

1 ANREP Board Meeting
2 21 April 2010

3
4 **Minutes taken by Ursula Smedly, Secretary (last few minutes of notes taken by Eleanor R. Burkett)**
5 **Approved minutes submitted electronically for web posting: September 14, 2010**

6
7 Present:

8 Jeff Schalau, President
9 Mike Kuhns, President-Elect
10 Mike Reichenbach, Past-President
11 Bill Hubbard, Executive Secretary
12 Ursula Smedly, Secretary
13 Will Sheftall, Treasurer
14 Brenda Allen, Southern Regional Representative
15 Eleanor Burkett, North-Central Regional Representative
16 Amy Grotta, Western Regional Representative
17 Sue Donaldson, Policy & Bylaws Committee Chair

18
19 Absent:

20 Dean Solomon, Assistant to the Treasurer
21 Sandy Smith, NE Regional Representative

22
23

24 1:39 MT meeting called to order

25

26 AGENDA

27

28

29 Are there any additions to the Agenda?

30 (Newsletter added as Item 3)- moved around as needed to accommodate much needed discussion of
31 the bylaws

32

33 Approval of Minutes from March

34 031710 unapprvd min.doc

35

36 • Changes noted in these minutes were handled in Sue's emails regarding policy changes. Ursula
37 will insert comments made via email into last month's meeting minutes. Ursula will also append
38 the documents to the minutes and will send out as a package to the Exec Committee.

39

40 **Motion: Will to approve with amended changes. Brenda Allen seconded. All were in favor. Motion**
41 **passed.**

42

43 ITEM 1 -- Membership news -- Bill Hubbard

44

45 • 15-20 renewals over the last couple of weeks.
46 • Membership is steadily climbing, well over 60% as renewals

47

48 ITEM 2 -- Treasurer report -- Will Sheftall

- 1 • Balance \$42, 178.75, which includes approximately \$17,000 transfer from the Fairbanks Visitor
2 Conference Center and Visitors Bureau with receipts through the end of March, and bank
3 charges through the end of February.
- 4 • There is \$33, 180.22 in the general account, which will soon to be short \$500 as payment to
5 Matt Howell
- 6 • In the savings account there is \$20,123.03.

7
8 ITEM 5 -- Proposed Bylaws Changes -- Sue Donaldson
9 Revised ANREP Bylaws 4-4-10 with explanations.docx
10 Revised ANREP Bylaws 4-4-10 changes accepted.docx
11 ANREP P&P Manual 4-6-10.docx

- 12
- 13 • Jeff REALLY wanted to commend Sue's efforts in putting the bylaws together. For the record,
14 this is the ONLY time she will ever work on bylaws, ever! Thanks SUE!!!
- 15
- 16 • Once it's all over, Sue will put together the documents needed to present to membership,
17 including the substantive changes made, as well as the edits.
- 18

19 From Sue's email (resent, 4/21/10):
20

21 Issues to be discussed before taking the bylaws changes to the membership:
22 PLEASE carefully review both the Bylaws revisions (attached) and the concerns below. We need to
23 finalize the revisions at the next Board meeting so that I have time to make documents and explanations
24 of the changes to send to the membership in May. I have also attached a revised copy of the Policies
25 and Procedures Manual incorporating Will's suggestions about quorums. See page 13 for the changes
26 (in red).

27

- 28 1. See comment d(11) – Quorums (Article VI). Concerns have been raised that allowing those
29 present at committee meetings to constitute a quorum may not be appropriate, particularly for those
30 committees making decisions about scholarships, awards, etc. However, the decisions of committees
31 are only advisory to the Executive Committee, which appoints the committee members. Should a
32 committee fail to incorporate feedback from committee members, the Exec Comm could direct the
33 committee to revisit the issue.

