

LPC 2026 Convention Bylaws Committee Report

Final Report 24 January 2026

This is the final report of the Bylaws Committee for the 2026 convention of the Libertarian Party of California, which the bylaws require be adopted by the committee at least 20 days before the convention, and posted to the LPC web site at least 15 days before the convention. The proposals contained in this report are identical to what was in the preliminary report. The only changes are the addition of numbers to identify the proposals, the addition of a table of contents, an expansion of the rationale for Proposal 10 Part A, correction of a few typographical errors, and rewording in this introductory section.

The members of this committee, appointed by the LPC Executive Committee on 9 September 2025, are:

- Joe Dehn
- Mimi Robson
- Starchild
- Mike Van Roy

Most of the discussion of the proposals contained in this report was conducted via the LPCalifornia-Bylaws-Discuss Google Group. An archive of those messages can be found at <https://groups.google.com/g/lpcalifornia-bylaws-discuss>.

This report contains proposals relating to ten separate topics, two of which have multiple parts, the later parts of which are intended to be presented or not depending on whether the initial part is adopted. Each proposal has a number and title by which it can be referenced and a brief "Summary" of the nature of the change(s) it would make. This is followed by a "Rationale" section intended to explain the background, motivation, and effect of the change; this may be long or short depending on how obvious those things may be from the summary or the actual wording of the proposal.

The wording of each proposal is presented using the common convention of marking text to be deleted or replaced by striking it out and coloring it in red, while new or replacement text is underlined and colored in blue. In a few places there are additional notes, not part of the text itself, e.g., about renumbering; these are in italics.

Anyone who has questions relating to these proposals may contact the Bylaws Committee by writing to: bylaws@ca.lp.org

Thanks for reading, and I hope to see you at the convention!

*Joe Dehn, Chair
LPC Bylaws Committee*

Table of Contents

Proposal 1: Budget Ratification

Update the language concerning the budget to reflect the fact that our fiscal year now coincides with the calendar year.

Proposal 2: Appeal of Program Planks

Update the procedures for appeal of a Program plank to reflect the fact that such planks are no longer adopted at the convention.

Proposal 3: Reinstatement of Resigned Members

Clarify that members who resign may rejoin and return to full voting status after a period of 12 months without a vote of the EC or convention.

Proposal 4: Executive Session

Specify rules and procedures relating to the use of executive sessions, including limiting them to specific types of issues, being for discussion only, and requiring recordings.

Proposal 5: Financial Standards Committee Membership

Move the requirement that the FSC have three members and that they cannot be any of the officers, currently contained in the Operating Procedures Manual, into the Bylaws, and expand the list of people who are ineligible to be appointed.

Proposal 6: Allow for State Platform Planks

Part A: Restore the ability of state convention delegates to adopt Platform planks, while continuing to treat the national Platform as the basis for our own. *Part B (to be considered only if Part A is adopted):* Add Platform Committee as a position that cannot be held together with Judicial Committee.

Proposal 7: State Convention Delegates

Restore the practice of county organizations selecting delegates to the state convention, up to a limit based on their membership, similar to the system used in the past, while continuing to allow other central committee members to vote at the convention to whatever extent there remain spots unfilled for their county.

Proposal 8: Eliminate EC In-Person Meeting Requirement

Eliminate the requirement that the Executive Committee hold at least one in-person meeting per year in addition to any held in conjunction with the convention.

Proposal 9: Suspension of Officers and Other Executive Committee Members

Allow Executive Committee to suspend any EC member, not just officers, while making the appeal process more effective for anyone who is so suspended.

Proposal 10: Operations Committee

Part A: Eliminate the Operations Committee. *Part B (to be considered only if part A is adopted):* Remove Operations Committee from the list of positions that cannot be held together with Judicial Committee. *Part C (to be considered only if part A fails):* Restore structure of the Operations Committee to what it had been up until 2024 - the Chair plus four other members chosen by the Executive Committee.

Proposal 1: Budget Ratification

Summary: Update the language concerning the budget to reflect the fact that our fiscal year now coincides with the calendar year.

Rationale:

Bylaw 12 includes language intended to deal with the fact that our fiscal year started around the time of our convention, so that the Executive Committee that would be operating under the annual budget might be significantly different from the one that prepared the budget. However, we now operate with a fiscal year that matches the calendar year, so separating out the steps of "projecting" and "ratifying" the budget no longer makes much sense. In addition, because this amendment puts the vote requirement for budget ratification into the section where that subject is addressed, it no longer needs to be mentioned in another section.

