132 · Mailing List Receivables</td>
<td>10,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139 · Allowances for Doubtful Account</td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 13 · Other Receivables</td>
<td>13,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 · Inventory</td>
<td>7,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 · Prepaid Expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161 · Bulk Mail Account</td>
<td>789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163 · Metro Passes</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 16 · Prepaid Expenses</td>
<td>1,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Current Assets</strong></td>
<td>21,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Current Assets</strong></td>
<td>51,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 · Fixed Assets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172 · Furniture and Fixtures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17214B · Basis</td>
<td>37,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17214D · Accumulated Depreciation</td>
<td>(36,889)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 172 · Furniture and Fixtures</td>
<td>729</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Libertarian National Committee, Inc.
### Balance Sheet  As of February 28, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Feb 28, 07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174 · IS - Hardware</td>
<td>17211B · Basis</td>
<td>34,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17211D · Accumulated Depreciation</td>
<td>(19,454)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 174 · IS - Hardware</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175 · IS - Software</td>
<td>17212B · Basis</td>
<td>182,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17212D · Accumulated Depreciation</td>
<td>(182,404)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 175 · IS - Software</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176 · Capital Lease</td>
<td>17221B · Basis</td>
<td>18,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17221D · Accumulated Depreciation</td>
<td>(18,241)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 176 · Capital Lease</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 17 · Fixed Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 · Security Deposits</td>
<td>191 · Rent Deposit</td>
<td>7,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 19 · Security Deposits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Other Assets</td>
<td>7,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ASSETS</td>
<td></td>
<td>74,364</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Liabilities & Equity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liabilities</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Liabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 · Accounts Payable</td>
<td>30,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Accounts Payable</td>
<td>30,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Current Liabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2110 · Direct Deposit Liabilities</td>
<td>(8,753)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 · Contingencies - Shot Term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2201 · ASAP Mat Sls Fullfillment Liab</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 23 · Contingencies - Shot Term</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 · Accrued Vacation</td>
<td>9,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 · Accrued Payroll Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251 · Federal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2511 · Income Tax Withheld</td>
<td>1703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2512 · Social Security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25121 · Employer Liability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Libertarian National Committee, Inc.
**Balance Sheet**  
*As of February 28, 2007*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Description</th>
<th>Feb 28, 07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25122 · Employee Taxes Withheld</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 2512 · Social Security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2513 · Medicare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25131 · Employer Liability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25132 · Employee Taxes Withheld</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 2513 · Medicare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2514 · Unemployment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 251 · Federal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252 · State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2521 · Income Tax Withheld</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 252 · State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 25 · Accrued Payroll Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271 · Other Deferred Revenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2711 · Deferred Regular Dues</td>
<td>6,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2791 · Deferred Rent Liability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 271 · Other Deferred Revenue</td>
<td>1,344,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Other Current Liabilities</td>
<td>1,361,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Current Liabilities</td>
<td>1,392,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Liabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 · General Operating</td>
<td>(1,321,071)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 · Fund Balances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321 · Fund - Ballot Access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322 · Fund - Branding</td>
<td>(890)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323 · Fund - Camp/Cand</td>
<td>(6,595)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324 · Fund - Campus</td>
<td>4,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325 · Fund - Convention</td>
<td>(30,685)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327 · Fund - Lib Leadership School</td>
<td>15,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328 · Fund - Drug War</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 32 · Fund Balances</td>
<td>(18,293)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Income</td>
<td>21,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Equity</td>
<td>(1,318,164)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL LIABILITIES &amp; EQUITY</td>
<td>74,364</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Ordinary Revenue/Expense

### Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Jan 07</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Feb 07</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Jan - Feb 07</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4000</td>
<td>General Fundraising</td>
<td>82,147.76</td>
<td></td>
<td>111,387.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>193,534.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4100</td>
<td>Project Revenue</td>
<td>945.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,035.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4200</td>
<td>Program Revenue</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,585.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,585.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4400</td>
<td>Trf fr Auth. FEC Comm - PACS</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4500</td>
<td>Offsets to Operating Expend</td>
<td>105.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>115.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4600</td>
<td>Refunds of Contributions</td>
<td>(140.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(240.00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Jan 07</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Feb 07</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Jan - Feb 07</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>83,057.76</td>
<td></td>
<td>114,972.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>198,030.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>172,034.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>172,035.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>344,069.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gross Profit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Jan 07</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Feb 07</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Jan - Feb 07</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>83,057.76</td>
<td></td>
<td>114,972.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>198,030.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>172,034.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>172,035.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>344,069.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Expense

### Expense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Jan 07</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Feb 07</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Jan - Feb 07</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7000</td>
<td>General Fundraising Exp</td>
<td>16,895.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>36,540.55</td>
<td></td>
<td>53,435.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7100</td>
<td>Project-Related Expenses</td>
<td>1,976.61</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,413.53</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,390.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7200</td>
<td>Convention Expenses</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7300</td>
<td>Program-Related Expenses</td>
<td>5,356.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,978.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,334.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8000</td>
<td>Salary &amp; Related Expense</td>
<td>25,208.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>29,901.45</td>
<td></td>
<td>55,109.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8100</td>
<td>Admin &amp; Overhead Expense</td>
<td>20,139.66</td>
<td></td>
<td>24,137.72</td>
<td></td>
<td>44,277.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8200</td>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>3,708.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,208.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8300</td>
<td>Capital Exp &amp; Depreciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Expense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Jan 07</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Feb 07</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Jan - Feb 07</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Expense</td>
<td>73,333.83</td>
<td></td>
<td>103,496.83</td>
<td></td>
<td>176,830.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>145,624.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>145,624.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>291,248.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Net Ordinary Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Jan 07</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Feb 07</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Jan - Feb 07</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Net Ordinary Revenue</td>
<td>9,723.93</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,475.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,199.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26,410.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>26,411.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>52,821.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Net Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Jan 07</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Feb 07</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Jan - Feb 07</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Net Revenue</td>
<td>9,723.93</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,475.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,199.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26,410.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>26,411.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>52,821.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Libertarian National Committee, Inc.
A/R Aging Summary
As of February 28, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>1 - 30</th>
<th>31 - 60</th>
<th>61 - 90</th>
<th>&gt; 90</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Badnarik for Congress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilson, Michael</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake, Karen</td>
<td></td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPDC Libertarian Party DC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivier, Mark</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiting, David</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,943</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Libertarian National Committee, Inc.
A/P Aging Summary
As of February 28, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>1 - 30</th>
<th>31 - 60</th>
<th>61 - 90</th>
<th>&gt; 90</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Mailing Services, LLC</td>
<td>1,951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic Mailing Systems Inc</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B &amp; B Duplicators</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Digital Office Systems</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoreyStern.com</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cory Consulting, Inc</td>
<td>1,105</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Lage Landen Financial</td>
<td>524</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP Mailing Solutions</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great American Leasing</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVO Net LLC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J&amp;N Printing</td>
<td>5,686</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Ragan’s</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>488</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kohlihaas, Scott A</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Electronic Type, Inc</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>511</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVA Label Co. Inc.</td>
<td>1,492</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postmaster – Walton Press</td>
<td>2,252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa, Steve</td>
<td>765</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecompute Corporation</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Design Studio</td>
<td>573</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US LEC Corp.</td>
<td>2,272</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton Press</td>
<td>1,604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner, Norcross &amp; Judd</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worldwide Express - DHL</td>
<td>226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>22,776</td>
<td>7,913</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30,689</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reserve Adequacy Trend Since Jan 2003
LPHQ Update

Executive Director's Report

by Shane Cory

Overview

Since the last LNC meeting, LPHQ has focused heavily on fundraising efforts along with organizational and fundraising improvements.

Please feel free to address any issues not covered here at the upcoming LNC meeting and I will do my best to address or answer any concerns.

Staff Update

Our staff levels remain at appropriate levels with minor changes coming within the next quarter. Below are our current staffers and contractors:

- Robert Kraus continues to serve as our controller and director of operations while working closely with our FEC consultant and handling data issues for our state affiliates. Robert has solidly assisted with HR matters throughout the year.
- Stephen Gordon has transitioned over to the position of political director. He is no longer tasked with media requests and his last issue of LP News should be the April edition.
- Louise Calise joined LPHQ on November 13th as our direct marketing manager. Louise is transitioning into her role and has already made significant improvements to our direct mail program.
- Susan Dickson still serves as a full-time employee and remains extremely productive.
- Edward Wilson was recently hired as our special projects coordinator.
- Corey Stern remains on contract to take over all webmaster duties for LP.org and all related websites. Corey is currently working on the LP convention web site.
- Sean Haugh remains on contract for our Candidate Tracker program and is currently reporting on candidates for 2007 and 2008.
- Sam New remains on contract in order to manage the Libertarian Leadership School while serving as the instructor for several classes.
- Angela Aranoff, a GW student, serves as a part-time employee to assist with the call center in the evenings.
- George Cook, also a GW student, serves as a part-time employee to assist with administrative duties during the day.
Operations

Since the beginning of the year we have made slight improvements within the operations arena. The improvements range from signage in the lobby to improved backup procedures and network cleanups.

We are also currently in the process of converting over to a new web server that will provide significantly more power, fast load times and security, which is greatly needed. The conversion should be fully complete by March 12th.

Affiliates and Campaigns

Sean Haugh has completed a revised formula or our Candidate Tracker project. While the formula still emphasizes and rewards performance, it is much more realistic. Sean is in the process of collecting profiles of existing candidates for the 2007 season. Six candidates have responded thus far, five of which appear on LP.org.

With the conversion of Stephen Gordon to the position of political director, we are attempting to provide greater assistance to our state affiliates and candidates. On February 6th, Stephen was offered this position and accepted a probationary period that requires him to complete specific tasks within that time period (90 days).

These tasks, which are listed below, were decided upon after consulting with the chairman. I also consulted with former Executive Director and National Chair Steve Dasbach in regards to reactivating affiliates. In my opinion, these requirements are more than reasonable:

A. Recruit a minimum of 20 candidates for elected office for the 2007 election cycle.
B. Reactivate the Libertarian Party of West Virginia.
C. Reactivate the Libertarian Party of Maine.
D. Reactivate the Libertarian Party of Mississippi.
E. Create a comprehensive, ballot access and candidate recruitment plan for the 2008 election season.
F. Attempt to contact every chairman of every LP state affiliate to assess needs from the LNC and determine candidate recruitment efforts.

I am not aware of any progress in West Virginia or Mississippi. With Maine, their de facto chair, Mark Cenci, has been very helpful in his willingness to organize a meeting to discuss the future of the Maine affiliate.

While the "silence" of our West Virginia and Maine affiliates has been discussed during previous LNC meetings, to my knowledge Mississippi has not. The inactivity of Mississippi has led to a particularly odd circumstance for the 2007 election season. For the 2007 season, Mississippi will have its most minor party candidates for state legislature since 1923. The Constitution Party is fielding nine
candidates and the Green Party is fielding two candidates. The LP is fielding two fewer candidates than the Green Party . . . in Mississippi. That would be zero.

As Steve will be working on the tasks listed above, we will also be working on other matters to assist our state affiliates. Our webmaster, Corey Stern is working on web site templates for affiliates along with a protected affiliate section on LP.org.

Additionally, at the request of several states, we will be offering to provide membership cards to affiliates at cost. We hope to address services such as membership cards along with a new affiliate agreement with leaders at the State Chair’s conference.

**Finance and Fundraising**

**Direct Mail**
Since taking over our direct mail program, Louise Calise has been very helpful in creating a more professional and much more organized development department. Louise handled the logistics of our annual report fundraiser and, with her negotiations, saved the LP many thousands of dollars in the process.

Since January, we have dropped our 2006 Annual Report along with two donor re-acquisition mailings. This is in addition to our monthly renewal series which has been re-vamped by Louise and me.

Within the last 60 days, we have mailed 96,000 pieces of mail.

The performance of our mail packages is also significantly improving. This is due in part to more attractive packages using four color replies and carriers without a significant increase in costs. Louise has reached out to many new printing vendors to receive more competitive bids for everything from letterhead printing to our more complex annual report.

The January renewal series alone resulted in an outstanding 17% response rate with a $15k+ net.

Our first donor re-acquisition mailing since 2005 has already resulted in a 2.35% response rate with a $47 average gift. It has also reactivated over 580 grossly lapsed donors. Note that the first phase of the 2005 "Mega Guilt" series resulted in a 1.29% response rate.

In my opinion, the reason for the great performance of the re-acquisition mailing is due to the lack of renewal efforts at the end of 2005 and beginning of 2006 caused by the zero dues transition.

While we still have a target-rich environment within our own database, we have started our first prospecting package that will drop this month. We will be testing to 10k wealthy or affluent professionals with Keoghs with a general solicitation to join the Libertarian Party.
As we can now engage in prospecting and re-acquisition, our membership/donor numbers should steadily improve month-by-month. In January, we saw a 3% rise (the first increase in 21 months) and in February we had an increase of approximately 6%.

Internet Fundraising
In 2006, we made good progress with Internet based fundraising, generating over $183,000 in revenue. For comparison, in 2005 approximately $108,000 was generated over the web.

So far in 2007, we have raised more than $54,000 over the Internet.

A few reasons for the increased online giving are changes in our e-mail solicitations, which are now personalized, and an improved mail transfer agent. Since these changes were implemented, open rates increased from around 18% to over 35% (the last message experienced at 39% open rate). Because we made these two changes at the same time, I'm not sure which improvement made the most impact.

Pledge Program
Since our last LNC meeting, our monthly pledge revenue has held at approximately $26,000 per month.

As with the last report, little focus has been paid to promoting the pledge program in lieu of immediate response donations.

Phone-based Fundraising
Our call center, even with best efforts of improvement, is not functional as an in-house program. Despite shifting to evening calling, the program remains at break-even levels. Weekend calling must be added for better results, however this is not possible with the Watergate office building as they charge $100 per hour for heating/cooling on the weekends.

We will be outsourcing our phone renewal program and are currently in negotiations with a vendor that will be able to make all of the required calls each month (and repeat contacts) for around $4,000 per month. As part of the program and cost, they will also automatically send follow-up letters, removing that burden from staff.

In addition to the calling vendor, I have also retained Scott Kohlhaas as a major donor fundraiser for phone-based solicitations. This is a month-to-month agreement that is set at a flat fee of $5,000 per month without commission.

Finance
A/P is down to $39,478 with all invoices current. Of the amount due, $27,171 is owed to J&N Printing for printing costs related to the annual report and re-acquisition mailings.
Total funds raised to date are $257,234. Note that this is significantly under-budget.