34
35 Three quorum issues:

- 36 1. Does the Membership present at the meeting, constitute a quorum?
 - 37 2. A quorum of the executive committee is 2/3, and a
 - 38 3. A committee quorum.
- 39
 - 40 • Regarding the first item, the membership who shows at the meeting shall constitute a quorum.
41 The committees' reports need to go through a check and balance process, so the committees
42 shall submit their reports and the Exec committee can review. As Sue has it written, Jeff, Mike
43 R. and Brenda agree that the language is fine. Will S. commented that there needs to be some
44 specific language stating that documents should be reviewed by minimum of three individuals.
 - 45 • Sue commented that due to audits and that procedure, she suggested that we specifically state
46 how many members need to be involved in an audit. (Financial review, as stated in the bylaws)
47 Will stated that it should be three individuals in addition to the Treasurer. Mike R. stated that

1 he felt that two and the Treasurer would be sufficient, based on his experience. Sue D. stated
2 that there were three plus the Treasurer was helpful when she sat on JCEP.

- 3 • Also, Sue said that this needs to be done annually and face-to-face. Mike R. felt that face-to-
4 face might not be the best way, given the electronic media availability. Will stated that you
5 really only need one member of the Exec Committee, plus the Treasurer, plus one other
6 member to serve. Will suggested that maybe Bill H. or some other member might be recruited,
7 as they're closest to Will in Florida.
- 8 • Sue made notes on her documents, but all were comfortable with the language around the
9 quorum issue.

10
11 2. See comment d(14) – Policy Statements (Article VIII). Language has been simplified in this
12 section. Will suggests we need to clarify two different types of “policy statements”: (1) Those that refer
13 to position paper style policy statements which address "political" (legislative, administrative) actions
14 proposed or enacted, that while external to the association have impact on our profession, our
15 members, or our capacity to educate clientele on issues key to their prosperity and/or the general public
16 welfare; and (2) internal operating policies voted by the Executive Board, which would be found in the
17 Policies and Procedures Manual. Do you want to add this language to the Bylaws? Current language
18 (Article VIII, Section 3) notes the Policies and Bylaws Committee reviews the policy statements annually
19 and presents new statements for consideration at Membership Meetings. This statement refers to the
20 type of policy statement in (1) above. I suggest that we add something to clarify that it is the duty of the
21 Policies and Bylaws Committee to maintain the Association’s Policies and Procedures Manual, update
22 the content based on Board actions, and recommend changes to the Executive Committee at least
23 annually.

- 24
25 • Sue stated that this was an attempt to clarify the language within the Policy Statement section.
26 The last meeting looked at the language, and Will identified two different kinds of statements.
27 We have in Article 8, section 3, the statement that policy statements will be reviewed annually.
28 Will clarified that what he meant was that perhaps these two different types of statements
29 should maybe be addressed separately. "Conducting the affairs" was the language that caused
30 the question. Sue suggested that operating policies be included in the policy and procedure
31 document. All others would be seen as opinions. Mike R. didn't see it necessary to clarify the
32 difference between the two types of policy statements, i.e. internal vs. external policies. Mike
33 R. clarified that both statements direct the affairs of the Association. Sue stated that policy
34 statements that direct the Executive Committee and the Policy and Procedure document is
35 direction for the Exec Committee. Bill said that he foresees that ANREP may be called upon to
36 issue statements regarding issues down the road. Sue suggested that maybe we take out the
37 language "conducting the affairs" and call them opinions of ANREP. Eleanor suggested that we
38 separate them, calling Section 1, “Policy Statements” and the other, “Operational Policies.” Will
39 suggested that this gets covered in the duties of the Executive Committee. Will suggested
40 language and Sue noted the language in her document.

- 41
42 • Duties of the Secretary (p. 4, section 6) job description need to include the duty of adding new
43 policy statements as they are changed or drafted. Also the statement "Update and maintain the
44 handbook" needs to show as a duty done on an ongoing basis, not just once a year.
- 45
46 • Jeff suggested that we also add that this does not apply to operational policy and procedures.
47 Perhaps need clarification. Will suggested the change should read "external matters that impact
48 the membership and the natural resource Extension professionals."