Bylaw 12: Finance and Accounting

~~Section 2~~

~~The Treasurer may authorize expenditures for any item incorporated into the proposed budget until the Executive Committee has ratified the budget for the current year.~~

Section ~~3~~ 2

The Executive Committee shall not enter into any contract lasting more than three months, incur any expense in a non-budgeted category, or incur any expense in a budgeted category greater than the amount budgeted by more than \$1,000 without a two-thirds vote of the ~~entire~~ eligible positions on the Executive Committee. Anyone who incurs such financial liability without such approval shall be held personally liable.

Section ~~6~~ 5

The Executive Committee shall ~~cause an annual budget to be projected~~ ratify, with a two-thirds vote of all eligible positions on the Executive Committee, an annual budget at its final meeting of the fiscal year for ~~ratification~~ implementation the following year.

Bylaw 13: Executive Committee

Section 5

A two-thirds majority of the eligible positions on the Executive Committee shall be required to pass the following:

~~D. The annual budget, or any financial liability, or contractual obligation lasting more than three months.~~

Proposal 2: Appeal of Program Planks

Summary: Update the procedures for appeal of a Program plank to reflect the fact that such planks are no longer adopted at the convention.

Rationale:

The existing language about handling cases where a Program plank is alleged to be inconsistent with the Statement of Principles or the Platform makes no sense given the way that such planks are currently adopted. This language is left over from a time when Program planks were adopted by a vote of the convention, so it provides for challenges by delegates and for the Judicial Committee's decision to be reported back to the convention. Now such planks are adopted by the Executive Committee, which can happen at any time during the year, and generally *not* when the convention is in session. This updates the language so that objections can be raised by members more generally, at the time when it will actually make sense to do so, and requires the JC's decision to be reported to the Executive Committee and the membership.

Bylaw 22: Program

Section 3

If ~~a delegate believes~~ any three State Central Committee members believe that an adopted plank is in conflict with ~~the Statement of Principles of the national Libertarian Party, or with~~ the Statement of Principles or Platform of the Party, ~~then the delegate~~ they may challenge that plank in writing to the Judicial Committee. ~~The challenger~~ They shall specify in the challenge the manner in which ~~the delegate believes~~ they believe the plank is in conflict. The Judicial Committee shall decide whether the plank in question conforms to the ~~respective~~ Statement of Principles or Platform and make a report stating the justification of its decision to the ~~floor of the convention~~ Executive Committee and the membership. If the plank is vetoed by the Judicial Committee, it will be declared null and void; but the plank may be reinstated in the Program by a ~~three-fourths~~ four-fifths vote of the ~~convention~~ Executive Committee.

Proposal 3: Reinstatement of Resigned Members

Summary: Clarify that members who resign may rejoin and return to full voting status after a period of 12 months without a vote of the EC or convention.

Rationale:

At the 2021 Convention, the delegates adopted a bylaws amendment requiring that anyone who resigned their Central Committee membership, and later sought reinstatement, undergo a vetting period before their full voting rights could be restored. At the time, it was understood that reinstatement could occur in one of two ways:

1. The individual could rejoin as a non-voting "Associate" member for 12 months and then be automatically reinstated as a voting Central Committee member; or
2. The Executive Committee – or the delegates at convention – could vote by majority to reinstate the member at any time.

However, the bylaw was worded in a way that has since been interpreted to mean that *both* methods of reinstatement require a vote of either the Executive Committee or the convention delegates, contradicting the original intent.

Additionally, the current language in Section 4 could be interpreted to mean that simply allowing dues to lapse triggers the procedures outlined in Section 7. Because Bylaw 6 already requires dues to be current, the extra language in Section 4 is unnecessary and potentially misleading. Moreover, the reference to Section 6 appears to have been in error when the amendment was originally adopted.

Bylaw 6: Membership

Section 4

The Secretary ~~automatically~~ shall terminate a State Central Committee membership if that member requests in writing such termination, ~~or if, except for elected Central Committee members, that member fails to remit prescribed dues by that member's renewal date.~~

Section 7

~~A.~~ Any individual wishing to renew their membership, having previously requested the termination of their membership through the means prescribed in Section 4, shall do so ~~in~~ as an associate, non-voting member ~~role~~, and shall be ~~eligible for full reinstatement~~ reinstated as a Central Committee member (a) automatically following a period of 12 consecutive months, ~~or (b)~~

~~B. Full Central Committee membership status may be reinstated~~ at any time by a majority vote of the Executive Committee or by a majority of ~~those Central Committee~~ delegates present and voting at Convention.

~~C.~~ This rule shall not apply to any membership terminated through Sections 5 ~~or~~ 6.

(Note: the intended effect of the above markup is to condense the existing three paragraphs of Section 7 into a single paragraph.)