**LNC Give or Get Program**

As part of a fundraising drive organized by Aaron Starr, we have been tracking all donations and fundraising activity of our current board members.

Below is a list of the current standings as of this month:

**LNC Board Member Progress Toward Give or Get Commitments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Give</th>
<th>Get</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>% of Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Redpath</td>
<td>$2,588</td>
<td>$2,588</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Moulton</td>
<td>$975</td>
<td>$975</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Keaton</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,025</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Dixon</td>
<td>$375</td>
<td>$375</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy Keil</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Karlan</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Colley</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Ryan</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Fox</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Carling</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Starr</td>
<td>$2,070</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$6,070</td>
<td>121%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Lieberman</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Salvette</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart Flood</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Lark</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>420%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wes Benedict</td>
<td>$420</td>
<td>$420</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardy Machia</td>
<td>$4,520</td>
<td>$4,520</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Sundwall</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$1,861</td>
<td>$1,861</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$40,734</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>$48,834</strong></td>
<td><strong>$68,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>72%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bob Sullentrup, Nancy Neale, Steve Damerell, Rebecca Sink Burris, Bob Barr, and Richard Burke are not participating in the Give or Get program.

**Future Recommendations & Miscellaneous Items**

In all honesty, I have too much going on at the time to recommend any future projects. We need to focus on finishing or improving existing programs. While we have seen quick and vast improvements in a number of areas, there is still a great deal of work to do before this office is running to my satisfaction. I will be working with existing staff to improve their work products and lighten their work loads through efficiency and better use of products like Raiser's Edge.
I would like to take a moment to thank a few people who are not on staff but are integral to the functions of this office:

- Richard Winger of Ballot Access News has been a blessing to the LP. I greatly appreciate his work and advice.
- Bill Hall of Warner, Norcross & Judd has been incredibly responsive to the needs of this office and has lifted weight and worry off of my shoulders allowing me to make clear and confident decisions.

To both Bill and Richard: Thank You!

**Director of Operation's Report**

*by Robert Kraus*

**Blackbaud – Data Dumps – Internal Customer Service**

No new major issues to report with RE-7 from Blackbaud. We took advantage of our final free NCOA Update (address, death, congressional dist, etc.) in December and decided to pay the fee to allow us to run 4 total updates for 2007. The first of which we will take late this month.

We also worked with our outside consultant to address some of the issues the IT Committee raised, as well as having our consultant work on general maintenance issues with our servers which are now working better and faster than ever. In addition, we continue to consolidate more phone numbers and created some general maintenance queries to keep our data as clean as possible.

In terms of data dumps, we continue to have a mainly one way flow of information to states. We are seeing some improvements however and we wish to thank LPAL, LPMN, LPPA, LPRI, LPTN, LPTX and LPVA for their recent updates. We would like to see more sharing of information and encourage state membership directors to send us their updates often & will address this at the State Chairs conference in more detail.

**FEC Filing**

We continue to file accurate FEC reports and use Paula Edwards to complete the FEC Filing Process on a monthly basis and handle our amendments. The reconciliation and audit steps to this process, added earlier this year, continue to work to assure that these reports are correct prior to filing, and to insure that the disbursements and contributions match to our accounting records. We have hired Kooch and Hoos to complete our “desk audit” as required by the FEC. They are in the process of reviewing our 2006 end of year reports & should have this audit completed by the end of the month.

**Financial**

With our continued efforts to control and maintain our expenses, combined with Shane’s efforts to keep the money coming in, we have had our 2nd profitable
month in the black. We continue with the downward trend in A/P that begun last year, and as of EOM Feb-07 it’s at its lowest level in over 5 years. Our aged over 30 days payables as of EOM Feb is the lowest since Nov 03, and as of Mar 7, 2007 we have no aged over 30 day payables – in other words we are now current on all payables.

This is a major achievement and something we’ve been working towards for the last two years! Now under Shane’s leadership we are on our way to hopefully making the goal of the reserve by the end of your terms if not this year [Shane's note: I bribed Robert with Girl Scout cookies to say nice things about me].

**Human Resources**

We are very pleased to announce our new associate, Edward Wilson, who is currently working our front desk, taking calls, dealing with membership issues and other special projects. We like to call him “Sam Jr.” and hope you all will get a chance to talk to him soon. Shane will go into greater detail about our new employee and other changes.

**Political Director's Report**

**by Stephen Gordon**

**Overview**

Since the last LNC meeting, I have received a lateral transfer from the position of Communications Director to the position of Political Director. I continue to serve as the de facto editor of *LP News*. This report will cover aspects of all three key areas of my responsibility at LPHQ.

Currently, many of the functions of the Communications Director are handled by other people. Shane Cory and William Redpath handle a significant quantity of media interview requests. Cory assists with the writing of some press releases. With the exception of the message side (blog, front page updates and daily poll), Corey Stern handles most of the load with respect to Internet and website issues. Louise Calise is responsible for most aspects of *Pledge News*, although I provide her with some assistance.

Many of the functions of the Political Director are outsourced. Sean Haugh is an invaluable asset with respect to Candidate Tracker. Additionally, we share information enabling each of us to perform our unique job functions. Stewart Flood continues to manage Ballot Base.

With respect to *LP News*, I still write most of the material, am the primary copy editor and act as the primary interface with the vendor which prints and distributes the publication.

**Press Releases**
Since the last meeting of the LNC, the Libertarian Party has released 13 press releases or articles designed to attract media attention. This is an increase of seven releases from the previous reporting period.

Issues covered were libertarian/conservative fusionism, gay marriage, State of the Union response, Bush’s surge policy, Iraq death toll, Homeland Security, 2008 Libertarian National Convention, Bob Barr becoming board member, 35th birthday of the LP, earmark spending, Milton Friedman's death, Texas election results and 2006 LP election results.

As with the previous reporting period, some of our releases were "web only" while others went through normal distribution procedures.

**Earned Media**

Excluding mentions of Bob Barr, using the search pattern of "Libertarian Party" on Google News provided an average of around 200 articles for any 30 day period since the election results were announced. This is a minor decrease from late October and early November, but is to be expected because of election dates. This is a moderate increase from the middle of last year, however. We are using Google News to quantify media coverage, as opposed to Lexis/Nexis, as Google coverage and reliability is now generally superior to low-level Lexis/Nexis media services.

Shane Cory, William Redpath and I have been involved with several radio and newspaper interviews since the last reporting period. Cory and I have been filmed for portions of political documentaries. We've also managed to pass several interviews to state affiliates, where the local issues involved could be more appropriately handled. Media requests for Bob Barr were routed though the Communications Director in his office.

During the period following Bob Barr’s appointment to this board, media coverage roughly doubled for the Libertarian Party. Some major media outlets covered Barr’s appointment to the LNC and we received a peak in Internet traffic. The greatest single source of Internet traffic came from the Drudge Report.

We’ve now established a reasonably friendly relationship with *Reason* magazine and many of their online readers. Traditionally, much of the coverage from *Reason* cast the LP in a negative light. By more carefully controlling the information sent to *Reason*, the level of criticism both in articles and in reader comments has decreased. To be sure, they are still critical where criticism is due, but they highlight more of our positive accomplishments now, too. The ratio of negative comments on *Reason*’s blog has significantly decreased since I started tracking them in 2004. They covered Bob Barr’s move to the LP with a full print article in their March edition.

**Negative Media**

The level of negative media about the Libertarian Party has increased since Election Day. As an example, talk radio host Michael Medved has written two recent negative pieces about the party, blaming us for GOP losses in the Senate.
Bruce Bartlett has written two similar pieces, one of which more or less suggests that the Libertarian Party should be disbanded.

The other key general source of negative media was due to the rather unusual skin coloration of one of our U.S. Senate candidates.

With obvious turmoil occurring within the conservative movement, it is reasonable to expect this sort of media coverage to continue.

**Issues and Policy**

During this reporting period, we engaged in two activities which may fall outside of the general media and press release category. The first was a formal comment urging the Department of Homeland Security to cease using its Automated Targeting System to provide risk assessments of millions of traveling U.S. citizens. Before submitting the statement and associated press release, the document was approved by the Advertising and Publications Review Committee.

William Redpath also provided a response to the President Bush's State of the Union Address using the medium of the Internet. As this was an immediate response to current events, we treated it as a press release and it wasn't submitted to the Advertising and Publications Review Committee.

**CPAC**

The Libertarian Party was represented as a cosponsor at CPAC. We maintained a booth, were properly listed as a cosponsor in programs, billing and advertising for the event, and maintained a spot with prominent national bloggers at Blogger Row. Bob Barr was speaker at the event, and Nick Gillespie of Reason magazine moderated one of the panels.

Joe Magyar was asked to cover the convention on the LP blog. He is the person who provided the excellent coverage of the 2006 Libertarian National Convention at ThirdPartyWatch.com, and he had recently moved to Washington, D.C. to write for a prominent financial/stock market publication. One editor of a prominent national publication privately praised his coverage as "awesome."

The impressive list of people with whom Shane Cory and I were able to network is extensive, but not appropriate for publication.

Booth operations ran smoothly, despite a less than premium location. Of the booths on our row, we clearly had the greatest amount of traffic. While we haven't yet tallied final results, we received additional contact information for hundreds of people. Quite a few people (including blogs) were impressed with the general level of libertarian presence, as well as the Libertarian Party presence, at CPAC. Because we used staffers and contractors to man the booth, comments ranged from "professional appearance" to "less nutty" than normal.

I was interviewed by one radio station, one documentary, one television camera and several blogs at CPAC.
Internet

According to data provided at Alexa.com, on most days the Libertarian Party website maintained a slight lead over the traffic (as measured by daily reach) at gop.com. Aside from several isolated days and a one week period, democrats.org is beating lp.org on daily reach. lp.org continues to consistently lead both of our competitive political party sites with respect to total page views.

As we are now using Google Analytics instead of AWStats to internally monitor our site statistics, it would be unreasonable to compare earlier reported traffic statistics to current levels. To establish a baseline for reporting purposes using Google Analytics, we'll begin our reporting period at January 1 and end this one on March 6, 2007.

There were a total of 219,588 visits and 618,304 page views, providing a P/V average of 2.82. 68.34 percent of our visitors were new, while 31.66 percent were returning. Virtually all of our traffic comes from within the United States.

Top 5 Entry Pages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Visitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>136,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/media/article_459.shtml</td>
<td>21,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/issues/platform_all.shtml</td>
<td>9,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/survey.shtml</td>
<td>4,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yourturn/</td>
<td>2,754</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From March 6-7, we conducted a one day online survey to get some idea of the political background and ideology of our site visitors. It is to be noted that there was more right-leaning than left-leaning prominent site material at the time. The results are less than scientific, but provide a general view of our site readers at that snapshot in time. Here are the results:

From time to time, we’d like to get a feel of who visits the LP website. Which is the best description of your political leanings and affiliation? (164 votes)

- I'm a member of the Libertarian Party 73 (44%)
- I'm a libertarian independent 34 (20%)
- I'm a libertarian Republican 18 (10%)
- I'm a libertarian Democrat 4 (2%)
- I'm a small government Republican 7 (4%)
- I'm an anti-war Democrat 2 (1%)
I'm a civil liberties-oriented Republican
0 (0%)
I'm a civil liberties-oriented Democrat
2 (1%)
I'm an anarchist and not involved in the electoral process
6 (3%)
I'm a mainstream Republican stopping by the site to check it out
2 (1%)
I'm a mainstream Democrat stopping by the site to check it out
1 (0%)
I'm a member of another third party
2 (1%)
I'm an independent but decidedly not libertarian
0 (0%)
undecided/other
13 (7%)

Affiliates

As the new Political Director, one of my immediate goals is to reactivate some of our "dead" or "nearly dead" state affiliates. States of immediate concern include Maine, Mississippi, West Virginia, Kentucky and the District of Columbia. If any board member has any information which may be helpful in resuscitating any of these, or other, inactive states, please contact me.

UPDATE: It appears that Maine is now in the planning stages for a state convention. Mark Cenci has spoken with Shane Cory about how the national office may be able to assist them.

Ballot Base

Stewart Flood is in the process of completing the development of the Ballot Base front end. He is also making modifications to correct some of the minor glitches discovered during the 2006 elections. Flood will be available during this meeting to answer any questions about Ballot Base.

According to Flood, Ballot Base will be redeployed in time for our two upcoming special elections.

Candidate Recruitment

A key responsibility with which I've been tasked is candidate recruitment. I've started working on 2007 recruitment and hope to have some concrete accomplishments to report at the next board meeting.

2008 candidate recruitment goals will significantly exceed our 2006 totals. Additionally, I hope to ensure that each state possible has at least one statewide candidate in 2008.
The initial contact mechanism for recruiting candidates will be a thank you letter to our 2006 candidates which urges them to run for office again. Additionally, I plan to contact each regional representative to the LNC, as well as state chairs and executive directors and ask for their assistance in identifying and contacting potential candidates. The assistance of any member of the LNC would be greatly appreciated in this matter.

**Special Elections**

There have two upcoming special elections of which we can take immediate advantage. The first is so late-breaking that I don’t have all the details. What I do know is that it is for a state Senate race in South Carolina. Stewart Flood has recruited a candidate and will be able to provide more details on this race by the time of this meeting.

The other race is the U.S. Congressional seat vacated because of the death of Charlie Norwood in Georgia. David Chastain, the new Executive Director in Georgia, has identified a candidate and they are currently working on filing requirements for this race.

**LP News**

Feedback to *LP News* has been almost universally positive since the reformat of the publication. In the last edition, we had to run our first Corrections section in months. The key technical problem we are having is in working with the printing company about color saturation levels.

We are publishing Letters to the Editor again. However, much of the material we receive for this section is not usable. We now have enough upcoming events to start publishing the Events section as was done in the past.

The latest edition of *LP News* ran interviews of 12 potential LP presidential candidates. These are the only candidates we know of who have expressed an interest in the LP nomination. We also provided an Annual Report section, which covered the last year’s financial data for the party. The Annual Report section also covered a written report from the Chair, Treasurer and Executive Director.

We are still having some difficulty in obtaining enough information about newsworthy items and upcoming events in quite a few states. I’d like to urge our Regional Reps to contact their local states and encourage them to submit information to *LP News*. Again, many people use *LP News* as an outreach tool, so there will be very little coverage of internal party divisions or debate over divisive issues.

We are currently accepting RFPs from potential publishers of *LP News*. Hopefully, we’ll be able to outsource the editing and layout of the publication, affording better utilization of staff time in the future.