- 1
2
- Mike R. had concerns that the last statement could compromise our 501 c (3) status. We are classified as a business, rather than education. We were incorrectly classified.
 - Agreed to change to read, "...matters external to the Association."
- 5

6 3. Do we want to require Committees to have "charters"? I was unable to locate any for the
7 committees, and have attempted to clarify the language in Article IX, Sections 2 and 4.
8

- 9
- Will suggested that the committee should have a descriptive purpose. Sue says that it's stated that committee charters are provided for by the board. Jeff said it should read "charges" not "charters." Sue stated that we probably don't need to have language in the bylaws regarding charges. Will suggest that in the Policy manual, we have a page for each committee outlining their duties. Mike R. stated that it's clearly stated that the Executive Committee forms these committees. Members can also suggest the creation of a committee as a charter. The Executive Committee still has the power to veto it too. Sue thought that the only reason the Exec Committee would vote a committee suggestion down, is if another committee would already cover those duties. Mike R. suggest that a request would be drafted that would outline the duties of the proposed committee, plus the signatures of 10 members in good standing.
- 19
- Other changes to the Policies and Procedures Manual:
 - I added the travel reimbursement policy, which was last approved by the Board on XXX.
 - I added Mike Kuhns to the list of Presidents.
- 23

24 (end of discussion of items 1-3)
25

- 26
- Jeff stated that he received an email from Sandy Smith, and that email stated that he was okay with the changes proposed for the bylaws. Sue thanked Sandy for his review prior to reviewing with the Exec Comm.
- 29
- Sue suggested that perhaps there be a ballot at the business meeting that would not go item by item, but vote on the document as a whole. Will thought we might go by each of the articles (there are 12). Then, Sue suggested that there would be an overview written for each of the articles, summarizing the changes that were made. Jeff saw the value in this, however, since there is limited time to go over this, and in that there might not be total agreement on certain sections.
- 36
- Sue reminded us that this vote could be done electronically (2/3) maybe through Survey Monkey. Will thought that this might not be digestible by the membership- all or nothing kind of vote. This way, we might not fully understand which part(s) might be unacceptable to the membership. Mike K. agreed, also where there might be disagreement between articles. Mike R. suggested that we vote on where the comments are and also where there's interlocking ideas. Sue said that there's probably over 60 comments on the document as a whole. We could send out a request for input in advance, as well as a vote in advance? Many of the Executive Committee agreed that we should not vote on the document at the meeting, but send out a request for an electronic vote. Will suggested that we vote by related items. Mike K. suggested that we go article by article and don't worry about linking. Jeff agreed. He added that where there's a linkage, perhaps make note. Sue suggested that she could add verbiage and explanation how it's linked to another comment. Jeff felt that most of our membership will
- 48

1 probably go with our recommendations on the bylaws. Jeff thought we could discuss the results
2 of the voting at the business meeting.

- 3 • Sue asked Bill H if we could put the revisions on the website and link to a survey monkey on the
4 website. Sue asked, for example, if it could be presented as: "Here's Article I and here are the
5 proposed changes. Vote yes, no or abstain." Sue plans on cleaning it up, write a rationale for
6 each, and send it to the Executive Committee, allow for review for a week, then draft a ballot
7 and develop the survey monkey which Bill will do. Also, Will suggested that a benefit of using
8 Survey Monkey is that we can limit it to one vote, one url, eliminating the possibility of multiple
9 voting.
- 10
- 11 • Sue said that the original bylaws are currently on the website (as we need to present the original
12 and the amended versions to our membership).
- 13
- 14
- 15

16 **Motion: Will moved that we present the bylaw revisions as discussed and amended, to our**
17 **membership for electronic voting, between May 15- June 15, with a synopsis of the changes, article by**
18 **article and the opportunity to vote yes, no or abstain, by article.**

19

20 **Amy Seconded. No further discussion. All were in favor. Motion passed.**

21

22 Next meeting, we will view and accept changes. Moved to Item 6.

23

24 **ITEM 3-- Newsletter – (ERB) Almeshia still on mend. Slowly recovering. We didn't have time to discuss**
25 **this at this meeting so will put on next agenda.**

26

27 **ITEM 4 -- Conference Update -- Eleanor Burkett (ERB) Things are looking good. Hopefully will have the**
28 **first draft of the Program Book soon (maybe next week) - be alert reviewers! Next week at our planning**
29 **committee meeting we will discuss volunteer needs and other details as the conference now draws very**
30 **near. Eleanor requested people to send her agenda items. Jeff will not be at the meeting next week as**
31 **he will be busy at PILD.**

