

I'm fine with:

- adding Oxford commas
- removing unnecessary commas (though see below about particular instances)
- superscript placement outside of punctuation
- couldn't care less about n-dash versus m-dash

I don't support:

- Both spelling out and parenthetically adding Arabic numerals throughout
- Changing numbered/lettered lists to bullet points

Some of the word shuffling seems to be six-of-one, half-a-dozen of the other, based on personal preference rather than on correcting some language rule, so I don't see a benefit to doing it, and it makes me nervous that I'm missing a subtle change in the meaning/application.

Changes that are substantive changes of the policy, not mere editorial cleanups:

- p. 7, line 11 – I object to using the LNC acronym as a substitute for both “Libertarian National Committee, Inc.” and for “Libertarian National Committee” because they are legally different things. One is the board, and the other is a legal corporate entity. Our policy manual uses phrases like “membership of the LNC” and “LNC members”, but the corporate entity has no legal “members” according to our articles of incorporation, and the board does have members. The two terms should not share an acronym so as to cause confusion about which is meant and potentially cause legal issues.
- p. 19, line 14 – addition of an “and” could be read to incorrectly suggest that both are required simultaneously
- p. 23, line 22 – removing the “you” and replacing with a third-person reference changes the meaning
- p. 28, lines 22-45 would change the policy to now say that staff assists with ALL the listed items instead of only having a role in selected items
- p. 31, lines 12-30 – The new verbiage confines the categories more narrowly than the existing text does. For instance “Member Communications” isn't just the “producing” of LPNews. It also includes printing and mailing it. The same may be true of other bullet items, that it more narrowly confines its application.
- p. 42, line 27 adds new role for APRC to approve the “form” of literature, not just its content
- p. 67, footnotes 4 and 8 – This proposes edits to two verbatim RONR quotes, adding text not found in the original document.

Editorial problems with this draft:

- p. 6, line 20 – I'm fine with italicizing the title of RONR, but there is actually not a comma in the title and while we're removing improper commas, that should be removed also
- p. 8, line 10 – why remove the “or” in an either/or pair?
- p. 8, line 13 – proposing to strike out “Libertarian National Committee” and replace it with nothing, though the name of a voting body is needed there
- p. 20, line 10 – the struck out “or” needs to have a comma inserted
- p. 21, line 7 – both the red and blue text are struck out
- p. 23, line 34 – I prefer to keep the comma for clarity
- p. 24, line 30 – the added language is confusing, as though the bullets are how to approve, rather than being a description of what constitutes a timely response

- p. 25, line 33 – both the red and blue text are struck out
- p. 27, line 9 – why move the prepositional phrase away from the word being modified?
- p. 27, line 35 – I prefer keep the comma for clarity
- p. 28, line 2 – struck out a phrase and moved it but didn't show the moved text in blue underline, instead it looks like existing text
- p. 28, line 6 – word “any” does not appear in the existing text but is shown in red strikeout as though it is to be removed from the existing text
- p. 28, lines 26+ – Here is a list with two embedded sub-lists. I don't like converting the outer list to semicolons, as it looks really strange to have an “and” at the end of a list in number 5. Only one of the two embedded lists was converted to have semicolons. I'd just leave this whole section as-is.
- p. 34, line 12 – I'm not sure why the comma is proposed for removal since it is a compound sentence.
- p. 39, line 27 – red text is underlined and bold like an addition, though I think it is intended to be struck out

p. 10, line 27 – This proposes to add a vice-chair report to the standard agenda, though the vice-chair has only a minimally defined role. I don't see a need to require a report, though I do not object to a vice-chair opting to provide one. Our agendas are usually packed already.

p. 48 – I prefer to keep using “Executive Director” rather than the ED acronym because of the medical condition that commonly uses that acronym. The full phrase isn't particularly unwieldy.

p. 55, line 6 – This section of the policy manual has been edited to add several words which are not in the original text, yet they are not shown in blue underline as proposed additions. This makes me concerned that I we need to do a full textual comparison to see what other changes might have happened without being noted in insert/strikeout format.

p. 56, line 42 – I am not wild about the laundry list new section header

p. 60, line 14 – I prefer the original wording