Proposal 4: Executive Session

Summary: Specify rules and procedures relating to the use of executive sessions, including limiting them to specific types of issues, being for discussion only, and requiring recordings.

Rationale:

A special rule of order was adopted by the Executive Committee several years ago regarding the procedures for going into executive session during a meeting. This was primarily done because Robert's Rules of Order allows for actions to be taken during executive session, meaning motions can be made and voted on with no transparency. However it would be better for this rule to be included in the bylaws, because otherwise a future Executive Committee could simply remove it from the special rules of order.

In addition, the current rule does not make clear what matters may be discussed in executive session. This amendment will limit the topics that may be discussed in such sessions to the types that are typically considered appropriate, such as disciplinary and personnel matters and relations with other entities that may require confidentiality.

Bylaw 13: Executive Committee

Section 5 (and renumber following sections)

The Executive Committee, and all its sub-committees, shall conduct all votes and actions in open session; executive session may only be used for discussion of disciplinary actions, personnel matters, contractual negotiations, pending or potential litigation, or political strategy requiring confidentiality.

The motion to enter into executive session must list all reasons for doing so; only items listed in the reasons for entering executive session shall be considered during executive session.

The motion to go into executive session shall require a two-thirds vote of the members of the Executive Committee present and voting.

No action shall be taken while in executive session, however during executive session discussion of actions which may be taken in open session can occur.

Recordings shall be made during executive session, however, such recordings shall only be made available to the members of the Executive Committee until such time as the Executive Committee, by two-thirds vote, incorporates such recordings into the public record. Nothing in this section shall require the Executive Committee to ever make these records public.

All other aspects of executive session not specifically addressed above will be in conformance with the newest edition of Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised.

Proposal 5: Financial Standards Committee Membership

Summary: Move the requirement that the FSC have three members and that they cannot be any of the officers, currently contained in the Operating Procedures Manual, into the Bylaws, and expand the list of people who are ineligible to be appointed.

Rationale:

The bylaws currently require that the Executive Committee appoint a Financial Standards Committee, with the job of reviewing financial records and processes and reporting its findings back to the Executive Committee – a function similar to what in many organizations might be called an "audit committee". The Executive Committee has adopted a rule that specifies that this committee should have three members, and that no current officer should be appointed to it since the effectiveness of this committee would be reduced if it were, in effect, auditing its own members. There seems to be general agreement that these are good policies, but it would be better to have this sort of policy in the bylaws so that some future Executive Committee cannot subvert the intent of the requirement, e.g., by appointing just the Chair or the Treasurer to serve as the "committee". In addition, this amendment would expand that restriction to apply to anyone serving as an assistant or "acting" officer, or as a paid employee or contractor, since similar concerns about conflict of interest might arise with them.

Bylaw 12: Finance and Accounting

Section 7

The Executive Committee shall select a Financial Standards Committee of three members during the first three months after a convention. The members may not include current Party Officers, acting Officers, assistant Officers, paid employees, or paid contractors. The Financial Standards Committee shall review the financial records and processes of the Party and report its findings at each subsequent Executive Committee session and at the next state convention.

Proposal 6: Allow for State Platform Planks - part A

Summary: Restore the ability of state convention delegates to adopt Platform planks, while continuing to treat the national Platform as the basis for our own.

Rationale:

Platforms have been an important part of the LP's history since the beginning. There was even a "temporary platform" before the first national convention. And our state party had its own Platform from the first state convention in 1973 up until 2022.

Functions served by LP platforms generally include: elaboration of the Statement of Principles to explain how our principles apply to particular issues, providing a reference for candidates in preparing their own statements on issues that come up in their campaigns, providing a reference for other party spokespersons (e.g., county chairs, media contacts) to address issues with which they may not be personally familiar, and serving as a starting point in preparing materials designed more specifically for outreach and membership recruiting (e.g. brochures, videos, social media posts). Additionally, the continuous *development* of platforms, specifically the process of debating and voting on planks at conventions, has historically served several significant functions: helping new members understand the libertarian approach to applying our principles, helping determine on which issues there may be significant differences among members, and encouraging members who are interested in issues to attend conventions.

Functions served by having a *state* platform, in addition to a national one, include: allowing the platform to address issues that are specific to that state, or of special interest in that state, giving delegates to state conventions experience with the kinds of things that are debated at national conventions, giving members who may want to get involved with national platform development a chance to serve on a platform committee, and developing ideas and text that may then be adopted at the national level.

There were, however, many who questioned the value of our state having its own platform. Among the arguments against this: it was redundant since it addressed many of the same issues, there was the potential for confusion if the national and state platforms described our position on an issue using different language, debate and voting took up too much time at state conventions, some parts of our state platform had become outdated or overly wordy but remained in place because nobody was willing to put the work into updating them but delegates were reluctant to delete them without having something better.