32

33

34

35 **ITEM 6 -- 2012 ANREP Meeting Site Selection -- Mel Baughman**
36 **2012 ANREP Conference Recommendation.doc**

37

38 Brenda and Sandy were also on the committee. They met twice. After the first meeting, they couldn't
39 answer some questions, so they requested additional info, they met again April 1. They're
40 recommended for the first choice is North Carolina (Hendersonville location). Mel outlined their
41 rationale, including the fact that they wanted to maintain some regional balance, facility capacity, cost,
42 rural atmosphere, opportunity for a retreat-like setting (vs. urban setting). There were some trade-offs,
43 however. For example, air travel might be challenging for a rural location versus an urban location.
44 They also considered opportunity for tours and Extension involvement in these tours. California did
45 offer these opportunities. They really preferred the rural location over the more urban proposals. All
46 facilities ranked equally in their sustainability efforts.

- 47 • Bill Hubbard thought maybe he'd try and go look at the location.

- 1 • Mike R. asked if there might be specific rules associated with the location. It's been Bill's
2 experience that there might be, so it might be worth investigating.
- 3 • Mike K. with regard to meals, he found online limited info. Mel said that it would be a
4 cafeteria-style, three meals a day. Will concurred that this has been experience. Will asked if
5 there would be a plated meal?
- 6 • Sue found information on their website, including capacities (224 maximum capacity for one
7 dining room) and timing. Also, Sue mentioned that it would take her a full day of travel to get to
8 NC from NV.
- 9 • Will asked Mel, regarding cost comparisons, what was the driving differential? Mel asked
10 clarification from the locations, the \$479 for three nights of lodging and all the meals for the
11 conference, plus registration fee. Honorarium, field tours, would not be included.
- 12 • Mike K. asked about registration fees? Mel said that would be handled by the University. Mel
13 also stated that they want the profit if there's profit, but they'll also incur the loss, if there's a
14 loss. Might be useful to buy insurance on the event. Mike K. stated that in the past, ANREP has
15 a policy stating that we share profit, and that we rely on those monies as part of our budget.
16 Those need to be addressed. It's understood that they just want to break even. Mike K. Do we
17 have insurance? Will stated, we have purchased liability insurance between \$500-600, as Dean
18 Solomon negotiated.
- 19 • Mel stated (reading from the proposal) that they want to split 50/50 with ANREP but is unable
20 to incur losses.
- 21 • Bill is willing to take a look at the facilities, if he can and get a feel for some of the policies they
22 have and get some of our questions answered.

23
24 The above is summary and discussion. Below is the full report as presented by the 2012 ANREP
25 Conference Review Committee:

26
27 April 1, 2010

28
29 To: ANREP Board members
30 Mike Reichenbach, reich027@umn.edu
31 Jeff Schalau, jschalau@Ag.arizona.edu
32 Sue Donaldson, donaldsons@unce.unr.edu
33
34 From: 2012 ANREP Conference Review Committee
35 Mel Baughman, University of Minnesota, baughman@umn.edu
36 Brenda Allen, Auburn University, allenbm@auburn.edu
37 Sanford Smith, The Pennsylvania State University, sss5@psu.edu

38
39 Re: Recommendations for 2012 ANREP Conference Location

40
41 Our committee met twice to review and discuss proposals from California and North Carolina. After the
42 first meeting, we contacted staff in each of those states to request additional information that would
43 clarify their proposals. Proposals from both states were outstanding. ANREP could be assured of an
44 excellent conference in any of the proposed locations.

