

BOD Conference Call

1/28/09

Board Members Attending:

Scot McElveen
Stacy Allen
Liz Roberts
Gregg Fauth
Emily Weisner
Lee Werst
Mike Anderson
Kendell Thompson

Board Members Not Attending:

Craig Ackerman

There are 7 voting members present, including new member Kendell Thompson. The other open positions are still being determined by the election so the nominees have not been invited to participate.

Curt Treichel resigned from the BOD yesterday. Those nominees who lost the election may be interested in his position.

Curt did not get re-hired at Saguaro for the winter season. He feels parks and the NPS are not doing enough to bring back good seasonals, and feels someone else should represent the Seasonal Perspective position.

By-Laws

Article I, Section B, Paragraphs 1 and 2

Scot: The idea behind this proposed change was to shift the emphasis from just rangers to a more inclusive view of NPS employees. We need to do everything short of taking out the term ranger out of our organizational name. We should change "ranger professions" to "professions of National Park Service employees".

Curt suggested adding volunteers to this section as well (by email before his resignation), though this doesn't seem to be necessary.

Mike, Gregg and Emily all support the idea of changing the phrasing to make the article more inclusive.

Scot: Motion to revise Article I, Section B, Paragraph 1 from:

"The Association of National Park Rangers shall be an organization to communicate for, about, and with National Park Rangers; to promote and enhance the park ranger profession and its spirit; to support

management and the perpetuation of the National Park Service and the National Park System; and to provide a forum for social enrichment.”

To read:

“The Association of National Park Rangers shall be an organization to communicate for, about, and with National Park Service employees of all disciplines; to promote and enhance the professions of National Park Service employees and their spirit; to support management and the perpetuation of the National Park Service and the National Park System; and to provide a forum for social enrichment.”

Liz: Seconded the motion.

VOTE:

Unanimous: YES

Scot: Motion to revise Article I, Section B, Paragraph 2 from:

“The Association shall provide education and other training to develop and/or improve knowledge and skills of park rangers and those interested in the profession. The Association shall provide a forum for discussion of common concerns of park rangers and provide information to the public.”

To read:

“The Association shall provide education and other training to develop and/or improve knowledge and skills of National Park Service employees of all disciplines and those interested in these professions. The Association shall provide a forum for discussion of common concerns of National Park Service employees and provide information to the public.”

Gregg: Seconded the motion.

VOTE:

Unanimous: YES

Article I, Section C

Reasons for proposed change

1. Resource stewardship more accurately describes what most NPS employees should be doing as their priority duty – and it shifts the perception of what ANPR stands for away from a singular, people/property type law enforcement focus.
2. To continue to emphasize the larger National Park Service professions of all disciplines.
3. We need to mention the well-being of the resources of the National Park System so that we can advocate for them too.

Scot: Motion to revise Article I, Section C from:

“To the maximum extent possible, consistent with the goal of upholding the park ranger profession, the Association will work with the Service to maintain a high standard of resource protection and service to visitors. Proposals for legislative action or advocacy for or against legislation will be limited to instances when such measures are crucial to the well-being of the park ranger profession as a whole, as determined by the Board of Directors. When a position on legislation is called for by such a situation, the

primary emphasis will be upon providing information on the Association's position as a professional organization and the reasons for that position."

To read:

"To the maximum extent possible, consistent with the goal of upholding the professions of National Park Service employees, the Association will work with the Service to maintain a high standard of resource stewardship and service to visitors. Proposals for legislative action or advocacy for or against legislation will be limited to instances when such measures are crucial to the well-being of the professions of National Park Service employees, stewardship of National Park System resources, and/or the integrity of the National Park System, as determined by the Board of Directors. When a position on legislation is called for by such a situation, the primary emphasis will be upon providing information on the Association's position as a professional organization and the reasons for that position."

Stacy: Seconded the motion.

VOTE:

Unanimous: YES

Article IV, Section A

When ANPR sends out requests for grant money, a potential supporting organization wants to see our policy on Equal Opportunity and non-discrimination. This change simply adds that this section is ANPR's official statement on Equal Opportunity.

Again, the other change will emphasize the greater National Park Service professions of all disciplines.

Scot: Motion to change Article IV, Section A from:

"Membership in the ANPR shall be open to all individuals interested in the National Park Ranger profession and persons who support the profession in perpetuation of the National Park System and the National Park Service (Ranger at Heart) regardless of race, color, gender, religion, age, sexual orientation, national origin, or mental or physical disability."