Increasing discontent with the independent state platform model led, in 2019, to a move to delete the entire contents of our state platform (overturned by a ruling of our Judicial Committee) and then, in 2022, a change to our bylaws to simply declare the national Platform to *be* our state platform.

And that's how things stand now. We have no way to add to our platform anything about issues that are specific to California, arising from the structure of government in this state, in response to laws or proposed laws in this state, or of special interest to Californians because of geography or industries or demographic factors. Delegates to our conventions no longer have the opportunity to participate in platform development, either by serving on a platform committee or by simply voting. Candidates for state and local office, county chairs, and people who are trying to develop membership outreach programs for California voters have no common standard of reference for the formal Libertarian position on anything that is not addressed in the national Platform.

This proposal addresses these problems by retaining the idea of making use of the national Platform, but allowing our state convention to adopt additional planks when the delegates deem that useful. This change will *not* be a return to the way things were prior to 2022. It will give us all the benefits of being able to address issues that are unique to California or of special interest to Californians, and provide a way – more limited than in the past but still significant – for delegates at our state convention to be involved in that process, while avoiding most of the problems that led to dissatisfaction with maintaining a separate state platform.

Because we will still have the national Platform as the basis for our own, delegates to our convention will be able to focus their attention on issues where having our own plank would serve some clear purpose, making the time spent on developing language, debating, and voting much more productive. This proposal

specifically requires that any planks we adopt not be in conflict with the national Platform, but there will be less chance of that situation even coming up because our planks won't be trying to address the same set of issues. And when any of our state planks becomes out-dated or simply redundant, if there is a national plank that does the job better or the same way, delegates will be a lot more willing to just delete our plank than they were in the past, since the alternative won't be "nothing".

This proposal defines the rules for adopting, amending, and deleting planks, and sets up a Platform Committee structured in the same way and with similar procedures as now used for the Bylaws Committee.

Bylaw 21: Platform

~~The national party platform shall be the Party Platform.~~

Section 1: The Party Platform shall consist of the national party Platform plus any additional state planks adopted by the Party.

Section 2: State planks may be adopted or modified by a 2/3 vote of the delegates at a convention with previous notice, or by a 3/4 vote without previous notice. State planks may be deleted by a majority vote.

Section 3: State planks may not be in conflict with the Statement of Principles or the national party Platform. Upon appeal by 10 delegates, any proposed or adopted plank which is alleged to be in violation of this section shall be reviewed by the Judicial Committee. If the Judicial Committee rules that the language is in violation of this section, any vote to adopt the language shall be considered void.

Bylaw 17: Committees

Section 3: Platform Committee

Not later than sixty days following the close of each convention, the Executive Committee shall appoint a Platform Committee of five State Central Committee members to recommend changes to the state planks of the Platform. The Platform Committee shall adopt its initial report not less than seventy days prior to the convention and the Secretary shall cause it to be published on the Party's website not less than sixty days prior to the convention. The Platform Committee shall adopt its final report, which may include corrections or improvements to proposals in the initial report but shall not introduce new proposals, not less than twenty days prior to the convention and the Secretary shall cause it to be published on the Party's website not less than fifteen days prior to the convention.

Rule 3: Debate Procedure

Section 1: Floor Motions and Amendments

For each main motion, the maker shall have two minutes immediately following to speak to the motion. For amendments to proposed changes to the Bylaws or Platform, these Convention Rules, or to resolutions, the maker shall have thirty seconds to speak to the amendment. The Chair shall then request a standing second to the motion or amendment. If fewer than ten percent of the delegates stand, the motion or amendment shall die for lack of a second.

Section 2: Committee Reports

Committee Reports that contain proposed changes to the Bylaws, or these Convention Rules, or the Platform shall not require a standing second.

In Rule 4, add "Platform Committee report;" as item E and re-letter.

Rule 6: "No Debate" Items

The Bylaws and Platform Committees shall designate each of ~~its~~their proposals as either a regular item or a "No Debate" item. The "No Debate" classification shall be reserved for proposals which are technical in nature rather than substantive. Upon motion of five delegates, any proposal designated a "No Debate" item by either Committee shall be reclassified as a regular item. Except for items proposed for immediate implementation, no debate shall occur on a Committee's proposals until the delegates vote on all of that Committee's "No Debate" items.

Create a new Rule 8 and re-number the subsequent rules.