**Direct Marketing Manager’s Report**
by Louise Calise

Overview

As Shane Cory has reported back in November 2006 our direct mail program is on track with quality packages.

To move forward effectively in the direct mail program we continually analyze net results and percent returns on appeals mailed to determine what and who to mail to next.

In order to accomplish this, I have created package codes in Raiser’s Edge for our appeals mailed and/or individual appeal codes for monthly mailings so we can specifically identify what our most cost-effective packages are. For example, when we mailed the Annual Report I entered different package codes in Raiser’s Edge to determine which segment of the file brought in the best returns. As of March 5, the highest percent of return for which this appeal was mailed to is donors who are Active and Life Members, and the second highest percent is zero dues members; however, the highest average gift ($84.49) is from the segment of Active and Life Members, while the second highest average gift ($77.92) is from the segment of Lapsed donors.

Another change in RE that I have implemented is to input costs of each appeal. Taking into consideration the fact that each mailing does not cost the same, this is of tremendous help when we are analyzing results because we then look at net results instead of gross results.

So far this calendar year we have raised $54,033 on our website alone. A good part of this is due to the fact that Shane has sent out blast email solicitations when an issue arises and directs donors to our website.

House Appeals

Overall our house appeals are bringing in higher returns than are average for house appeals to nonprofit organizations.

In January we mailed an appeal to our lapsed donors (those who have not given LP a gift of $5 or more within the last 5 years). This equated to mailing 24,701. From this appeal alone we have netted $17,700 with a 2.26% return.

Unfortunately, when I mailed this appeal the query I did included Life Members who have not given to the LP within those 5 years. In identifying this mistake, it was agreed that a letter of apology and new membership cards needed to be mailed to the Life Members who received this appeal. Since Shane signed the original letter, he wanted to sign the letter of apology. Also, I confessed my mistake to those members I was able to reach by telephone. I am thankful that no one was upset.

On the positive side, this appeal did so well that we then mailed further lapsed donors (those members whose membership expired between 1/1/1999 and 1/2/2002) on February 27, 2007. This appeal was mailed to 33,143. From this
appeal we anticipate netting more than the January appeal with a higher percent return.

As of March 6, 2007 our Annual Report is bringing in a 0.95% return with gifts and the average gift is $82.14. Our first goal for this appeal was for it to be in the black (total costs are $27,850) which will be met by the end of this week.

**Prospecting**

We are preparing to test a prospecting appeal this month to donors from the Target America database. A list of 10k names has already been purchased and the letter is in the works.

**Special Projects**

by Edward Wilson

This year the Libertarian Party cosponsored the 34th Annual Conservative Political Action Convention (CPAC) which was held on March 1-3rd in Washington, DC. The Libertarian Party presence was surprisingly well received by the overwhelmingly Republican majority at the convention. It appeared that the only Republicans that were excited about their party were the ones who were there to rally for a presidential candidate in 08; no one was boasting about the achievements of Bush or Cheney.

The LP was very successful in discovering that within every Republican is a Libertarian waiting in the wings. Many loyal Republican voters expressed that they fell disenfranchised with the current administrations spending and therefore were very receptive to the Libertarian Parties message of limited government and lower taxes. The LP wasn't alone in condemning the current administration; during the presidential banquets there were a variety of Republican speakers who denounced their parties' contribution to the increasing size of government.

The Republican Party had its opportunity to prove that they would reduce the size of government, in the last few years, when they had control of all the Legislative and Executive branches of government. Nevertheless, they failed to provide what they had vowed to do. In November of 2006 the Republican Party got its first taste of criticism when they lost control of the House and Senate to the Democrats. The unfulfilled promise of providing its constituents with smaller government and more civil liberties has significantly hurt support for the Republican Party. The CPAC convention proved that the steady decline in support for Republicans has not stopped. Thankfully, The Libertarian Party has been more then happy to take on the burden of following through with the broken promises of the Republican Party.

**Libertarian Leadership School**

by Sam New
On February 27, 2007, the Libertarian Leadership School completed its sixth semester under the guidance of committee chairman Jim Lark, and project coordinator Sam New. This semester, we offered Campus Organizing, Candidate Recruitment, Campaign Fundraising, Candidate Training, Campaign Management, and Blogging. Of note, Louise Calise taught an effective class on Campaign Fundraising. Sam is currently in the process of finalizing grades and issuing certificates to those students who completed courses successfully.

This semester saw a spike in student enrollments (a total of 22), due largely to email promotions and solicitations. The next semester is scheduled to begin Monday, April 2. Registration is now open. For questions, comments, and ideas, contact Sam New.

**Candidate Tracker 2007**

by Sean Haugh

The 2007 edition of Candidate Tracker (CT) is up and running. To date we know about 30 candidates running for office this year, of which 6 have answered the initial survey. Six known incumbents are running, and many more candidates will announce as we progress throughout the year. Besides many winnable local races on tap for this year, Louisiana, Virginia and New Jersey hold their statewide partisan elections in odd years. Strong candidates have already emerged in the first two states, and New Jersey is working on running as full a slate as possible for their state legislative races.

The CT formula has been changed significantly from the 2006 version, however the basic structure of the formula remains the same. What follows is an overview of the changes between CT 2006 and CT 2007.

First, the general points. The new formula will result in significantly higher CT scores than in 2006. This is justified because higher scores allow us to use a greater range of value when measuring various activities relative to each other. However, we also need to do a better job of communicating the point at which a CT score actually may mean an increase in vote totals.

Another fundamental change from last year is the greater scrutiny applied to all events and appearances. Every field has a strict definition designed to only count those activities which actually reach voters in the target district. If we erred in this in 2006, it was in the direction of rewarding candidates with points simply to encourage any new campaign activity. Now that the concept of Candidate Tracker, and particularly CT’s aspect of sober and honest self-appraisal, has been largely accepted within the party, it behooves us to ensure that CT points truly reflect successful campaigning.

One suggested factor not included is whether the race has ballot access implications. The mere fact that ballot access is on the line is largely irrelevant to the voters, and should be enough inducement to candidates and state parties to put the resources into the race that more directly affect what CT is supposed to measure.
Another factor included in 2006 that was not included this time is campaign staff. Last year, we decided that we would not give points for having a website because it is expected that all candidates will have one. We should apply the same principle to campaign staff and volunteers. Measuring campaign staff is both indirect and duplicative. If one has campaign staff or volunteers, their activity will naturally increase the CT score, while campaigns without them will find a natural ceiling and lack a competitive advantage which is adequately expressed in the proposed formula. In the future, we hope that debate invitations also move into this “de rigueur” category.

Similarly, points for attending campaign training through Libertarian Leadership School or another program as well as the use of Ballot Base were considered and rejected. While we do have an interest in coordinating these campaign support initiatives by the party and encouraging their use, proper use of these options will show up and be counted for points through directly measurable campaign activity.

A separate system for nonpartisan and partisan races was considered and rejected, in favor of simply increasing the value of nonpartisan races. Winning campaign activities are the same regardless of the nature of the race or the size of the district. The only exception to this is when the district size is so small that all candidates are known before filing simply by existing in the community, and these are not the types of races which might benefit from the Candidate Tracker.

One factor in partisan races not included is the existence of straight party voting in any particular state. While it will be a significant factor as we become more competitive, at our current level of success there is no significant statistical difference between Libertarian candidates in states which lack the straight party device versus ones which do. Another change not contemplated in this proposed formula is factoring in the closeness of the race. While this has a direct impact on Libertarian vote totals, it opens the CT up to measuring what other campaigns do, which is beyond the resources available for the project.

In general, the introduction of sweeping new concepts into the CT formula was avoided. CT 2007 does not collect much more data than it did last year, it simply has more categories to sort and value the data.

The CT formula was originally conceived as a method to predict the likelihood of winning. We found that while it did do a good job of measuring Libertarian campaign activity, CT scores did not necessarily translate into vote totals. There were so few campaigns in 2006 which engaged in enough activity to even move up a percentage point at the polls. This proposed formula should increase the accuracy of measuring real Libertarian campaign activity, which in and of itself has great value to us. Yet we need to have more campaigns that not only attempt outright victory, but more importantly understand what is required to effectively compete in the electoral marketplace, before we can collect enough data to correlate CT scores with winning.

The new CT formula is appended below. Here I will list the changes in detail and give the reasoning behind them.
The “FundVoterScore” from 2006 has been replaced with a “SpendVoterScore.” This will measure only campaign spending on advertising (broadly defined) and Get Out The Vote (GOTV) divided by the number of voters in the district. While we will still keep track of total fundraising, fundraising itself will not score points. As we saw in 2006, fundraising alone is not necessarily an indication of campaign activity. Funds raised that are not spent on activities which demonstrably increase name recognition and vote totals are just as good as funds not raised at all. The focus on spending over fundraising recognizes the need for donors and supporters to realize value and assure them that their contributions will be spent effectively. Considering that the dollar value in this equation will be lower and that we want to encourage these core campaign activities, the multiplier is doubled.

The point value for being in a non-partisan race is increased from 20 to 50 points. At this stage in our development, winning a partisan race is simply a bigger hurdle than we want to admit. The increase recognizes this but still leaves enough room for candidates to overcome any disadvantage in a partisan race by factors which increase name ID and reputation in the community.

The new “CommSvcScore” pulls together many of the items that were used in the “HQ bonus field” from 2006 and other fields which reflect what the voters already know about a candidate before the race begins. Point values are greatly increased relative to other campaign activities to place emphasis on the need for positive name recognition before one even files for office. Veteran status is decreased relative to local service because while it looks good on a resume it does not necessarily involve voter contact. However, active reserve status is highly valued by voters, so it is included. Years living in the district is included because it increases opportunities to be known within the district as well as being in and of itself a fact of interest to voters.

The point values for the CommSvcScore are:

- 200 points for incumbent
- 50 points for previous election to another office
- 20 points for current appointment to office
- 5 points for past appointment to office
- 30 points for leader of a service organization
- 10 points for officer of a service organization
- 3 points for active membership in a service organization
- 1 point for every year candidate has lived in the district
- 5 points for a veteran of the US Armed Forces
- 10 points for current reserve status in the US Armed Forces

All of the media related items are combined into a “MediaScore.” More types of media are included in this formula to recognize the qualitative differences between them. These are weighted relative to other parts of the score, e.g., 3 television news stories on the candidate are valued roughly the same as holding appointed office. Factoring in circulation or other statistics measuring how media reaches voters within the district was considered but rejected for several reasons, most notably the inability to easily acquire these stats for all media outlets. This increased differentiation of the current model was chosen because it allows us to
collect and use more data without significantly increasing staff work load. It incorporates all we adjusted on the fly during 2006 by including them in the “HQ bonus field” or adjusting definitions of media to include other types.

Public access shows are counted per airing on the theory that channel surfers will encounter them. As before, only television is big enough where a mere mention has any value. Polling is included here but discounted because there is no current connection to be made between polling numbers and vote totals for Libertarian candidates. Websites are cautiously included, although all media will be subject to greater scrutiny than we gave them in 2006. Overall, this greater scrutiny will lead to fewer media appearances being counted, which makes the total media score less valuable than it was in 2006. However this is counterbalanced by the fact that there is no ceiling to the media score, while it is much more possible to reach the limits of the community service or public appearance scores.

The point values for MediaScore:

- 7 points for each appearance on network television
- 2 points for each appearance on cable television
- 1 point for each appearance on public access television
- 1 point for each time the candidate is mentioned on network television
- 5 points for every article in a major newspaper
- 3 points for every article in a smaller newspaper
- 5 points for every radio appearance over 10 minutes
- 2 points for every radio appearance under 10 minutes
- 3 points for being discussed on radio over 10 minutes without being present
- 1 point for every website posting
- 1 point for every point above 7% in a major poll
- 5 points for each endorsement by a civic group
- 10 points for a major media endorsement
- 40 points for each appearance in national media

All manner of personal appearances are incorporated into the “PubAppScore.” Debates are included and highly valued in recognition of the respect they connote. Note that any media coverage of the candidate in debates or other events allows for extra points to be scored for the same activity. (For example, a candidate would get 20 points for being in a TV debate plus 7 points for each time that debate is aired on TV.) Appearances on behalf of the candidate are included because campaigns should be big enough that the candidate has staff or supporters who can represent the candidate when he or she is at another event.

For all criteria except national media, this must be within the district. All outlets of any type which do not cover the district are not counted. Primarily Libertarian media outlets (except public access television) are not counted.

The point values for PubAppScore:

- 3 points for each appearance by the candidate at a public event
- 1 point for each appearance made on behalf of the candidate at a public event
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- 1 point for every 3 hours spent by the candidate going door to door
- 20 points for being included in a debate carried on network television
- 5 points for being included in a debate carried by other media

The “HQ bonus field” is retained, although all factors which were used in the HQ bonus score in 2006 are now included separately. However this field is retained in case of some phenomenal unforeseen circumstance which has a direct impact on the campaign.

The final score is determined by taking the sum of the Criteria and HQ Bonus scores and dividing by the number of candidates in the race. Democratic, Libertarian and Republican candidates count as “1,” up to a maximum of two per party, while candidates of other parties, independent candidates and Democratic, Libertarian and Republican candidates in excess of two count as “1/2” each. You can call this the “Louisiana rule.” While it is more difficult for Libertarians to compete in states with open primaries like Louisiana, it does not become, say, 7 times more difficult for a Libertarian to make a difference in a race if there are 7 Democrats or Republicans in it. However, the open primary has been attempted in other states (e.g., Washington) and occurs in special circumstances (e.g., the California recall election) and can swallow up Libertarian candidates, which is why extra opponents still are counted.