To read:

"Membership in the ANPR shall be open to all individuals interested in the professions of National Park Service employees and persons who support these professions in perpetuation of the National Park System and the National Park Service regardless of race, color, gender, religion, age, sexual orientation, national origin, or mental or physical disability. *[This is ANPR's official statement on equal opportunity.]*"

Emily: Seconded the motion

VOTE:

Unanimous: YES

Article IV, Section B, Paragraph 1a or 1b

Scot: This is the most important issue tonight.

This section defines active members as “Current permanent and seasonal and retired employees of the National Park Service and former employees who joined ANPR while employed and have maintained continuous membership.”

This impacts Bill Schappell, who is a former NPS seasonal now working for the Bureau of Reclamation to gain status. Though he left the agency, his goal is to return to the NPS. But under this current Bylaw, Bill is ineligible for a BOD office, as he is an Associate member. Bill is the only nominee for the Treasurer position.

Scot’s suggestion is to change Article IV, Section B, Paragraph 1a or 1b from:

1. Membership of the Association shall be divided into:
 - a. Active Member - Current permanent and seasonal and retired employees of the National Park Service and former employees who joined ANPR while employed and have maintained continuous membership.
 - b. Associate Member - All other persons interested in the goals of the ANPR.

To read:

“Associate and Sustaining members who have previously worked for the NPS and are actively pursuing a return to NPS employment may petition the Board of Directors to have their membership designation changed to the Active membership designation by a majority Board vote (51% of a quorum must vote in the affirmative). If initially approved, such a designation expires on December 31st of the calendar year. It may be continued for another calendar year, not to exceed three years total, at the request of the involved member upon the approval of the President and the Board of Directors Member for Membership Services. Once changed to the Active membership designation the active member involved must pay the membership dues at the Active membership designation rate.”

Liz: We should just change the bylaw to read “current, retired and former employees of the National Park Service are eligible to be Active members. “

Kendell: It is along the lines of “once a ranger, always a ranger.”

Liz: The purpose of specifying “active” members is simply to make sure that those participating are active, involved and in-touch with the feel of the NPS.

Is there a larger question regarding ANPR spouses? Can they run for a position or vote if they are a long term spouse, even if they have never worked for the NPS?

Emily: How often does this situation occur? Can we just take it on a case-by-case basis?

Mike: We should keep the associate membership category. Seasonal law enforcement academies may have people interested.

Scot: We don't want to strike the associate membership category; we just want to make the active membership category a bigger group.

Scot: I'm not comfortable allowing an associate member to be on the BOD who has never been an NPS employee.

Liz: Change wording for Section B, Paragraph 1a to read:

"Active Member - Current, retired or former employees of the National Park Service."

Scot: Seconded the motion.

VOTE:

Unanimous: YES

Article VI, Section A, Paragraph 2

A membership year is now 12-15 months, not just 12 months. By simply making the technical correction in the by-laws, we are catching up to our actions from the past year.

Scot: Motion to change Section A, Paragraph 2 from:

"A membership year is 12 months as determined by the board of directors."

To read:

"A membership year is 12 to 15 months as determined by the Board of Directors."

Liz: Seconded the motion.

VOTE:

Unanimous: YES

Article X, Section A, Paragraph 1

Scot: Board meetings are called much more frequently by email, rather than phone call. We should remove the part of this by-law that refers to telephone or electronic meetings as "unusual circumstances."

Scot: Motion to change Article X, Section A, Paragraph 1 from:

"The Board may conduct business at either a duly called meeting or, alternatively, through a written ballot; or, under unusual circumstances, by telephone ballot or electronic mail or a combination of electronic mail, telephone, and written ballot."

To read:

“The Board may conduct business at either a duly called meeting or, alternatively, through a written ballot, by telephone ballot, or electronic mail ballot, or a combination of electronic mail, telephone, and written ballot.”

Mike: Seconded the motion

VOTE:

Unanimous: YES

There will be no discussion on seasonals tonight since Curt has resigned.

2010 Ranger Rendezvous Site Proposals

Thoughts on this issue:

Emily: Was the New Orleans bid the only one we sought? Could we find a place closer to the heart of the city?

Scot: Received 6-10 bids from New Orleans that were far out of our price range.