Rule 8: Platform Committee

The Chair of the Platform Committee shall report the Committee's recommendations to the floor, proposal by proposal. The delegates shall vote on each proposal separately. After the delegates have debated and voted on all of the Committee's recommendations, if time permits, any delegate may propose new planks or additional amendments to existing planks, which the delegates shall vote on separately.

Proposal 6: Allow for State Platform Planks - part B

(to be considered only if the preceding proposal is adopted)

Summary: Add Platform Committee as a position that cannot be held together with Judicial Committee.

Rationale:

If there is going to be a Platform Committee and the Judicial Committee is going to be called upon to resolve questions about whether state platform planks are in conflict with the Statement of Principles or the national Platform, it would be better that members of the Platform Committee not also be serving on the Judicial Committee.

Bylaw 15: Judicial Committee

Section 2 (3/4 required to amend)

A Judicial Committee member may not be a member of the Executive Committee, the Operations Committee, the Platform Committee, or the Program Committee. The Judicial Committee shall be the final body of appeal in all Party matters, subject to the provision that a decision of the Committee may be overturned by a three-quarters vote of a convention.

Proposal 7: State Convention Delegates

Summary: Restore the practice of county organizations selecting delegates to the state convention, up to a limit based on their membership, similar to the system used in the past, while continuing to allow other central committee members to vote at the convention to whatever extent there remain spots unfilled for their county.

Rationale:

For the LP's national convention, delegates are selected by the state affiliate parties, with each state allowed to send a number of delegates based primarily on the fraction of the national membership residing in that state. Up until 2007, our state conventions were constituted similarly, with delegates selected by and representing local "regions" (generally corresponding to counties, but there were some counties that voluntarily grouped together to operate as a single region, and the largest county, Los Angeles, was divided into several regions). There were also a few classes of ex officio delegates, selected independent of that formula, including current members of the state Executive Committee and Libertarians who were serving in public office, but the vast majority of the delegates were selected by the regional organizations. The allocations for the regions were set by a formula based on the number of central committee members (voting members) associated with that region, as a fraction of the statewide total, so the total allocation stayed approximately the same from year to year, though the formula itself could be adjusted to constrain the total size of the convention. As things stood in 2007, the total theoretical delegate count, applying that formula and including ex officio delegates, was approximately 400, though actual total attendance did not normally reach that number.

That system provided several benefits. Members who were selected as delegates tended to be ones who were active in their county. The prospect of selection was an incentive to attend at least one local meeting, the one where the selection took place. Those attending that meeting had reason to discuss what was going on with the state organization. County-level activists had reason to consider who, among their members, were most suitable to serve as delegates. State-level activists, including candidates for state Executive Committee positions, had more reason to pay attention to activities at the county level, because that was where the people who would be state convention delegates were to be found. Counties that expected to have more members interested in serving as delegates than allowed by the formula had an additional incentive to recruit more members, and to get their existing members to renew, fostering a competitive spirit among many of the counties. Overall, the result was more awareness and interest among the county organizations about what was happening at the state level, and vice versa.

That system also served to moderate the influence of counties based on proximity to the location of the convention. This, in turn, also helped reduce the incentive for EC members to push for a location that they thought would result in better attendance by those who would vote their way, or to avoid having it where those who would vote against them would show up. Everybody always likes having the convention nearby, but at least everybody knew that this would not *also* be a way for their counties to have significantly "more than their share" of influence in the decisions made at the convention. It also provided, along with mechanisms like the 90-day "seasoning" requirement, a certain degree of "anti-takeover" protection. A group, internal or external, trying to get control of the convention could not do so just by recruiting a lot of supporters in the area near the convention to show up that weekend. This was particularly relevant in presidential election years, when it might have been tempting for a well-funded candidate for our nomination to pay supporters to attend. A group could still theoretically get control by recruiting enough members all across the state, taking control of the county organizations, and then selecting their own people as delegates, but that would be a much harder project requiring an extended time period for planning and implementation.

Criticisms of this system included: Members who were not active in their county-level organization but who could make a positive contribution at the state convention might be overlooked and not get selected. People from counties that didn't have functioning organizations might not be able to attend at all. If a county organization was dominated by some faction – either ideological or just a "clique" of friends – they might use their control of the county meeting to keep somebody not in their group from being named as a delegate, even if not enough of their own group were interested in going themselves. And one of the arguments that probably was most significant in getting the system abolished – *why would we want to limit attendance?* Why

keep out people who want to participate, in our biggest event of the year? A bigger convention would be more fun, more financially viable, and allow for more successful fundraising at the banquet.