* Appendix 1: CT 2007 Formula:

\[
\frac{([\text{SpendVoterScore}]+([\text{NPRace}]*-50)+[\text{CommSvcScore}]+[\text{MediaScore}]+[\text{PubAppScore}])/\text{Candidates}}{
}

* Appendix 2: CT 2006 Formula (for reference):

\[
[\text{FundsVoterScore}]+([\text{NPRace}]*-20)+([\text{Incumbent}]*-100)+([\text{USMilVet}]*-20)+[\text{TeleAppScore}]+[\text{TeleMentScore}]+[\text{PrintArticlesScore}]+[\text{PubAppScore}]
\]

Criteria Description

- FundVoterScore is the total funds raised over the number of registered voters multiplied by 100
- For NPRace, add 20 points if the race is non-partisan
- For Incumbent, add 100 points if the candidate is an incumbent seeking reelection
- For USMilVet, add 20 points if the candidate is a veteran of the US armed forces
- For TeleAppScore, add 5 points for each television appearance by the candidate
- For TeleMentScore, add 2 points for each time the candidate is mentioned on television
- For PrintArticlesScore, add 5 points for every article on candidate in print media
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- For PubAppScore, add 2 points for each appearance of a candidate at a public event

Appendix 3: Definitions:

under SpendVoterScore:

Advertising: any media which puts the candidate before the voters. Beyond traditional newspaper/TV/radio advertising, this also may include website costs, billboards, yard signs, brochures, door-hangers, or bumperstickers. Specifically excluded from this definition are buttons, coffee mugs and t-shirts. All advertising must be focused on the district. Advertising spending which does not accomplish this (e.g., ads in LP News, billboards that are outside the district) will not be counted.

GOTV: the costs of any program designed to identify likely supporters and get them to the polls. This may include phone banks, rides to the polls, or arrangements for absentee ballots.

under CommSvcScore:

Previous election to another office: Any office on the ballot in the district, e.g., a former or current Soil & Water Supervisor running for higher local office. Elections in other jurisdictions, e.g. City Council in another state, are not counted.

Current/past appointment to office: Any office appointed by a government body in the district.

Service organization: Must be a recognized local or national service organization, e.g., Chamber of Commerce, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Rotary, Partners Against Crime, or a neighborhood association. Political organizations are not counted, nor are activities which begin after filing for office. “Leader” means current Chair (or the equivalent) of the group. “Officer” can include either offices besides the Chair or chairmanship (or the equivalent) of a committee or initiative of the organization. “Active membership” means activity within the organization beyond simply paying membership dues.

US Armed Forces: All branches of the service are included. Reserve status specifically includes the National Guard.

under MediaScore:

Network television: Local affiliates of ABC, NBC, CBS and Fox.

Cable television: All other television channels besides national news (see below) or public access.

Public access television: Counted by number of airings.
Mention on network television: When the candidate is mentioned by name and office sought in a story about an issue (e.g., a public hearing) or an opposing candidate.

Major newspaper: Daily newspapers in the district or high circulation free weekly papers (e.g., Creative Loafing). This may include a big city paper outside the district that is the highest circulation daily within the district (e.g., the New York Times in western Connecticut).

Smaller newspaper: Weekly or semiweekly newspapers wholly contained in the district. This may also include voter guides or questionnaire responses published by civic or political groups and distributed to their members within the district.

Radio: Only includes commercial or public radio stations. College, web or pirate radio are not counted.

Website: Only those websites or blogs specifically devoted to politics within the district are counted. This may include web-only articles published by any of the other media outlets noted above.

Poll: Commissioned and/or publicized by a major newspaper or network television and according to sound statistical methods. Internet polls, polls commissioned by the campaign, and polls by websites or smaller media outlets are not included.

Endorsements: Official endorsements of civic groups active in the district. Endorsements from individuals, Libertarian groups or political organizations not active in the district are not counted. “Major media” in this context means major newspaper or network television. Media endorsements by smaller newspapers or cable television stations are counted the same as those from civic groups.


under PubAppScore:

Public event: An event attended by voters in the district and open to the public. Specifically Libertarian events are not counted (e.g., a regular meeting of the county party, state convention). The candidate must be recognized by name and office sought. Events where the candidate is not identified as a current candidate are not counted. Events created by the campaign itself are also not counted (e.g., a “Smile Brigade,” fundraising dinners).

Debate: A forum that is open to all candidates on the ballot and is well attended by them. Debates which are cancelled due to lack of participation and public appearances where many or all candidates in the race happen to be present are not counted.
CAMPUS ORGANIZING REPORT

Submitted to: Libertarian National Committee, Mar. 2, 2007

Submitted by: James W. Lark, III
Region 5 Representative
Libertarian National Committee

The following report will provide information concerning efforts to build and support Libertarian campus organizations. I shall provide an updated report at the next LNC meeting should additional information become available.

1) Due to a tremendous amount of faculty work, I have been forced to place the campus website project on the back burner for the moment. Completion of this project by the middle of the summer will likely be my highest priority LP project for the next four months.

2) Since June, 2006, I have handled the task of updating the LP’s campus contact list and responding to inquiries from students who want information about the LP campus outreach effort. I am pleased to note that I have been able to update the contact list and respond to virtually all inquiries in a prompt manner. As far as I can tell, the complaints about out-of-date contact information and slow responses (or no responses) to inquiries have stopped.

During the past several months, I have seen a steady stream of inquiries from students who wish to start Libertarian campus groups. Unfortunately, most of these inquiries have not yet produced active groups.

3) I intend to prepare at least one “how to” article about promoting the LP on college campuses for inclusion in LP News within the next four months.

4) In my previous report to the LNC, I mentioned the possibility of conducting an outreach effort at the annual CPAC event in Washington, D.C. in early March, 2007. As you are probably aware, the LP is sponsoring a booth at this event. Please note that the funding and volunteer staffing for this outreach project was generated through the efforts of Shane Cory and his staff colleagues.

5) On Feb. 27 I completed my sixth semester of service as the professor of the Libertarian Leadership School course on campus organizing. So far the feedback from students concerning the course continues to be very positive. (Indeed, one of my students during the sixth semester organized a Libertarian group at his college. He has offered effusive praise for the quality of the education he received during the course.)
6) I am continuing to work with various state and local organizations to assist their efforts for campus outreach. In particular, I hope to meet with campus activists during my participation in the Libertarian Party of Oregon state convention on March 9-11, the LNC meeting/LSLA conference in Orlando on March 16-18, and the LP Tennessee convention on March 30-31. I shall conduct a workshop on campus organizing during the LSLA conference on March 17.
LPHQ Response to the LNC’s IT Committee

During the Alexandria meeting of the Libertarian National Committee, the LNC unanimously voted to require LPHQ to respond to a report created by the newly formed IT Committee that, in particular, raised many issues related to Raiser’s Edge.

Former National Chairman Geoffrey Neale, who at the time was serving as national treasurer and already assisting LPHQ with many Raiser’s Edge issues, was asked to address the report in the capacity of a contractor.

Mr. Neale traveled to Washington, D.C. in January to investigate each issue in the report and, if possible and necessary, correct any concerns that were raised by the IT Committee.

Below is Mr. Neale’s unedited report.

TO: Shane Cory
FROM: Geoffrey Neale
SUBJECT: LNC IT Committee Report Response

Per your request, I will address each individual item identified in the IT Committee Report submitted to the November 11, 2006 LNC meeting.

I am specifically not addressing any website issues, since that is outside the purview of my assignment.

I will attempt to provide the IT Committee required responses to each item in a relatively short form, and will provide a more verbose summary later.

The IT report required four responses per item, which are:

- A proposed timetable for implementing each correction.
- An explanation of why each correction cannot be implemented (if impossible).
- The anticipated cost of implementing each correction (if a non-trivial amount).
- A recommendation on whether to implement each correction (cost/benefit analysis).

Given the above responses are too verbose for easy categorization, I am going to refer to the above four responses as Timetable, Explanation, Cost and Recommendation.
Item 1: Online Access

Timetable: Unable to determine or estimate
Explanation: Requirements are too vague
Cost: Unable to determine
Recommendation: Establish far better requirements

The biggest hurdle to accomplishing this is an established policy regarding the database. Who owns the data? Clearly, from my perspective, the data belongs to LPHQ, and the affiliates are granted the use of this data for approved purposes. Others may disagree. However, in the absence of a published policy to which all parties agree, I really do not know what deliverable this item encompasses.

From a fiduciary perspective, I think it is absolutely clear that under no circumstances should a non-LPHQ person have authority to change any meaningful data in the LPHQ database. The validity of this data is necessary to accurately provide such information as FEC reporting. Additionally, there are issues regarding the confidentiality of much of the data. I would not presume to think that a donor to the LNC has somehow explicitly or implicitly given permission to share donation history, credit card information, etc.

What is needed before I could even assess the feasibility and costs is a firm decision on what data is to be provided, and whether or not such data can be modified by non-LPHQ personnel.

I would also like to offer on minor qualification to a statement in the IT Report: while access to RE data was promised as part of the fundraising to RE, specifics such as allowing affiliate dba’s to change or delete data was never promised. Somehow, certain individuals seem to think that affiliates should be able to change data. This would be extremely dangerous, and extremely unwise.
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Item 2: Automated Submission / Import of Address Corrections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timetable:</th>
<th>Not established</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanation:</td>
<td>Proposal is far too dangerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost:</td>
<td>Not established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation:</td>
<td>Restate requirements to be non-specific</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The IT Committee has designed a solution. It is not their responsibility to do so.

Additionally, the solution that has been submitted has three major problems:

1. According to staff, around two files are received per month. Admittedly, the number submitted could be indicative of a perception of past behavior and results, which would be higher if performance was better. However, it is hard to assume that any more than about ten to fifteen such submissions would be made under any circumstances.

2. The solution provides absolutely no security, and would open up the LPHQ database to abuse. Since the solution establishes the use of email accounts, any person who learned of this email account would be able to ship a file of addresses, labeled as inquiries, and have the data loaded into the LPHQ database.

3. The solution relies on data being submitted in an exact manner, any deviation from which would result in a failure of the data to load. While this does not necessarily stop accurate data from being loaded, the solution provided does not state how errors are to be handled.

I think it would be more appropriate to restate the issue as follows:

When affiliates submit files of address changes, there is insufficient feedback of the success or failure of submitted changes, and the perception of turnaround time is misstated, because the only current feedback is the next monthly dump.

I would then restate the requirement as follows:

Provide a timely method of processing batches of address corrections, and also provide a report of each address correction. The report should state whether or not the address correction was successful, and if not, the reason why the address correction could not be made. The entire process, under normal circumstances, should take no more than three (3) business days.

If this was the requirement, then my solution would be to build an application that would verify the address correction batches, generate a report of the results, and then post the valid requests.

While this solution is not the instantaneous solution provided by the IT Committee, it has the benefit of being secure, and addressing the “hidden” issue in the proposal - there is no direct feedback method.

Additionally, I find it inconceivable to think that there is a justifiable need for instantaneous updates for data that is reported to the affiliates on a monthly basis. The IT Committee solution is absolute overkill, as well as being potentially dangerous.

Item 3: Monthly Dumps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timetable:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanation:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation: N/A

The IT Committee stated that issues were corrections or actions. This is not. This entire item is a policy statement.

As to the statement that the distribution of dumps should be automatic and automated, I find this requirement to be completely outside the purview of the IT Committee. This is a solution, not a requirement.

The requirement should be that dumps are generated and distributed consistently and in a timely manner. Any solution that meets this need should be considered, and any solution that meets this need should be accepted.

**Item 4: Restore “Deactivated/Deceased” Records from FoxPro**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timetable:</th>
<th>Within two weeks of policy decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanation:</td>
<td>None - feasible once requirements are established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost:</td>
<td>minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation:</td>
<td>Decide and proceed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This request is very simple to accomplish, once a simple policy decision is made.

The old database used a single value to establish that a member was either deceased or had been dropped. Raiser’s Edge uses two values - a deceased flag, or a dropped flag. Since you cannot determine from the old system whether someone is dead or dropped, what should this solution assume? Should we drop them? Or should we flag them as deceased? Pick one, and the solution can proceed.

**Item 5: Restore “Bad Address” Records from FoxPro**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timetable:</th>
<th>Mostly Done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanation:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost:</td>
<td>Covered in initial invoice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At this time it should be noted that the NCOA address correction procedures have a small hole. NCOA determines the validity of an address, but does not necessarily identify whether or not the address is valid for a particular member. If a member has never filed a COA form, then NCOA has no knowledge of who lives at a particular address.

Because of this condition, we have a disconnect between the old system and RE. Perhaps it was assumed that the NCOA would correctly identify all those people who were not “in the USPS system”, but it cannot.

I identified all members and prospects whose address had been flagged in the old system as “bad address”, whose address was identical in both systems, and flagged these individuals as “no valid address” in RE. This addressed over 4,000 individuals, but could not address approximately 1,300.

The 1,300 remaining are cases where there has been some change to either name or address since the RE conversion. Some changes are minor, and some are not. All will require manual review and correction.
My suggestion is to establish the relative priority of completing the manual process, and I will outline procedures to accomplish this.
Item 6: Restore Original “Creation Date” Records from FoxPro

Timetable: Done
Explanation: None
Cost: Covered in initial invoice
Recommendation: None

I have finished this task.

In cases where a member in the old system was first a prospect, then a member, the acquisition_date from the prospect has been used to populate the date_added value in RE.

In cases where a member in the old system was never a prospect first, the original_join_date has been used to populate the date_added value in RE.

In cases where a person was only a prospect in the old system, the acquisition_date has been used to populate the date_added value in RE.

Item 7: Restore “Free Member” Records from FoxPro

Timetable: Within two weeks
Explanation: None
Cost: Minimal
Recommendation: Proceed

This item is relatively simple, and has not yet been addressed.
**Item 8: Standardize City and County Fields**

**Timetable:** Within three months  
**Explanation:** None  
**Cost:** Depends upon implementation - no more than $2,000  
**Recommendation:** Proceed once scope determined  

This sounds simple. It is not.

I have started this process, and have spent about ten hours on it. My first scope was to correctly identify the country of each address. Obviously, we cannot apply US rules to non-US addresses. This was a primarily manual process of identifying and standardizing all non-US addresses to conform to the RE address structure.

As part of this, I standardized the countries being used. We had countries like “Holland” (Holland is a province within the Netherlands), or “Czechoslovakia” (now “Czech Republic” or “Slovakia”). We had “Philippines” and “Philippines”. We had “Korea” and “Korea, Republic of”. There were more, but they are now standardized.

All Canadian addresses now properly use the appropriate province codes.

All US addresses now are identified with the country US. Previously, all converted data had no country designation.

Now we are ready to proceed with the next step, which is to test for standardized city and county values.

First, we need to purchase the appropriate USPS data (unless we already own it). Once this data is purchased and loaded to the database, we can proceed.

County standardization is pretty simple. City standardization could possibly be accomplished through USPS data, but I cannot say for sure until we actually select the appropriate data for purchase.

One of the problems we may encounter is that the USPS works more from the perspective of acceptable city names rather than official names. Additionally, each zip code is assigned a default city name, which often does NOT match with the actual mailing address.