45
46 Our recommendation is to select the site in North Carolina at Kanuga Conference Center near
47 Hendersonville. This venue offers the rural resort atmosphere that ANREP members have enjoyed at
48 many of our conferences. Lodging, food, and registration costs would be substantially lower at this site

1 than at any other proposed. This lower cost should be appealing after the high-cost conference in
2 Alaska. It is also on the East Coast which balances the geography of conference locations following the
3 Alaska conference. While there are interesting field tour possibilities, this is a forested landscape and
4 the conference organizers will need to work hard to offer tours that showcase Extension and university
5 research and that appeal to the broad range of subject matter interests among our members.
6

7 We suggest that the ANREP Board develop a policy about whether it expects to generate income from
8 these conferences to support scholarships for attendees or other Board priorities. Likewise it should
9 develop a policy about how financial risks will be borne. Past conferences have generated profits at
10 varying levels, but if a disaster should occur that would greatly reduce attendance or cause a late
11 cancellation of this conference, there could be thousands of dollars in fixed expenses that need to be
12 paid. The Board may want to investigate event insurance as a means to manage financial risk. The
13 Society of American Foresters has event insurance for its conventions and that insurance was quite
14 useful when it cancelled most of the SAF Convention that was scheduled to occur immediately after the
15 9/11 terrorism incident.
16

17 Proposals are evaluated below with respect to the selection criteria.
18

19 1. Prior experience on the part of the Host State's faculty in conducting a major educational event;
20 evidence of support from Host State's Extension faculty
21

22 Extension staff in both California and North Carolina have extensive experience in organizing, large-
23 scale, complex educational events. We have complete confidence that either state would be an
24 excellent host for the ANREP conference in 2012.
25

26 The California proposal was submitted by Rick Standiford and Bill Frost who co-chaired the 2000 ANREP
27 national conference. They will be supported by the same administrative team that organized that
28 conference.
29

30 The North Carolina proposal is supported by Robert Bardon and Susan Moore who have extensive
31 experience in organizing conferences at the state, regional, national, and international levels.
32

33 2. Convention facilities and hotels that have:

- 34 o Ability to host 250 – 300 people
- 35 o Sufficient meeting space for general sessions for all conference attendees
- 36 o Breakout rooms for concurrent sessions and workshops of approximately 50 people
- 37 o Banquet facilities for the entire group as well as special events
- 38 o Exhibit space for approximately 80 – 100 posters and 10 - 15 vendors
39

40 Proposals from both California and North Carolina claim to have located convention facilities and hotels
41 that meet the above criteria. We did not independently verify that information, but have no reason to
42 doubt those claims.
43

44 3. Location
45

46 California previously hosted an ANREP conference, but North Carolina has not hosted any ANREP
47 conferences. We think there is value in offering a conference in North Carolina to build support for
48 ANREP in that state and region. Conferences engage new people in their management.

1
2 We believe there is value in moving the conference around to different geographic regions to foster
3 regional ownership of this event and to equalize travel costs over time. Since the 2010 conference is in
4 Alaska, a long distance from the East Coast, holding the conference on the East coast in 2012 would
5 create geographic balance.
6

7 The California proposal offered convention sites in Sacramento and San Diego. These large cities have
8 excellent airport access and the convention facilities are a short distance away and easily accessible by
9 cabs, shuttles, and rental cars. The Sacramento site would be at a large, downtown hotel or convention
10 center. The San Diego site would be in the Mission Bay area, with a resort hotel as the likely location.
11

12 In North Carolina the New Bern site is in a fairly large city, but the closest national airport is at Raleigh,
13 about a 2 hour 15 minute drive from New Bern. There is a regional airport at Charlotte about 30 miles
14 away.
15

16 Airline access to Hendersonville, NC is via the Greenville-Spartanburg International Airport 57 miles from
17 Hendersonville or via the Asheville Regional Airport, 30 minutes from Kanuga Conference Center. It is
18 possible that airline flights from around the country to these airports may be more expensive than
19 flights to more major airports in California, but we did not evaluate those costs.
20

21 4. Estimated costs for 3 nights lodging, meals, meeting space, and conference administrative fees
22