Unfortunately, due to the significant drop in membership in recent years, that last expected benefit has not been realized. There simply aren't that many active members now, across the entire state, interested in attending our state convention to give us a convention as large as the ones we used to have regularly under the previous system. In most recent years the total number of people voting has been under 100, some years a lot lower. However, even though the total attendance has been much lower, the issues that motivated the earlier system have not entirely gone away – at the most recent convention, more than 1/4 of the voting members were affiliated with a single county. Also, our continued use of the term "delegate" for the members voting at our state convention has been criticized, since they are not sent by and do not represent anybody other than themselves.

This proposal would establish a hybrid system, giving the county organizations the *primary* role in selecting delegates, but with other members able to be seated to whatever extent the county organizations were uninterested in or unable to play that role. Each county would have a numerical limit calculated in a manner similar to the system we had prior to 2008. Delegates selected by a county organization – typically by election at their own annual meeting, though this would be up to each county to determine in their own bylaws – would have priority for seating at the state convention. There would also be provision for certain kinds of ex officio delegates as in the previous system. However, anybody *not* selected as a delegate in this manner would be able to volunteer as an "alternate", eligible to vote at the convention in the same way as a delegate, subject only to the numerical limit for his/her county. This means that in the case of a county that fails to select anybody, either because they didn't manage to hold a meeting for that purpose or just didn't want to bother, that county would be represented entirely by people who self-selected, just as they are now. Similarly, members from counties that have no county organization would continue to be able to attend, self-selecting (but still subject to the limit for their county).

This proposal includes a formula that would entitle each county to have one delegate for each 1/200 of the statewide membership. So, for example, a county that had 5% of the statewide membership would be represented by up to 10 delegates/alternates. The largest county, Los Angeles, having about 16% of the membership, could have 32. This number would be rounded up, so even the smallest county would be represented by at least one person. And as with the old system, every county chair would be an ex officio delegate, so as a practical matter the smallest counties would typically be able to have two representatives.

It is important to understand that implementing this system now would not likely, in the short term, keep anybody who wants to attend and vote at our state convention from doing so. It will therefore *also* not, in the short term, provide many of the benefits associated with that limitation, e.g., additional incentive for counties to grow their membership. The formula would allow for a total convention size several times what we have had in recent years. Even the county that had the largest number of members in attendance at the most recent convention, Santa Clara, would not have hit their limit if this system had been in place. However, having this system in place would provide *some* protection, in the short term, from extraordinary efforts to "pack" the convention geographically. The number from Santa Clara County would have been below the limit, but not by much. Counties that are near the location of the convention will always be better represented, but nobody would be able to use any county, no matter how large or how close to a future convention, to control the whole convention, by filling their allocation.

However, we will, hopefully, *be growing our membership*, first to reach the levels we attained in the past (when the benefits of county selection did play a significant role) and then even further! Not only will selection by county provide more benefits as we grow larger, putting this hybrid approach in place *now* will provide a natural *transition path* to that result. As increasing membership numbers make the allocation formula more relevant, more members will start to care about being selected that way, and more counties will start taking that process seriously. We won't need to decide, either in advance or as a response to some internal political crisis, to "switch" to county representation – it will just naturally become a more important part of the picture as overall membership increases, and as a larger and larger fraction of our counties become organized.

This proposal gives us some of the advantages of the previous system now, is not likely to prevent anybody who actually wants to attend from doing so any time soon, and allows the way our membership is represented at our convention to naturally adjust in keeping with the significant growth in membership that we all want to see in the future.

Bylaw 20: Convention

Section 3

a. Delegates and alternates to the convention shall be current State Central Committee members, and shall either hold public office or shall have been State Central Committee members for any ninety days prior to the convention.

b. Regular delegates shall be selected by active county organizations as provided in their bylaws, up to a limit of one delegate for each 0.5% or fraction thereof of the total number of State Central Committee members who are affiliated with that county, as of the end of the fourth month prior to the convention. Active county organizations may also select any number of alternates, and may specify a ranking of these alternates. All such selections shall be reported to the Party Secretary no later than two weeks prior to the convention.

c. The following shall have voting status as delegates ex officio, not counting against the limit in paragraph (b) and with their vote not transferable to any other member or substitution by an alternate:

i. The current Chair of each active county.

ii. For each inactive county, the Chair Pro Tem or if there is no Chair Pro Tem another member appointed to serve as a delegate for that county by the Area Coordinator for that county. Each Area Coordinator shall be responsible for providing this information to the Party Secretary at least one week prior to the convention.

iii. Each current member of the state Executive Committee.

iv. Any registered Libertarian currently holding an elective public office. (For the purpose of this provision, central committee member shall not be considered a public office.)

d. Any State Central Committee member meeting the qualifications in paragraph (a) may apply to serve as an alternate by notifying the Party Secretary in writing or through a form provided for this purpose on the Party web site.

e. Alternates shall be seated and have the same voting rights as regular delegates selected by their county, up to the limit for their county set in paragraph (b). If the total number of delegates so selected and currently registered in attendance plus alternates present and willing to serve exceeds that limit, alternates ranked by the county party shall be seated first, in that order. Any other alternates shall be seated according to the date when they first became a central committee member, earliest being seated first.

f. Notwithstanding the above, any current State Central Committee member may be added as a delegate or alternate by a 4/5 vote of the convention.