As an example, I live in Bee Cave, TX 78738. The USPS lists 78738 as Austin as the default city. It also lists “Bee Cave” and “Bee Caves” as acceptable cities. It does not, in any dump I’ve found so far, list “Bee Cave” as the official and “Bee Caves” as the acceptable but not official.

In the IT Committee report, the example stated “St Clair” and “Saint Clair”. Both are acceptable city names. Which one is the official one? If we can find a dump that designates this, the solution is straightforward. If not, we would need to establish the official value in order to standardize.

Therefore, the way forward is dependent upon the data we can obtain. The costs are also dependent on this.

I think it is unreasonable for us to expect RE to provide us with this solution, since our address validation services establish validity, not consistency. If the USPS accepts “St Clair” and “Saint Clair”, then the address is valid. It just doesn’t serve our needs. I’d suggest staff pursue this option first, but be prepared to act anyway.
Item 9: Reliability of Certification Records

Timetable: Within two weeks
Explanation: None
Cost: Minimal
Recommendation: Proceed

I see no problem in creating support systems to identify these conditions. Then, it is purely a procedural matter to keep things up to date.

Item 10: “Membership in what state”, “Voter Address”, “Backup Address”

Timetable: Within three months
Explanation: None
Cost: Minimal
Recommendation: Proceed once scope determined

This is all eminently possible. The biggest impact that will occur is in the data dumps, since standard RE queries will have to be abandoned. This will be discussed later.

Item 11: End Practice of Marking More Than One Field for More Than One Purpose

Timetable: N/A
Explanation: N/A
Cost: N/A
Recommendation: Take no action

The solution to the stated problem is policy and process. I can assist in identifying the stated conditions, but I’m not sure what I can do otherwise to assist.

However, this seems like totally inconsequential nonsense to me. If someone who has their membership marked “Do not call” subsequently dies, and then we mark them as deceased, who really cares if both of those conditions exist at the same time? My recommendation is to not act upon this request.
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Item 12: Dumps: Consistent Fields for All Contact Data

Timetable: Within three months
Explanation: None
Cost: Minimal
Recommendation: Proceed once requirements established

I agree with the business need. Please refer to the addendum on data dumps regarding format.

Item 13: Prevent Orphan Contact Type Tags

Timetable: Within one month
Explanation: None
Cost: Minimal
Recommendation: Proceed

I have identified to stated circumstance. It just needs to be developed, tested and implemented. Due to the RE data structure, the solution to the problem is relatively complex.
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Item 14: Eliminate Usage of “Life Member” Field

Timetable: Depends upon decision to implement  
Explanation: None  
Cost: Minimal  
Recommendation: Proceed once scope determined  

I think this is the most egregiously titled issue in the IT Committee report.

First I'll answer this in an “as written” form: Who the hell do the IT Committee think they are to tell LPHQ to stop using membership categories in RE?

Now I'll answer this in a “politically correct” form: I think the issue has been inappropriately stated. It should read: “Stop using the “Life Member” field in the data dumps. To this, my response would be: If that’s what you want, we can do it.

RE uses the membership category information, including life membership, throughout the system. To think that RE will suddenly be able to use an expiration date instead of the life membership values is ludicrous. Additionally, it is of absolutely no interest to affiliates as to how internal data within RE is represented.

If the affiliates want a data dump to appear differently, we can do that. However, you’ll have to go to my addendum to see how I address the data dump issues.

Item 15: Retain Expiration Date on “Dropped” Members

Timetable: Unknown at this time  
Explanation: None  
Cost: Unknown at this time  
Recommendation: Proceed with more in depth analysis  

I have not had time to make an assessment of this issue at this time.
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Addendum: Data Dumps

Several issues relate to data dumps. One says no changes, except to add to the end of the table. Another two say remove some columns. Consistency is definitely lacking.

What I propose is as follows:

• Develop a new data dump format that is considered “ideal”.
• Develop the new data dump.
• Perform parallel testing with several beta affiliates.
• Implement a dual distribution method during a fixed period.
• Eliminate the current data dump format.

During this process, we can address any and all issues that encompass the data dumps as a single effort.

In Closing:

This list covers what the IT Committee identified - it does NOT address many other issues related to what is basically an incomplete conversion and implementation of an RE conversion.

I think that any identified data issues should be addressed. The database is the most valuable asset of the LP, and diligence should be applied to identify and correct any data problems.

Respectfully submitted,
Chuck Moulton
Chair, IT Committee
LNC-IT Addendum to LPHQ/Neale Response

NOTE: Original LPHQ text is in grey highlight; LNC-IT text is plain.

During the Alexandria meeting of the Libertarian National Committee, the LNC unanimously voted to require LPHQ to respond to a report created by the newly formed IT Committee that, in particular, raised many issues related to Raiser's Edge.

Former National Chairman Geoffrey Neale, who at the time was serving as national treasurer and already assisting LPHQ with many Raiser's Edge issues, was asked to address the report in the capacity of a contractor.

Mr. Neale traveled to Washington, D.C. in January to investigate each issue in the report and, if possible and necessary, correct any concerns that were raised by the IT Committee.

Below is Mr. Neale's unedited report.

TO: Shane Cory
FROM: Geoffrey Neale
SUBJECT: LNC IT Committee Report Response

March 12, 2007

Per your request, I will address each individual item identified in the IT Committee Report submitted to the November 11, 2006 LNC meeting.

I am specifically not addressing any website issues, since that is outside the purview of my assignment.

I will attempt to provide the IT Committee required responses to each item in a relatively short form, and will provide a more verbose summary later.

The IT report required four responses per item, which are:

- A proposed timetable for implementing each correction;
- An explanation of why each correction cannot be implemented (if impossible);
- The anticipated cost of implementing each correction (if a non-trivial amount);
- A recommendation on whether to implement each correction (cost/benefit analysis).

Given the above responses are too verbose for easy categorization, I am going to refer to the above four responses as Timetable, Explanation, Cost and Recommendation.

---

Item 1: Online Access

Timetable: Unable to determine or estimate
Explanation: Requirements are too vague
Cost: Unable to determine
Recommendation: Establish far better requirements

The biggest hurdle to accomplishing this is an established policy regarding the database. Who owns the data? Clearly, from my perspective, the data belongs to LPHQ.

LNC-IT Committee suggests that the data belong to the entire Libertarian Party, rather than just the paid staff in the office of the Libertarian Party. BallotBase is a current effort to work together to provide usable online access to the state DBAs (database administrators), and the LNC-IT Committee hopes that progress can be made quickly on it.

... and the affiliates are granted the use of this data for approved purposes. Others may disagree. However, in the absence of a published policy to which all parties agree, I really do not know what deliverable this item encompasses.

From a fiduciary perspective, I think it is absolutely clear that under no circumstances should a non-LPHQ person have authority to change any meaningful data in the LPHQ database.
LNC-IT Committee notes that both the DNC and RNC have their databases tied to their state affiliates. Information sharing is full and complete between them and their affiliates.

The validity of this data is necessary to accurately provide such information as FEC reporting. Additionally, there are issues regarding the confidentiality of much of the data. I would not presume to think that a donor to the LNC has somehow explicitly or implicitly given permission to share donation history, credit card information, etc.

LNC-IT Committee suggests the above is a red herring, as no one has asked for access to either donation history or credit card numbers.

What state DBAs were expecting was the ability to update the data, in real-time, that are already accessible to us via the dumps. For that matter, we don’t even want to be able to edit all of the fields already provided in the database dumps, but rather a limited subset thereof. The reason we want direct access is because when we submit address corrections to LPHQ, to ensure proper entry of the data, we have to audit the work of the LPHQ staffers who manually make our changes. Sometimes we have to submit and resubmit and resubmit several times before LPHQ gets the change implemented properly and completely.

LNC-IT Committee suggests that online access for a limited number of trained and vetted state officers (perhaps the state chair, the secretary, or the designated DBA) would result in a considerable savings in staff time and an even greater savings in the volunteer time state officers spend monitoring and auditing LPHQ performance in making address corrections.

Time spent auditing address correction lists and resubmitting missed or incorrect changes multiple times is time forever lost to fundraising, writing candidate recruitment letters, and party building.

What is needed before I could even assess the feasibility and costs is a firm decision on what data is to be provided, and whether or not such data can be modified by non-LPHQ personnel.

LNC-IT Committee asks only that a portion of the data already provided to the affiliates be open for online access, to wit:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>States can modify?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CnBio_ID</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CnBio_Title_1</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CnBio_First_Name</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CnBio_Middle_Name</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CnBio_Last_Name</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CnBio_Suffix_1</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CnBio_DateAdded</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>CnBio_DateChanged</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CnBio_Deceased</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>CnBio_Inactive</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>CnBio_No_Valid_Addresses</td>
<td>YES* (it’s really more complicated than this)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>CnBio_Requests_no_e-mail</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>CnAdrPrf_Addrline1</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I would also like to offer on minor qualification to a statement in the IT Report: while access to RE data was promised as part of the fundraising to RE, specifics such as allowing affiliate dba’s to change or delete data was never promised.

The LNC-IT Committee prefers to avoid getting into discussions about what the definition of "is" is.

Suffice it to say that during the fundraising lead-up to the Raiser's Edge purchase, almost all state affiliate officers with whom online access was discussed had been led to believe that being able to update the records within their own state was one of the main reasons for the upgrade; and in fact, many of those same state affiliate officers had been requesting such access for several years.

There's absolutely no point in having only the ability to "look up" records with online access. Who would have eagerly requested that? We can do lookups on the database dumps.
Somehow, certain individuals seem to think that affiliates should be able to change data. This would be extremely dangerous, and extremely unwise.

This "danger" warning keeps popping up, and it is without much merit. The worst problems with data mishandling have been at the national office itself.

For instance, an HQ staffer loudly criticized the behavior of the state database operators during the beta test of online access in early 2005. Yet within a month of the staffer’s departure from LPHQ, according to page 26 of the Minutes posted at:


... it was discovered that the staffer had managed to almost lose the Party $6000 in pledge contributions due to a failure to properly maintain credit card pledge files.

The LNC-IT Committee’ suggestion is that the volunteers at the state affiliate level – many of whom have been quietly doing their jobs as best they can for a decade or more – are unlikely to intentionally "damage" the database their state depends upon. If anything, the state database operators are likely to be much *more* concerned about the integrity of the data than some LPHQ staffers were in the past.

With proper training and vetting, there simply is little danger to the LP. Besides, I am certain that altering data with the *intent* of damaging the Party would be actionable under law.

Almost all mistakes that might be encountered will be simple honest clerical errors – but again I suggest that the state database operators will have a lower error rate than most LPHQ staff.

An alternative is to devise a system (like BallotBase) which can queue up changes made by the states, and provide a report to LPHQ which can be imported at the touch of a button after review.
Item 2: Automated Submission / Import of Address Corrections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timetable:</th>
<th>Not established</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanation:</td>
<td>Proposal is far too dangerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost:</td>
<td>Not established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation:</td>
<td>Restate requirements to be non-specific</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The IT Committee has designed a solution. It is not their responsibility to do so.

The LNC-IT Committee suggests that since the committee was formed to review LPHQ IT matters, and to suggest changes, that the reverse is true.

Additionally, the solution that has been submitted has three major problems:

4. According to staff, around two files are received per month. Admittedly, the number submitted could be indicative of a perception of past behavior and results, which would be higher if performance was better. However, it is hard to assume that any more than about ten to fifteen such submissions would be made under any circumstances.

The LNC-IT Committee suggests that Mr. Neale may be unaware of the extensive history of state affiliates with regard to helping to keep the database current prior to the national convention of 2004.

The reality was that almost all the states sent in extensive lists of corrections and new names, and about a dozen used the importable format that was available prior to the abandonment of the FoxPro system in September, 2004.

One member of the LNC-IT Committee occasionally helped out at LPHQ and one of the many jobs was to process those lists of corrections.

The fact that few states are currently sending in corrections can be directly traced to being discouraged by 1) LPHQ staffers failing to manually enter all corrections; 2) a torrent of suggestions by staffers that feedback from the state DBAs is not particularly welcome.

It was recently brought to our attention that LPHQ staff have created an importable address change file format. However, this procedure is rather Byzantine to use, requiring the states to provide all fields’ values for the record, even those irrelevant to the change, and it essentially creates new records within RE which can override data already entered, such as the “date_added” field which was proposed as the field that inquiry dates should be kept in (please see item #6). That isn’t an ideal way to maintain a database. A review of Raiser’s Edge support topics also suggests this is not the ideal method to import corrections.

5. The solution provides absolutely no security, and would open up the LPHQ database to abuse. Since the solution establishes the use of email accounts, any person who learned of this email account would be able to ship a file of addresses, labeled as inquiries, and have the data loaded into the LPHQ database.

6. The solution relies on data being submitted in an exact manner, any deviation from which would result in a failure of the data to load. While this does not necessarily stop accurate data from being loaded, the solution provided does not state how errors are to be handled.

I think it would be more appropriate to restate the issue as follows:
When affiliates submit files of address changes, there is insufficient feedback of the success or failure of submitted changes, and the perception of turnaround time is misstated, because the only current feedback is the next monthly dump.

I would then restate the requirement as follows:

Provide a timely method of processing batches of address corrections, and also provide a report of each address correction. The report should state whether or not the address correction was successful, and if not, the reason why the address correction could not be made. The entire process, under normal circumstances, should take no more than three (3) business days.

If this was the requirement, then my solution would be to build an application that would verify the address correction batches, generate a report of the results, and then post the valid requests.

While this solution is not the instantaneous solution provided by the IT Committee, it has the benefit of being secure, and addressing the “hidden” issue in the proposal – there is no direct feedback method.

Additionally, I find it inconceivable to think that there is a justifiable need for instantaneous updates for data that is reported to the affiliates on a monthly basis. The IT Committee solution is absolute overkill, as well as being potentially dangerous.

The LNC-IT Committee insists that the whole point is that, whether address corrections take three days or three weeks, in this day and age, technology makes waiting a month for the next dump unnecessary and it costs fifty affiliate volunteers untold hours trying to reconcile and audit the corrections to see if they "took" or not. We should not have to wait even three days. It is simply unnecessary, as proper automation of the process would include a confirmation email to the state providing the update.

The technology is there. Other organizations already use an instant-feedback scheme. We're the IT Party; it's time to embrace the technology.

---

**Item 3: Monthly Dumps**

| Timetable: | N/A |
| Explanation: | N/A |
| Cost: | N/A |
| Recommendation: | N/A |

The IT Committee stated that issues were corrections or actions. This is not. This entire item is a policy statement.