23 The Hendersonville, NC site offers a substantially lower cost per person than any other site.
24

25 North Carolina

26 Hendersonville: \$479, plus \$25 to \$100 for field tours.
27

28 New Bern: \$840, plus \$25 - \$100 for field tours.
29

30 California

31 Sacramento, Hyatt Regency: \$790, plus \$60 for field tours
32

33 Sacramento, Sheraton Grand: \$778 - \$868 (depending on room rate), plus \$60 for field tours
34

35 San Diego, Catamaran Resort Hotel and Spa: \$791 (or current federal rate), plus \$60 for field tours
36

37 5. Amenities offered by the potential conference sites
38

39 North Carolina

40 Kanuga Conference Center is a peaceful, nature-based setting on a 1,400 acre mountain site. It is a 10-
41 minute drive from Hendersonville, a small community of 12,000 with a friendly small town, USA feeling.
42 Main street has fine restaurants, homemade ice cream shops, antique stores, and lots of artists and art
43 galleries. It is located at the southern edge of the Blue ridge Mountains in western North Carolina. It
44 offers lakeside trails and gazebos, hiking trails, scenic view points, lake swimming, free use of rowboats
45 and canoes, free fishing, gym, tennis, and shuffleboard. There is wireless access in the Inn lobby and
46 some meeting spaces, but no mention of wireless access in the sleeping rooms.
47

1 At New Bern, we may be staying in a downtown hotel on the riverfront and attending meetings at a
2 convention center one-half block away. The New Bern historic district is in close proximity. New Bern is
3 at the confluence of the Neuse and Pamlico Rivers on North Carolina's Pamlico Sound. It offers Tryon
4 Palace, spectacular gardens, historic homes, quaint shops, cozy restaurants and lively entertainment
5 downtown. It is located on the Coastal Plain where the native longleaf pine forest ecosystem
6 predominates. The hotel offers complimentary airport shuttle service, complimentary parking, high
7 speed wireless Internet access, fitness center, pool, Outdoor Walking Track along Riverfront/Marina,
8 access to sailing and jet skiing.

9

10 California

11 Downtown Sacramento offers ready access to Old Town Sacramento, State Capitol and museums, and
12 Sacramento River Walk locations for excellent dining, shopping and casual site seeing.

13

14 The San Diego site is in close proximity to outstanding beaches and boardwalks of the Ocean Beach area.
15 It is very close to Sea World, San Diego Zoo, the Gaslamp District, Old Town San Diego, and Tijuana,
16 Mexico. An outstanding trolley system provides easy access to a range of sightseeing venues. Excellent
17 dining and outdoor activities are in close proximity to the potential conference site.

18

19 6. Sustainable practices employed by the conference site/center/hotels

20

21 All facilities offered a reasonable list of sustainable practices. There was no compelling reason to choose
22 one facility over another based on this criterion.

23

24 7. A broad variety of natural resources tours

25

26 All conference locations offered good opportunities for natural resources tours.

27

28 North Carolina

29 Tours near the Kanuga Conference Center, Hendersonville, NC would have strong appeal to people
30 interested in forestry, horticulture, wildlife, biodiversity, recreation area management, natural resources
31 interpretation, and hydrology.

32

33 Tours near New Bern, NC would appeal to people interested in wood energy, forestry, wildlife,
34 biodiversity, hydrology, seafood industry, sustainable farming.

35

36 California

37 Tours near Sacramento, CA would highlight university Extension and research projects that would
38 appeal to people interested in watershed management, water conservation and quality, range
39 management, oak restoration, natural resources interpretation, wildlife, forest fuel management
40 strategies, and environmental management of agricultural enterprises.

41

42 Tours near San Diego, CA would interest people involved in wildfire protection, estuary management,
43 invasive species in riparian areas, oceanography, and effects of urban sprawl on native ecosystems.

44

45

46 (Additional notes taken by Eleanor, as Ursula's phone died -thanks Eleanor!)

47

1 (ERB) no vote today, Bill is going to do onsite visit and find our more information. He will email us with
2 what he finds out working with the two people from NC.
3
4 (ERB) Will - Other plus for Kanuga Center - if we can bring our own alcohol, it will be a nice draw and
5 save money on receptions and other gatherings.
6
7 ITEM 7-- ANREP Activities at 2010 PILD Meeting -- Jeff Schalau – (ERB) small ANREP meeting at PILD and
8 meet at NIFA offices. They are going to talk about putting together a chapter in the DC area.
9
10 (ERB) Meeting adjourned at 4:48 PM CST – motion/Brenda, second/Mike K, passed
11
12