~~Notwithstanding the above, each Executive Committee member may seat one current State Central Committee member as a delegate.~~

Proposal 8: Eliminate EC In-Person Meeting Requirement

Summary: Eliminate the requirement that the Executive Committee hold at least one in-person meeting per year in addition to any held in conjunction with the convention.

Rationale:

The requirement that the Executive Committee meet in-person at some time not connected with the convention is a holdover from when in-person meetings were the best option we had. Getting together in one place imposes significant costs on EC members, both financial and in terms of travel time. It also makes it more difficult for the membership at large, who have now become accustomed to the convenience of access via Zoom, to observe the meetings. There are times when meeting in person can be useful, and times when the additional cost can be minimized, e.g., if a meeting is held in connection with some other libertarian event to which many EC members would be traveling anyway. And the EC would still be able to do that. But it makes no sense for EC members to incur those costs *just* to fulfill an arbitrary quota of such meetings.

Bylaw 13: Executive Committee

Section 3

The Executive Committee shall meet at such time and place as may be determined by action of the Executive Committee, by a call of the Chair, or by written request of one-third or more of the members of the Executive Committee. ~~Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Executive Committee shall hold at least one in-person session per year that shall not be within six weeks of an LPCA convention.~~ The Secretary shall mail to each member of the Executive Committee, and to each county Chair, a notice of the time and place of each session, not less than fourteen days prior to such session. Sessions conducted electronically shall require seven days' prior notice, unless all members of the Executive Committee attend the session and each expressly waives such notice at the beginning of the session.

Proposal 9: Suspension of Officers and Other Executive Committee Members

Summary: Allow Executive Committee to suspend any EC member, not just officers, while making the appeal process more effective for anyone who is so suspended.

Rationale:

Currently the bylaws only provide a process for the suspension of officers and Operations Committee members. The meaning of "suspension" in the bylaws is the first step in removing the officer, which is followed by the opportunity for the suspendee to appeal to the Judicial Committee (JC), however in the current bylaw the JC must rule on the suspension within three days, which precludes the opportunity for a hearing. Further the current bylaw doesn't make any provisions for the suspension/removal of any other member of the Executive Committee.

Since all members of the Executive Committee are elected by the membership at convention, removal should require the opportunity for a hearing rather than just assuming the JC would have sufficient information to either agree with or overturn the removal.

The Operations Committee, on the other hand, is a sub-committee of the Executive Committee whose members are appointed by the Executive Committee, therefore removal from that committee should not require the opportunity for appeal as the appointing body has the authority to remove members of sub-committees.

This will remove the provisions for a member of the Operations Committee to appeal to the JC for a removal from that committee while providing due process for all Executive Committee members that were elected by the membership, by requiring that they be given written notice of their suspension and giving them the opportunity for a hearing to be held to appeal their removal.

Bylaw 11: Officers

Section 7

An ~~officer or Operations Committee~~ Executive Committee member may be suspended from office by the Executive Committee. The office of the suspendee shall be declared vacant unless the suspendee appeals such suspension to the Judicial Committee in writing within ten days of written notification of such suspension. Upon written appeal by the suspendee, the Judicial Committee shall rule within three days, unless a hearing is requested, to either uphold the suspension, thereby vacating the office, or restore the suspended member to full authority. If a hearing is requested, it shall be held per Bylaw 15, Section 5. A failure to rule shall be deemed as restoring the suspended member to full authority.

Proposal 10: Operations Committee - part A

Summary: Eliminate the Operations Committee.

Rationale

The Operations Committee was established as a body that could act much more quickly than the full Executive Committee, in the days when the Executive Committee only met about four times per year, and when meeting electronically was not a practical option for a group that size. Now the EC typically meets monthly, electronically, and can be convened in as little as seven days, and in even less time than that in a true emergency as long as all the members waive notice. So the value of having a different body that can act more quickly is greatly reduced, and no longer worth the tradeoffs with respect to accountability and transparency.

The Operations Committee has not even been effectively performing its originally intended function in recent years. It has sometimes been difficult to get it to meet when the EC was depending on it to do so to deal with a particular matter; for example when the EC specifically delegated to the Operations Committee the task of approving a time-sensitive mailer for an election last year, it failed to even meet.