The LNC-IT Committee's position is that the current status quo is inefficient and hobbles proper planning for mailings and the like by affiliates, some of which also recruit and forward memberships for National. States have had to wait until about the 9th of the month for their monthly data dumps of late, but the real problem is that every month we don't automate the sending of the report is more busywork for staff, which all donors pay for. There is no benefit in having manual intervention in the monthly dump procedure, only cost.

Therefore, the LNC-IT Committee's suggestion is indeed a "correction," in this case an attempt to correct the inefficient current method of sending out list updates. Automated monthly dumps were a feature under the FoxPro system and should have been a requirement of the initial Raiser’s Edge conversion.
As to the statement that the distribution of dumps should be automatic and automated, I find this requirement to be completely outside the purview of the IT Committee.

As stated, The LNC-IT Committee suggests that since the committee was formed to review LPHQ IT matters, and to suggest changes, that this requirement is well within the Committee's bailiwick.

This is a solution, not a requirement.

The requirement should be that dumps are generated and distributed consistently and in a timely manner. Any solution that meets this need should be considered, and any solution that meets this need should be accepted.

This is almost exactly what the LNC-IT Committee requested. Here is the relevant wording as it was presented:

"The timing should be automatic (i.e., they need to all go out at 1:00 am, the morning of the first day of each month). Automate the process. No one should have to ask for a monthly dump. … Dumps should be sent with consistent filenames and in consistent formats (e.g., always zipped or always unzipped)."

---

**Item 4: Restore “Deactivated/Deceased” Records from FoxPro**

| Timetable: | Within two weeks of policy decision |
| Explanation: | None - feasible once requirements are established |
| Cost: | Minimal |
| Recommendation: | Decide and proceed |

This request is very simple to accomplish, once a simple policy decision is made.

The old database used a single value to establish that a member was either deceased or had been dropped. Raiser’s Edge uses two values - a deceased flag, or a dropped flag. Since you cannot determine from the old system whether someone is dead or dropped, what should this solution assume? Should we drop them? Or should we flag them as deceased? Pick one, and the solution can proceed.

The LNC-IT Committee suggests using the “Deceased” flag for the legacy FoxPro records that were so marked, but which are not currently marked “Deactivated” nor “Deceased” in RE.

The Committee notes that this process will have to be done with considerable care, because some of the records in FoxPro were later updated in RE. We know of at least two states that have been attempting to get LPHQ to manually re-establish “deceased” and “deactivate” data.

According to the last LPHQ Membership Report to which the LNC-IT staff has access (March 31, 2004), there were 11,860 records marked “deactivated”. By the time of the changeover to RE in September of that year, it is likely this number approached closer to 12,000.

---

**Item 5: Restore “Bad Address” Records from FoxPro**

| Timetable: | Mostly Done |
| Explanation: | None |
| Cost: | Covered in initial invoice |
| Recommendation: | None |
At this time it should be noted that the NCOA address correction procedures have a small hole. NCOA determines the validity of an address, but does not necessarily identify whether or not the address is valid for a particular member. If a member has never filed a COA form, then NCOA has no knowledge of who lives at a particular address.

Because of this condition, we have a disconnect between the old system and RE. Perhaps it was assumed that the NCOA would correctly identify all those people who were not “in the USPS system”, but it cannot.

I identified all members and prospects whose address had been flagged in the old system as “bad address”, whose address was identical in both systems, and flagged these individuals as “no valid address” in RE. This addressed over 4,000 individuals, but could not address approximately 1,300.

The 1,300 remaining are cases where there has been some change to either name or address since the RE conversion. Some changes are minor, and some are not. All will require manual review and correction.

My suggestion is to establish the relative priority of completing the manual process, and I will outline procedures to accomplish this.

The LNC-IT Committee suggests there is a serious math error in the above figures. It is believed that the changeover consultant only queried for records marked with "BAD_ADDRESS" = "1" or "2". It appears that the Consultant did not import any flags marked "BAD_ADDRESS" = "3".

It is noted that as of the last FoxPro dump of September 2004, Virginia alone had:

1,156 records marked with "BAD_ADDRESS" = "3"
104 records marked with "BAD_ADDRESS" = "2"
251 records marked with "BAD_ADDRESS" = "1"

Therefore, Virginia had 1,511 addresses marked "BAD" by September 2004. If Virginia had 1,511, it is statistically impossible for there to have been only 5,300 other bad addresses in the entire rest of the country.

However, the first step to resolving this question is simply to provide a report to the states with their portion of the records still known to LPHQ to be a problem. Along with that report should come documentation for how the states can help staff resolve outstanding “BAD_ADDRESS” problems for their state.

---

**Item 6: Restore Original “Creation Date” Records from FoxPro**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timetable:</th>
<th>Done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanation:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost:</td>
<td>Covered in initial invoice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have finished this task.

In cases where a member in the old system was first a prospect, then a member, the acquisition_date from the prospect has been used to populate the date_added value in RE.

In cases where a member in the old system was never a prospect first, the original_join_date has been used to populate the date_added value in RE.

In cases where a person was only a prospect in the old system, the acquisition_date has been used to populate the date_added value in RE.
The IT Committee asks as of what date this was completed. A Committee member examined a March 2007 database dump, and it appears that all inquiry-only records still have nothing earlier than 9/10/2004 as their creation date. Please note that the procedure currently specified for states' updates may re-set the contents of this field (we are led to believe). If this is true, the import procedure needs to be improved before this step can be carried out.

Item 7: Restore “Free Member” Records from FoxPro

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timetable:</th>
<th>Within two weeks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanation:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost:</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation:</td>
<td>Proceed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This item is relatively simple, and has not yet been addressed.

It's easy, so let's do it! It benefits the states by increasing their pool of prospects.

Item 8: Standardize City and County Fields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timetable:</th>
<th>Within three months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanation:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost:</td>
<td>Depends upon implemen tation - no more than $2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation:</td>
<td>Proceed once scope determined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This sounds simple. It is not.

I have started this process, and have spent about ten hours on it. My first scope was to correctly identify the country of each address. Obviously, we cannot apply US rules to non-US addresses. This was a primarily manual process of identifying and standardizing all non-US addresses to conform to the RE address structure.

As part of this, I standardized the countries being used. We had countries like “Holland” (Holland is a province within the Netherlands), or “Czechoslovakia” (now “Czech Republic” or “Slovakia”). We had “Philippines” and “Philippines”. We had “Korea” and “Korea, Republic of”. There were more, but they are now standardized.

All Canadian addresses now properly use the appropriate province codes.

All US addresses now are identified with the country US. Previously, all converted data had no country designation.

Now we are ready to proceed with the next step, which is to test for standardized city and county values.

First, we need to purchase the appropriate USPS data (unless we already own it). Once this data is purchased and loaded to the database, we can proceed.

County standardization is pretty simple. City standardization could possibly be accomplished through USPS data, but I cannot say for sure until we actually select the appropriate data for purchase.

One of the problems we may encounter is that the USPS works more from the perspective of acceptable city names rather than official names. Additionally, each zip code is assigned a default city name, which often does NOT match with the actual mailing address.

As an example, I live in Bee Cave, TX 78738. The USPS lists 78738 as Austin as the default city. It also lists “Bee Cave” and “Bee Caves” as acceptable cities. It does not, in any dump I’ve found so far, list “Bee Cave” as the official and “Bee Caves” as the acceptable but not official.
In the IT Committee report, the example stated “St Clair” and “Saint Clair”. Both are acceptable city names. Which one is the official one? If we can find a dump that designates this, the solution is straightforward. If not, we would need to establish the official value in order to standardize.

Therefore, the way forward is dependent upon the data we can obtain. The costs are also dependent on this.

I think it is unreasonable for us to expect RE to provide us with this solution, since our address validation services establish validity, not consistency. If the USPS accepts “St Clair” and “Saint Clair”, then the address is valid. It just doesn’t serve our needs. I’d suggest staff pursue this option first, but be prepared to act anyway.

We need to focus on the counties first, before cities. The example given in the LNC-IT report, “St Clair,” is actually a county. LPHQ should just pick a standard spelling for each county, enforce consistency by checking a separate table for them, and stick with the spellings unless a state DBA indicates that they would prefer an alternate spelling, then that would become the LP’s “official” spelling for the county. This is not “micromanagement,” this is the commonly-accepted “best practice” for managing a multiple-choice-type field.

---

**Item 9: Reliability of Certification Records**

- **Timetable:** Within two weeks
- **Explanation:** None
- **Cost:** Minimal
- **Recommendation: Proceed**

I see no problem in creating support systems to identify these conditions. Then, it is purely a procedural matter to keep things up to date.

The LNC-IT Committee agrees.

---

**Item 10: “Membership in what state”, “Voter Address”, “Backup Address”**

- **Timetable:** Within three months
- **Explanation:** None
- **Cost:** Minimal
- **Recommendation: Proceed once scope determined**

This is all eminently possible. The biggest impact that will occur is in the data dumps, since standard RE queries will have to be abandoned. This will be discussed later.

The LNC-IT Committee states for the record that this is a feature request and that other items in this report are much more important. However, if making a slight change to the monthly dump query to honor membership state preferences is going to be difficult, please explain.

---

**Item 11: End Practice of Marking More Than One Field for More Than One Purpose**

- **Timetable:** N/A
The solution to the stated problem is policy and process. I can assist in identifying the stated conditions, but I’m not sure what I can do otherwise to assist.

However, this seems like totally inconsequential nonsense to me. If someone who has their membership marked “Do not call” subsequently dies, and then we mark them as deceased, who really cares if both of those conditions exist at the same time? My recommendation is to not act upon this request.

The LNC-IT Committee suggests this isn’t the point, and those situations are rare.

The practice we refer to here is when an otherwise “clean” member record (i.e. no flags) is found to be for a deceased member; whereupon the state party sends LPHQ a notice to change the person to “deceased”. Recent LPHQ staff practice has been to flip multiple flags for the person in response. This can make the flags more difficult to interpret at the user end, or encourage reliance on taking “shortcuts” in their reports, leading to letters accidentally sent to deceased member addresses. All else being equal, good data design dictates that one field should be used to convey one piece of information.

I agree with the business need. Please refer to the addendum on data dumps regarding format.

I have identified to stated circumstance. It just needs to be developed, tested and implemented. Due to the RE data structure, the solution to the problem is relatively complex.

I think this is the most egregiously titled issue in the IT Committee report.
First I’ll answer this in an “as written” form: Who the hell do the IT Committee think they are to tell LPHQ to stop using membership categories in RE?

The LNC-IT Committee suggests once again that its purpose is to review LPHQ IT matters, and to suggest changes, that this suggestion is therefore well within the Committee’s bailiwick.

The Committee also notes that nowhere are we suggesting that LPHQ stop using membership categories. We are only suggesting they record the one membership category, lifers, the same way as all the others: in the member category field and with an expiration date, not additionally in a separate field.

Having multiple fields to define one thing does little except add opportunities for data entry errors. In order to assess the impact of the change suggested, though, we would need to know which queries and functions actually use the “life-member” field.

Now I’ll answer this in a “politically correct” form: I think the issue has been inappropriately stated. It should read: “Stop using the “Life Member” field in the data dumps. To this, my response would be: If that’s what you want, we can do it.

RE uses the membership category information, including life membership, throughout the system. To think that RE will suddenly be able to use an expiration date instead of the life membership values is ludicrous.

This is not correct. Raisers Edge is nothing more than an expensive, somewhat fancy “skin” that uses an SQL database as its platform. Since it is a database, it has all the capabilities that any database does.

A recent mailing to former members included Life members because staff accidentally omitted a line or two from the query that generated the mailing list. Errors of that sort are more likely to happen when simple membership status data is spread over more and more fields.

Not using that field will not prevent Life members from getting their due. Additionally, it is of absolutely no interest to affiliates as to how internal data within RE is represented.

This was not presented as an idea that would strictly benefit affiliates. It was also intended to benefit LPHQ and reduce data errors.

If the affiliates want a data dump to appear differently, we can do that. However, you’ll have to go to my addendum to see how I address the data dump issues.

---

**Item 15: Retain Expiration Date on “Dropped” Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timetable:</th>
<th>Unknown at this time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanation:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost:</td>
<td>Unknown at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation:</td>
<td>Proceed with more in depth analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
I have not had time to make an assessment of this issue at this time.

---

**Addendum: Data Dumps**

Several issues relate to data dumps. One says no changes, except to add to the end of the table. Another two say remove some columns. Consistency is definitely lacking.

We appreciate the lesson. However, one referenced a major change (i.e. standardizing phone/emails), while another referenced unknown fields to be added by LPHQ.

**What I propose is as follows:**

- Develop a new data dump format that is considered “ideal”.
- Develop the new data dump.
- Perform parallel testing with several beta affiliates.
- Implement a dual distribution method during a fixed period.
- Eliminate the current data dump format.

During this process, we can address any and all issues that encompass the data dumps as a single effort.

In addition, what we need is a procedure, agreed-upon by LPHQ and the states, whereby dump changes can be suggested, vetted, and if agreed-upon by a significant number of state DBAs, run in parallel for a period before switching over.

Our membership database is the most valuable asset that the party has. The LNC-IT Committee expresses its hopes that the state parties maintaining these data are given appropriate respect, and treated as partners in an effort to build a better LP.

**In Closing:**

This list covers what the IT Committee identified. It does NOT address many other issues related to what is basically an incomplete conversion and implementation of an RE conversion.

I think that any identified data issues should be addressed. The database is the most valuable asset of the LP, and diligence should be applied to identify and correct any data problems.

The LNC IT Committee hopes that the consultant will identify all outstanding issues with the Raisers Edge conversion, so the LNC can determine the best course of action to take.

---

The LNC-IT Committee thanks the LNC for addressing our concerns.
Region 1 Report
LNC meeting March 16, 2007

Submitted by Tony Ryan, Region 1 Representative

Since our last meeting the Region 1 states have all stopped to take a brief breather after their efforts to get candidates elected last fall. Then, at the first of the year, many geared up again to carry on with day to day activities.

I requested updates from the state chairs and received a few (and, I may have misplaced 1 or 2 that I thought I had) and here is what I have.

Alaska

The land of the midnight sun is still active and working on local issues of import to all, libertarian or not. They continue the fight there against smoking bans and eminent domain.

Colorado

Crazy guy Travis Nicks (you can’t miss him at the LSLA) says he and his brood are working on recovering from the expensive battles waged over a screwy and misinterpreted election rule (remember the Sheriff’s candidate debacle?) and says, “Send money!” But, we all say that, don’t we?