Gregg: Is there public transportation from the hotel at the airport to the French Quarter?

Kendell: Has worked at Jean Lafitte. It's a haul out to the airport and it's not really New Orleans. You could do one or two nights in New Orleans during the conference but for the rest of the stay at the airport hotel, you might as well be anywhere.

Mike: Also agrees with Kendell's assessment. The ambiance of the Garden District and the French Quarter is what really makes New Orleans. Being by the airport is just not that exciting.

Liz: We had a really good response to New Orleans as a location from the membership at the Santa Fe RR. Maybe we could build a free day into the agenda so people could be in New Orleans for a time?

Scot will check into public transportation and follow up further.

Kendell: Also, this Rendezvous falls during Halloween, which is fun but might impact flight prices.

Scot: No decision needs to be made until February. Should we send out an email to the membership to gauge preferences?

Lee: Might be better for the BOD to vote, rather than have too many hands in the pot.

Liz: Likes the idea of opening it up to the membership.

Gregg: Maybe we could eliminate one option, such as the CO option which seems to be the least popular.

Kendell: Do we have people in either location to help coordinate and facilitate the potential Rendezvous sites?

Scot: Pat Gredigan and Craig Ackerman are both close to Bend, though Mike Pflaum is really the "on the ground" organizer.

His concern is that Bend might be a bit more expensive to fly into, and color season on East Coast might impact East Coast attendance at a Western Rendezvous.

It is also worth noting that both locations gave us cheaper rate for seasonals and students.

The BOD is not voting on this tonight, but we may want to do it by email in the near future. If we do decide on one for 2010, do we want to look to 2011?

Kendell, Liz and Gregg: It might be a good idea to plan ahead.

The Bend facilities seem nice and received good reviews. It is a mid-level hotel with new meeting facilities, which are better than average.

We may want to search the membership list maybe for people living in/near Bend who may be able to help out with Rendezvous 2010.

Membership

222 memberships expired on 12/31/08, many of which were long-time members. This number doesn't count the 113 that were already deleted from the membership list in December because they specifically told Teresa they did not plan to renew, or they were seasonals who terminated their health insurance during 2008.

So the grand total of non-renewals is 335, a number that far exceeds any in previous recent years.

Scot: Teresa recommended that BOD pitch in to call 222 memberships. Gregg, do you need help?

Gregg: Has a large cadre of volunteers who should be able to cover the list. He has six people to make the calls. But if anyone is really interested, feel free to help make phone calls, though the volunteers can handle it. They'll start making calls now.

Scot: ANPR typically loses 250-200 members per year. In good years, we enroll more than we lose, and bad years are the reverse. But losing 335 is certainly higher than the norm.

Gregg: Is not sure why the number is so much larger.

Kendell: It may be that the economy is really bad.

Scot: New members in sufficient numbers probably won't be seen until seasonals come around again in the summer.

Gregg: People may just be late to re-up.

Guns-In-Parks

Scot: When we got back from Rendezvous, he added our name to the lawsuit with NPCA and CNPSR. However, our lawyers found that ANPR was not in good standing as a non-profit in DC, and we need to correct this before putting our name down on this lawsuit. DC requires non-profits to do a biennial report and list an agent in DC, as well as pay a \$75 reporting fee. After the 2000 report, no reports were filed. Scot has paid all filing fees, the late penalties, and changed our agent in DC to Emily Weisner. ANPR spent \$555 to get back to good standing. Our name is not on suit now, but it will be added when the lawsuit is revised in mid-February.

So far in this case the judge gave the government two options:

They could suspend the January 9th rule and she'll give them 3-4 months to defend why it should stand; or, if it is not suspended, she wants the government's argument back by Jan. 30th 2009.

The rule will not be suspended so arguments will be back in by 1/30/09. A two week extension was asked for, and agreed upon.

Several conservative organizations filed to intervene on behalf of the government. It is possible that the NRA will intervene as well.

Our attorneys have been getting hints from the government that the administration has been contacting attorneys to find other alternatives to litigation.

Mid-February to late February is the date for an initial hearing at this point.

The new Secretary of Interior evaded the issue when asked about it in a conference with NPS employees.

Other Issues

Minutes from Ranger Rendezvous will be voted on at a later date.

Make a change on pg. 18 – The printer would continue with color cover of *Ranger* at cost.

The BOD election will be completed 2/3/09.