On the other hand, it has also sometimes taken up and acted upon matters that would have been more appropriately addressed at a meeting of the full EC, and which did not constitute any kind of emergency, such as filling a vacancy in a position for which there was already an alternate who could have performed the function until the next EC meeting.

And it has often failed to even communicate what it is doing; there are whole spans of years when it is known that there were meetings but for which no minutes were published, creating an information gap between the Operations Committee and the EC, in whose stead it is supposed to be operating, and also with the membership at large.

The Operations Committee allows a small, less representative group to make decisions on behalf of the entire organization that could, given current communication technology, be more effectively and transparently handled by the full EC.

~~Bylaw 14: Operations Committee~~

~~Section 1~~

~~The Operations Committee shall consist of the Chair, the three other Officers, and one member of the Executive Committee chosen by the Executive Committee.~~

~~Section 2~~

~~The Operations Committee shall meet at such time and place as may be determined by call of the Chair or two members of the Operations Committee. At least three days' notice is required unless all members of the Operations Committee attend the session or expressly waive such notice prior to the session.~~

~~Section 3~~

~~The Operations Committee shall have the powers of the Executive Committee between meetings of the Executive Committee, except for the following:~~

~~A. Establishing or modifying the Party budget, except that the Operations Committee shall have a budgeted discretionary amount of \$10,000 per quarter. At least four members shall approve any expenditure over \$2,000.~~

~~B. Creating, modifying, or repealing standing resolutions.~~

~~C. Incurring any non-budgeted expense or debt.~~

~~D. Suspending or censuring any member of the State or County Central Committees.~~

~~E. Overturning any Executive Committee action.~~

~~The Operations Committee, may, by unanimous vote, approve any other action that would require a two-thirds vote of the Executive Committee.~~

Section 4

~~The Operations Committee may, by unanimous vote, fill any vacant Party officer or Operations Committee position on an interim basis until a session of the Executive Committee is held.~~

Bylaw 11: Officers

Section 3

The Chair shall be the Chief Executive Officer of the Party. The Chair or his or her designee shall preside at all Party conventions; and all sessions of the Executive Committee; ~~and at all sessions of the Operations Committee.~~

Section 7

An officer ~~or Operations Committee member~~ may be suspended from office by the Executive Committee. The office of the suspendee shall be declared vacant unless the suspendee appeals such suspension to the Judicial Committee in writing within ten days of notification of such suspension. Upon written appeal by the suspendee, the Judicial Committee shall rule within three days to either uphold the suspension, thereby vacating the office, or restore the suspended member to full authority. A failure to rule shall be deemed as restoring the suspended member to full authority.

Section 9

The Executive Committee shall appoint new officers, including the Chair, or Executive Committee members or alternates; ~~or Operations Committee members~~ if vacancies occur. Such appointments shall be to complete the term of office vacated unless a convention meets sooner, in which case a new election shall be held for any position so filled.

Proposal 10: Operations Committee - part B

To be considered only if part A is adopted.

Summary: Remove Operations Committee from the list of positions that cannot be held together with Judicial Committee.

Rationale

If the convention decides to eliminate the Operations Committee, reference to the Operations Committee in respect to membership of the Judicial Committee should also be removed.

Bylaw 15: Judicial Committee

Section 2 (3/4 required to amend)

A Judicial Committee member may not be a member of the Executive Committee, ~~the Operations Committee~~, or the Program Committee. The Judicial Committee shall be the final body of appeal in all Party matters, subject to the provision that a decision of the Committee may be overturned by a three-quarters vote of a convention.

Proposal 10: Operations Committee - part C

To be considered only if part A fails.

Summary: Restore structure of the Operations Committee to what it had been up until 2024 - the Chair plus four other members chosen by the Executive Committee.

Rationale

If the convention does not eliminate the Operations Committee, the way that its membership is determined should be restored to what it was for almost its entire history – the Chair plus four other members selected by the Executive Committee. This allowed the EC to take into account whether a member was likely to serve this role well, including availability to participate in a quickly-called meeting. The very recent (adopted in 2024) change to have the committee consist of the four officers plus just one additional member may have seemed reasonable, but it has not worked well in practice. The other officers are elected by the convention mostly on the basis of considerations that have little to do with a person's suitability for serving on the Operations Committee. The EC would still be allowed to select any or all of the officers to serve on the Operations Committee if they were a good fit for the job, but they should not be assigned this role automatically.

Bylaw 14: Operations Committee

Section 1

The Operations Committee shall consist of the Chair, ~~the three other Officers, and one member of the Executive Committee~~ and four other State Central Committee members chosen by the Executive Committee.