The Jefferson County affiliate is after it, folks! At their February meeting they had to be moved to a different room after being told (but not “busted”) they were violating a fire code with too many people (including 8 new attendees)! And, there are at least 50 students at the Colorado School of Mines (Golden) who have formed a Libertarian group there and want to become a campus affiliate (say, “YES!” Dr. Jim).

They have also formed an alliance with an activist group in Lakewood (home of elected Libertarian city Councilman Doug Anderson) who call themselves the T-Party. They defeated the city fathers who wanted to give a developer a city park in exchange for some other land he found less useful for his purposes. They are not fully libertarian in their thinking, but they’re on the right track. Go, Jeffco – convert ‘em!

Illinois

Chair Val Vetter is not too upbeat about the Illinois party status – with good reason. Contributions and participation are falling, even among party officers who accept 2 year positions and then become unreachable.

He is particularly concerned about ballot access (a huge money problem – minimum $50K to meet petition requirements for a 1 shot chance for federal offices in ’08, and then do it over for the next election!). Not just the money aspect, he asks whether the LP will have a viable presidential candidate – no answer from me on that one!

But, Val is a great guy and they have a new convention coming up soon, so, maybe they’ll get new, invigorated blood to help. And, Julie is moving back!
Iowa (home of the Lib penguin)

Haven’t heard from Iowa, but former LNCer Mark Nelson was elected to serve on a local governing board (parks/rec, I believe).

Kansas

I know Rob sent me something, but darned if I can find it (sorry, Rob). The core thing was, if my age cooked memory serves right, that they are working hard on a variety of Spring local elections — running lots of L candidates. This, right after all that work last Fall! Good job, people!

Minnesota

Lee Brennise and company are putting on a great annual convention on April 21st in the Twin cities area (Bloomington – one of those suburbs you don’t know is one until you see a sign on some short strip of the freeway) - Wendy McElroy, Sharon Harris and more.

Keeping a great website up there, guys!

Missouri (home of our guy Sully)

Chair Darla (mom on a mission) Maloney says she and her people are still out there kickin’ butt and takin’ names on issues like eminent domain and smoking bans. They’ve befriended numerous business owners and farmers and expect many of them to attend the MOLP May convention! She’ll be talking on the subject at the LSLA conference.

Montana

Again, I thought I had something from Mike…. I think I’ll blame AOL, since they regularly send me into fits, anyway. The website is getting dusty, though.

South Dakota

The sparsely populated state is still alive and well and already working to achieve ballot access (again). Our gov. candidate didn’t get a high enough percentage of the vote and we have a growing sympathy towards the idea of allowing our party ballot access (especially from the R SOS, who, I think, tires of counting sigs every time we go through the process and succeed). Compared to many states, though, our process is relatively easy and gets us access for a full four years!

Wisconsin

Another great, current website filled with useful information! Upcoming is their next state convention – also April 21 (along with Minn. And CO’s Jeffco Casino night - what’s one to do!) - at Ed Thompson’s newly remodeled Tee Pee Restaurant in Tomah.

The state has some new officers as of last month, due to the prior chair’s health problems, but they are working to rebuild momentum.

Wyoming
The only place with less people than SD – but probably more wind! When I think of big WY, I still think the Free Staters were wrong – but I'm a western type.

Not many people, but a website as big as the state, complete with bushlastday.com's countdown clock on the time left in the Bush "reign". The few, the mighty…

Nebraska and North Dakota weren't included this time as they are “unofficial”. Nebraska has new officers, but I received no response and there is still nothing in North Dakota – not even an old website.
California:
Bruce Dovner was selected as CA's rep on the Platform Committee. The LPC convention will be held April 20-22 in San Ramon. Most of the board, including all the officers, will not be running for reelection.

Idaho:
No report received. No convention this year.

Oregon:
Wes Wagner, Dan Wilson, and Mark Vetanen have been filing criminal and civil complaints against the party and its officers and staff. So far, all have been dismissed by the authorities having been found to be without merit.

These individuals and others attempted at this weekend's convention to replace the party constitution with one that would leave the party with no officers and no bylaws, either of which would have immediately shut down the party. They failed to do so. I witnessed little willingness on either side to work out their problems. I suspect this will probably come to a head again at next year's convention, if not before. Wagner and Wilson threatened to leave the LPO, form a new party, and force the LNC to disaffiliate the current LPO and recognize them as the legitimate LP of Oregon.

Washington:
No report received.

The LPWA convention will be held May 12. It is expected to be uncontroversial.

Ruth Bennett (WA), Brian Holtz (CA), and Adam Mayer (OR) are seeking selection to the Platform Committee. Ruth Bennett has a long history of service to the LP. Holtz and Mayer both served on the last Platform Cmte.

M Carling

Sorry this is late. I wanted to include the results of the OR convention which Jim Lark and I attended this weekend.

I hope Bill Hall will advise which parts must be deleted before this can be included in the minutes.

California:
Bruce Dovner was selected as CA's rep on the Platform Committee. The LPC convention will be held April 20-22 in San Ramon. Most of the board, including all the officers, will not be running for reelection.

Idaho:
No report received. No convention this year.

Oregon:
The LPO continues to suffer from attacks by Wes Wagner, Dan Wilson, and Mark Vetanen who have been filing apparently frivolous criminal and civil complaints against the party and its officers and staff. This faction attempted to kill the party at this weekend's convention by replacing the party constitution with one that would leave the party with no officers and no bylaws, either of which would have immediately shut down the party. They failed to do so. There was little willingness on either side to work out their problems. This will probably come to a head again at next year's convention, if not before. Wagner and Wilson threatened to leave the LPO, form a new party, and force the LNC to disaffiliate the current LPO and recognize them as the legitimate LP of Oregon.

Washington:
No report received.
The LPWA convention will be held May 12. It is expected to be uncontroversial.

Ruth Bennett (WA), Brian Holtz (CA), and Adam Mayer (OR) are seeking selection to the Platform Committee. Ruth Bennett has a long history of service to the LP. Holtz and Mayer both served on the last Platform Cmte.

M Carling
REGION 3 REPORT TO THE LNC – March 2, 2007
Emily Salvette, LNC Region 3 Rep

Region News
The Region 3 Convention will be held August 3-5 in Dayton, Ohio. The program includes workshops by the Leadership Institute from Washington, D.C.; speakers, including LNC Chair Bill Redpath; state leaders’ meetings for networking and sharing best practices, and social activities. The convention is open to everyone and we encourage libertarians in neighboring states & regions to join us. We will make special outreach to libertarians in West Virginia, which is an orphan state. Information will be posted on our region’s site: www.lpr3.org. Thanks to the Region 3 Convention Committee: Jennifer Griggs (IN), Ken Moellman (KY), Nathan Allen (MI) and Robert Butler (OH).

State Reports
Indiana – Susan Street-Beavers started February 19 as the new LPIN Executive Director. Susan will be at the LSLA and LNC meetings in Orlando. The Indiana state convention will be held May 18-20 in Fort Wayne. Past Allen County Chairman Mike Sylvester is the convention chair. Mark Rutherford, LPIN Chair for the past 7 years, will not be seeking re-election. Todd Singer will run for chair, and Mark and Todd are already working together to assure a smooth transition of leadership.

Kentucky – The state chair, George Dick, reports that there is not a lot of activity going on in Kentucky. At its last executive committee meeting in December, the officers agreed that easing ballot access should be the party’s major goal. They are collecting about 2 names per week through their website. They will be having a state convention in the summer. George will not seek re-election. We hope the regional convention will attract a number of folks from Kentucky who will help us re-energize the party there.

Michigan – A state leadership training day for local party officers will be held in Lansing on April 1. The state convention is scheduled for May 5 in Grand Rapids. The convention chair is Dr. Eric Larson.

Ohio – The LPO is putting on an aggressive organizational effort right now. They are doing significant leadership recruiting and training. I attended an organizational meeting of the North West Ohio LP (Toledo area), which was conducted by two of these great new recruits, Joe Spoor and Mike Smitley. The LPO executive committee has a practical plan for organizing the local groups around the state, and its Vice Chairman, Kevin Knedler, has developed excellent training materials. Kevin is also the chair for the state convention April 20-22 at the Deer Creek Resort and Conference Center. They have a very impressive program planned, with Dr. Mary Ruwart as the banquet speaker. See their convention web site at www.lpoconvention.org. The state chair would like to see the whole LNC there!

The other news out of Ohio is that the Ohio Secretary of State, as expected, did not appeal Ohio v Blackwell to the US Supreme Court. Richard Winger explained this means there is no valid law in Ohio for a new party and its candidates to get on the ballot. If the legislature doesn’t fix this before the next election, any party can demand to be placed on the ballot under a 6th Circuit precedent set by the LP of Michigan. He suggests the Ohio LP stay under the radar for now. They are seeking legal advice and are in contact with the Green Party and Constitution Party regarding this case.
Libertarian National Committee Region 4 Report

Orlando Meeting: March 2007

March 12, 2007

The following report is submitted by Stewart Flood, Region Alternate:

There has been a considerable amount of change in leadership at the state level in our region since the last meeting. Georgia and Alabama are both currently operating without a state party chairman, with the vice-chairman temporarily filling the position. Florida, North Carolina and Tennessee will all be holding their state conventions within the next few weeks. Mississippi is currently nonresponsive and requires attention.

Last December our regional representative Mark Bodenhausen stepped down from his position due to both acute and chronic health issues. The state chairs met by telephone and Bob Barr was appointed to fill the remainder of the term.

Reports were received from Tennessee and South Carolina. Both the chairman and treasurer of South Carolina submitted reports and I have included both. I have also included comments as state vice-chairman, based on events that have taken place in our state in the past 24 hours. I received comments about activity in North Carolina and Florida, but since no submission was sent by a party officer I felt that I could not include them, even as “unofficial” reports. A report was submitted for Alabama by Mark Bodenhausen, which has been included since he is the former regional representative and is an active participant in the subject he reported on. At my request he also sent information about their lawsuit from Arlene Richardson and Richard Winger which has also been included.

Respectfully submitted,
Stewart F Flood Jr
Region 4 Alternate

Report to LNC from the LP of Tennessee:

The LPTN is working on ballot access issues. Since we are not currently recognized as a political party by the state, our candidates run as independents. We have found legislative sponsors for a bill (HB0626 in the State House, SB0288 in the State Senate) which would essentially create a two-tier structure for major and minor parties. Minor parties would have much lower qualification standards, and they would gain ballot access and label privileges for their candidates. Minor parties would not have the option to nominate candidates by primary election as the major parties do, but could rather select nominees by convention. The cost of those primary elections has been the state's main objection to previous attempts to lower petition signature thresholds for qualification as a political party. Lobbying efforts for this bill are underway.
Alicia Mattson  
Chair, LP of Tennessee

**Alabama Report:**

Dear friends of liberty:

The Libertarian Party of Alabama needs your help. In what Richard Winger describes as "one of the most important ballot access cases of Alabama" will be coming up for appeal in Atlanta's 11th Circuit Court.

In Swanson vs State of Alabama, case number 06-13643, an independent candidate for US Senate filed against Alabama's 3% (of the last vote cast) petition requirement. The hearing in this landmark case is in Atlanta on Tuesday March 20. The case challenges the number of signatures required for minor party and non-presidential independent candidates, and the early June petition deadline. The case has taken nearly five years to get through the U.S. District Court, and is without question the longest running ballot access case in United States history.

We need to pack the courtroom to let the judges know that people care about these types of cases!

We intend to send people to Atlanta to support the case and we would appreciate any warm bodies to fill up the court room! It is extremely rare that cases make it this far, and even as few as 50 people can make a big difference. It would be the first time in twenty years that the LPA has succeeded in rolling back ballot access requirements.

There will be a van leaving Birmingham on 3/19 and returning on 3/20. I hope that other states in the region are able to send someone to attend. If you can piggyback onto the state chair's conference, please do so. Additional details will be posted this week. If you have any questions please send an email to: gallatin76@aol.com

In liberty,  
Mark Bodenhausen

*From Arlene Richardson:*

I really appreciate your efforts and support. I wanted to point out that the argument will take place on March 20 beginning at 9:00 a.m. and our case is fourth in the lineup that day.

I have attached an overview of the case Richard Winger sent to some folks in Atlanta. I hope it serves to let you know what the case is about. My greatest hope is to overturn the 3% petition requirement for independent and 3rd parties. In the alternative, to overturn the law making independents and 3rd parties turn in their petitions to the secretary of state by 5:00 p.m. on the day of the primary, thus allowing signatures to be collected at the polling places as they were in 2000.
From Richard Winger:

We now know who the 3 judges will be on March 20. One is from the Court of International Trade. She is a New Yorker. She is probably very smart (smart judges are GOOD!).

The second woman has a bad record on ballot access. She voted to uphold the Georgia law requiring even a ballot-qualified party like the Georgia Libertarian Party to submit a petition signed by 5% of the number of registered voters, to run for US House. She didn't seem to even understand the law. Her name is Frank Hull. Yes, it's a woman with a first name of Frank. I have read other opinions of hers and she doesn't seem very smart.

The third is a man named Stanley Marcus. The ACLU voting rights office, which is based in Atlanta, says he has been somewhat disappointing on civil liberties issues. He doesn't have a record on ballot access. He was appointed to the US District Court by Ronald Reagan and to the 11th circuit by Bill Clinton.

Alabama's original 1% petition wasn't really too terrible, since it was only about 14,000 signatures. But in 1995 the legislature tripled it to 3%. And in 2001 they moved the petition deadline from July to early June. This took away the ability of petitioners to stand at the polls on primary election day and get signatures from registered voters waiting in line to vote at the primary.

So the Alabama issues are: (1) whether the deadline change from mid-July to early June is unconstitutional, since there was no good reason for it, except to block that petitioning technique; (2) whether the 3% (of the last gubernatorial vote) is unconstitutional since, again, there was no good reason for it; the old 1% petition was working, keeping the November ballot uncrowded.

The change from 1% to 3% in the number of signatures required wasn't implemented until 1998. We have had 5 elections under the 3% petition now...1998, 2000, 2002, 2004 and 2006. Out of those 5 elections, only once has anyone done the statewide 3%. The Libertarians managed to do it in 2000. Surprisingly, one of the statewide Libertarians then got over 20% of the vote cast (it was a 2-person race), so they got to be on the ballot automatically in 2002 as well.

Another argument in Alabama is that since independent presidential candidates can get on for only 5,000 signatures (whereas independents for other office, and minor parties, need the 3%, which is now over 40,000), and since the Alabama presidential ballot isn't crowded, what is the needed for requiring 3% when 5,000 works OK for president?

Finally, in Alabama, the state permits the parties to block people from running in major party primaries if the major parties think those individuals are "disloyal" to the party. Alabama courts
have routinely let the Democratic and Republican Parties keep controversial individuals off their primary ballots because the parties said "so-and-so said something derogatory about the Republican Party on her radio talk show, which proves she isn't loyal to the Republican Party." So in Alabama, there is an entire class of people who can't run for office AT ALL! They can't run in the major party primaries because of their politics, and they can't run in the general election as independents or minor party candidates because they can't afford to pay people to collect so many signatures.

Jenness v Fortson, the horrible 1971 US Supreme Court decision that upheld Georgia's 5% petition, has a footnote saying if the Socialist Workers Party candidates (they were the plaintiffs) can't get the needed signatures, they are free to run in major party primaries. It's footnote 25. That is really obsolete, because in the years since, the US Supreme Court has repeatedly upheld the right of the major parties to exclude people who really aren't loyal to those parties. The 11th circuit upheld Georgia's keeping David Duke out of the Georgia Republican presidential primary on the grounds that Republicans didn't think David Duke was a bona fide Republican.

The US Supreme Court ruled in 2000 in Calif. Dem. Party v Jones that the Republican Party couldn't be forced to put up with non-members voting in the Republican primary.

So, Jenness v Fortson, especially footnote 25, is really obsolete. Since Alabama case law is so strong that the major parties can keep people from running in their primaries based on the political ideas of those people, it should be possible to argue that Jenness v Fortson is not controlling on Alabama.

Richard Winger

South Carolina Libertarian Party Report:

Other than the fact that the lawsuit against the SEC/AG was dismissed without prejudice there is really nothing to report. In regard to the suit, the Federal Judge (Cameron Currie) outlined the errors in our end of the suit (there were several) but left the door wide open for us to bring suit in State and Federal Court again later when we have our ducks in a row. Obviously, Judge Currie sees there is merit to the case or it would have been dismissed with prejudice. We thought this suit would be a long haul even though we held out hope it would be a slam-dunk. Still, the letter and intent of the law are on our side.

Liberty,
Timothy

(State Party Chairman Timothy Moultrie)

In addition to Tim's input on the lawsuit, I recommend reporting these things, warts and all, to give everyone an accurate picture of what the heck is going on:
We lost Jenni Messel, our Spartanburg County Chair this month, due to complications from pulmonary hypertension. We have no one in that county to backfill her position, which will make it even more difficult to obtain a quorum for the monthly executive committee meetings than it has been for the past 9 months anyway. Jenni was also the SCLP webmaster, which has now fallen to Stewart Flood to maintain. Jenni was only 29 years old and one of the new generation that we need most badly. She will be missed greatly and won't be soon replaced.

The other active counties have been Charleston, Berkeley, Kershaw, Richland, Lexington, Greenville, and Anderson. Dorchester has become active again. York has been inactive on account of the advanced age and declining health of the Chair, although there is a new member in the SCLP who is a prospective candidate to relieve him. Jasper and Aiken have become inactive. Horry, controlled by the last regime, has, in effect, seceded from the party; they are known to be active in their local area, but have failed to send a representative to the state executive committee meetings in the past 9 months and have had no formal communication with said committee. We have prospective Chairmen for Beaufort, Georgetown, Laurens, and Clarendon Counties to use in getting them formally organized. SC has a total of 46 counties.

The membership rolls from national show about 130 members in SC. Increasing membership is going to be one of the major goals in the next 2 years. The current Membership Coordinator, Victor Kocher, has been one of the key workhorses of the SCLP for the past 6 years and is trying now to get a handle on membership records with an eye toward expanding membership.

The treasury has $5,328 in savings, $275 in checking, both of which are reported to the FEC, and $199 in our newly established non-federal funds account that is reported to the South Carolina Ethics Commission. Monthly donations have been trickling in at a rate of about $60 per month, which is a fraction of what they were a year ago when we had UMP payments of $248 every month on top of donations that were at least double what they are now. New sources of donations are essential, although no one has made any suggestions as to where these sources will be found. I am going to be a panelist on FEC reporting and regulation at the 1st Quarter LNC meeting in March in Orlando.

The Berkeley, Charleston, and Dorchester County Clubs are meeting every 4th Monday and every 2nd Thursday. The social meeting on every 2nd Thursday is probably going to shift from North Charleston to Goose Creek to see if it will yield a higher attendance. The business meeting that is held every 4th Monday will continue to be held in Charleston.

The Charleston and Berkeley Clubs have both had representatives at the Bastiat Society meetings held every 1st Wednesday. The meetings have been extremely interesting and informative on issues of interest to Libertarians, the crowd has reliably been small "I." libertarian, and many bridges have been built between this group and the SCLP as a result.

The Lexington County Club has been meeting every 2nd Tuesday, and the Richland and Kershaw County Clubs may have been attending these meetings. Turnouts have been sparse for them too.
I don't believe that the upstate county clubs have been conducting regular meetings lately and appear to be in a malaise. The demise of our Spartanburg County Chair could not have come at a worse time in this regard.

Jeff Dimit
(SCLP Treasurer)

For those of you who do not know what the South Carolina lawsuit pertained to, the South Carolina Republican Party admittedly violated state election law and failed to properly organize their party in both 2004 and 2006. While this has been admitted to and acknowledged by the state election commission, the state declined to take the action required by law and permanently decertify the Republican Party. The South Carolina Libertarian Party was forced to sue the state election commission and the Attorney General, who was the chairman of the state Republican Party in 2004.

Our case was dismissed without prejudice, for technical issues regarding the venue. Nearly simultaneously, the South Carolina Republican Party suddenly decided to reorganize at a time not normal for their party. This was clearly done to put them in compliance with state law and hopefully prevent us from taking further legal action.

On the afternoon of March 11, 2007, less than a week following their reorganization, I personally received copies of internal local party correspondence that indicate at least one county may have already violated state election law. This material, clearly showing evidence of violation of the law, was sent to me without request and without any knowledge on my part in advance.

While the violations have been admitted to and “the law” is clearly on our side, I personally believe it is impossible to obtain a fair ruling at either the state or federal level due to the political control that the Republican Party wields in our state and in Washington DC.

But to end this report on a more pleasant note, I am pleased to announce that the South Carolina Libertarian Party has received a filing from a qualified candidate for the June 19th special election to fill State Senate Seat 46 in Beaufort County, which includes Hilton Head Island. Filing ends literally today at noon, and there is a field of several Republicans who will face off in a May 1st primary. The winner will face our candidate in the special election. There is no Democratic nominee, placing us in a position where we could easily have a very close race.

Stewart Flood
(SCLP Vice Chairman)
REGION 5 REPORT

Submitted to: Libertarian National Committee, March 2, 2007

Submitted by: James W. Lark, III
Region 5 representative
Libertarian National Committee

The following report will provide information concerning activities of the Libertarian Party state affiliates in Region 5 since the LNC meeting in November 2006. I shall provide an updated report at the LNC meeting should additional information become available.

Delaware

LP Delaware chairman George Jurgensen (georgej@snip.net) indicated that the activity level in the LPD is somewhat low at this time. He mentioned that the party is conducting a letter writing campaign to local newspapers to engage in issue advocacy on the topic of drug law reform.

District of Columbia

At this time, Rich Heller (Hellerrich@aol.com) is serving as the contact for the LP DC, following the resignation of chair Shannon McMenamin. As I mentioned in my previous report, a representative of the Free State Project has established monthly meetings for the FSP in the metro DC area.

Maryland

The Libertarian Party of Maryland was successful in its effort to be recertified as a political party. The petition drive for recertification was completed at the end of December.

The MDLP will hold its convention in Dundalk on March 3. If I have the opportunity, I shall attend the convention. LP Maryland chair David Sten (Chair@md.lp.org) indicated that he is not planning to seek reelection as chair, although he is planning to seek reelection to the Executive Board.

Pennsylvania

LP Pennsylvania chairman Mik Robertson (chair@lppa.org) provided the following report in response to my request for information:
Our immediate activities are focusing on candidate recruitment for the municipal election this year. We have four confirmed candidates at this early stage, including one incumbent mayor. We are also encouraging the commonwealth legislature to decline to enforce the provisions of the REAL ID federal mandate. In the longer term, we are working with some other groups to reform the election laws of the commonwealth, both ballot access and the way write in votes are treated.

There is the possibility a constitutional convention may be called in Pennsylvania, and we have begun thinking about how to best influence the process to create a more libertarian government should that event come about. Our ongoing efforts are to continue to develop local organizations, and we have just added a new county chapter in the last month.

**Virginia**

Currently there are three LPVa campaigns for office in 2007: George Marchenko (www.marchenko.com/) and Matt Martin (www.matthewtmartin.com/) are running for seats on the Henrico County Board of Supervisors, and Arin Sime (www.arinsime.com) is running for the State Senate in the 24th District.

Mr. Sime’s campaign, which has the highest profile of the three, continues to go well. (In the interest of full disclosure, please note that I am a senior advisor and finance director for the campaign.) On Feb. 19, Scott Sayre, a businessman from the Buena Vista area, announced that he would challenge Republican incumbent Emmett Hanger for the nomination. A major emphasis of Mr. Sayre’s campaign is his support for limited government and lower taxes.

It appears that the nomination contest will be decided in a primary on June 12. As noted previously, Mr. Hanger is considered a “RINO” (“Republican in Name Only”) by many activists in the Republican Party. So far there is no sign that a Democrat will enter the race; the district tends to vote conservative Republican. If Mr. Sime faces Senator Hanger in the aftermath of what is likely to be a hotly-contested primary, and if there is no Democrat in the race, I believe he (Mr. Sime) will have a nontrivial chance to win the election.

**West Virginia**

While the Libertarian Party of West Virginia does not belong to Region 5, I shall endeavor to provide information about the party to the LNC. LPWV members are welcome to contact me whenever I can be of service to them concerning the LNC.
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Arizona - No report


Arkansas - No report

I joined one of their e-mail groups which does have current chatter about organizing meetings in different districts. Their website http://www.lpar.org/ advertises an April 28th media appearance by Gerhard Langguth, Arkansas Libertarian Party Chair. It's unclear whether it's for 2005 or 2006. Their most recent posted newsletter is for April 2005.

Louisiana - No report

Their website is reasonably up to date (contains a 2007 posting). I've spoken by phone with Louisiana Libertarians and they appear to be quite active and motivated. They recently achieved better ballot access conditions and had candidates who performed quite well in 2006. Last October I attended my 20th high school reunion in Baton Rouge, LA, and per chance, the afternoon festivities were at the same restaurant where the Louisiana Libertarians were meeting. The lp.org candidate tracker lists their 2007 candidate for governor.

Nevada

The NVLP held its state convention on Feb 10th. Our Executive Committee is elected in the odd years. The new ExComm is listed below.

Chair: Jim Duensing
Vice Chair: Debra-Payne Dedmon
Treasurer: Joseph P. Silvestri
Secretary: Nathan Santucci
Southern Rep: Shawn Glines
Central Rep: Ray Duensing
Northern Rep: Vacant
At-Large: James Begley

I have been pushing everyone on our ExComm to attend the State Chairs' conference. The LSLA should be a meeting where serious activists and officers can become better assets to the party. Luckily, my naggingly friendly reminders have caused several ExComm members to attend. Those attending the LSLA from Nevada will be myself, Joe Silvestri, Shawn Glines, and Ray Duensing. Hopefully in 2008, we'll have everyone from Nevada in attendance.

At our State Convention, we held a Presidential Debate between Gene Chapman, Steve Kubby, Dave Holist, and George Phillies. All announced candidates, that I was aware of, were invited. These were the only ones who attended.

The LPNV website has just undergone a complete revision. I'm sitting down with our webdesigner tonight. Hopefully, the new version will be operational before Orlando.

Jim Duensing, Chair
New Mexico - No report

I spoke with their state chair, Jay Vandersloot by phone who discussed their ballot access lawsuit. Their website has an un-dated statement announcing they have been recertified as a political party in New Mexico. I think this is current news.

Oklahoma (unofficially included in region 6)

OKLP has been focusing on reforming our restrictive ballot access. Oklahoma needs 48,500 valid signatures under the current law (5% of last vote) to be on the ballot in 2008, but we have a year to collect signatures and no restrictions on circulators or signers (just have to be registered).

A few days ago, Oklahoma lost its 2004 ballot access lawsuit in our State Court of Appeals. We are currently considering appealing to the state Supreme Court.

Our ballot reform bills failed to receive a hearing in committee this session, though could still be heard next year. We sent out a few hundred letters to Libertarians living in committee member districts and a thousand postcards throughout the state. We are working with Oklahomans for Ballot Access Reform (www.OkVoterChoice.org), the Oklahoma Coalition of Independents (www.Okies.info), and Common Cause Oklahoma.

The other possible reform option is by initiative petition, which would require 74,000 signatures (8% of last vote) gathered in three months.

Since we were last on the ballot in 2000, interest in the Party seems to be suffering here.

David Splinter
Vice-Chair, OKLP
www.OKLP.org

Texas

Texas recently succeeded in a fundraising campaign to raise $48,000 in contributions between January 1 and February 28 comprised of one-time contributions, future pledges, and new or increased monthly contributions (multiplied by 12 to annualize the amount). The result provides a level of funds to secure two full-time staff throughout 2007 consisting of myself as Executive Director, and Arthur DiBianca as Assistant Director.

Wes Benedict
Executive Director
Libertarian Party of Texas

Utah

We're slowly chipping away at our petition signature goal of 2,500 (state law requires 2,000) to get back on the ballot. Our operative deadline is the end of June so we remain eligible for tax checkoff funds.

The hold up has been waiting for it to warm up. I believe progress will kick into gear in a couple of weeks.
No organizing convention date has been set.

Rob Latham, Chairman
Libertarian Party of Utah

Rob additionally reports he expects his personal efforts at petitioning will be enough to secure the needed signatures for ballot access in Utah. --Wes
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Connecticut - no report

Massachusetts - no report

New Hampshire - Recently took party in the Free State Project Freedom Forum in New Hampshire which had 300+ attendees. Their State convention is April 15.

New Jersey - no report

New York - no report

Vermont - nothing to report. States in geographical area, but not part of Region 7 because they had no one at the National Convention...

Maine - Things are stirring again.

Rhode Island - They have held an organizing meeting and are starting to revive.

-- Hardy Machia *