

Board Meeting Open Session
Ranger Rendezvous
12/10/09

BOD Members Attending:

Emily Weisner

Kendell Thompson

Tom Banks

Stacy Allen

Scot McElveen

Greg Fauth

Mike Anderson

Topic Summary:

JT Townsend reported on the oral history project he discussed with the BOD in the opening session.

JT's Goal: to have NPS stories on the Mall as part of the 2016 Folk Life Festival.

Dr. Janet McConnell is assisting with this project

Scot briefed Director Jarvis who indicated his interest.

JT will also talk with Kathy Hanson, Bob Sutton and NPF, as well as explore partnerships with other organizations.

Old Motions

From Ranger Rendezvous 2008:

Liam Strain: MOTION

ANPR will explore the possibilities of becoming a carbon neutral organization and report back to the membership on their findings.

The concern from the BOD was over the cost of this action. However, President Obama has asked that organizations become more environmentally friendly.

Bob Krumenaker feels this action strengthens marketability for ANPR and this is an opportunity for us to become a leader.

This is not a monetary commitment, just a commitment to look into this idea. Maybe the BOD could begin to choose Rendezvous locations based on their green commitment.

Bob – make commitment first and find volunteers to assist.

Liam Strain– ANPR could dedicate some funding and have the board audited to ascertain ANPR's carbon footprint. However, at this time, we're voting on the idea not the formation of a committee.

Dick Martin – The employee survey indicated that environmental righteousness is a high priority of NPS employees and our commitment to becoming carbon neutral would encourage new members to join an organization.

MOTION: ANPR will explore the possibilities of becoming a carbon neutral organization and report back to the membership on their findings.

VOTE:

Motion passed unanimously. 7-0

Nominations

The nomination forms are on the website – nomination forms due in 14 days after the close of Rendezvous. Nominations can be made for 7 days after close of Rendezvous. Nominees have to be current members.

President Elect – 6 year commitment

Mike Anderson: Nominated Stacy Allen

Liam Strain: Seconded

Erin Carroll: Patrick Hattaway Nominated

Allison Herrmann: Seconded

Fundraising – 3 year commitment

Emily Weisner: Nominated Kendell Thompson

Barry Sullivan: Seconded

Membership Services – 3 year commitment

Mark Christiano: Nominated Liam Strain

Bruce McKeeman: Seconded

Special Concerns – 1 year commitment –

This BOD member helps the President and BOD when Congressional Testimony needs to be prepared, etc. He/She needs to re-energize our contacts and make sure ANPR remains relevant. This job can involve drafting position papers, though this is responsibility of ANPR and BOD. Proximity to DC is helpful.

Mark Christiano Nominated Amy Gilbert

Michelle Wenz: Seconded

New Motions

Tony Sisto: *MOTION - A work group will be formed in 2010 to consider issues pertaining to future of ANPR. This work group will submit a written report to the BOD by April 1, 2010.*

Cliff Chetwin: Seconded

Question from membership: How does this impact the revised Strategic Plan that will be coming out soon?

Stacy Allen: The plan is going out for comments thru 2/15. Revisions will take awhile, depending on the amount of comments. Stacy can hold the plan and incorporate any suggestions the group makes in regards to the Strategic Plan. This

will all come forward and be part of the package by April 1, 2010. He will compile membership comments and then add those to the work group recommendations.

If there is a lot of comment and participation on the strategic plan by the membership this may also impact the workgroup and vice versa.

Mallory: These two ideas are very similar and need to be incorporated as one. Otherwise we're at odds in the planning process.

Bob: If this goes forward, it needs to merge and complement the strategic plan process. Clarification – this work group we're discussing is the Revitalization Workgroup, proposed at the beginning of Rendezvous.

Barry: The report should be presented to the President and BOD with recommendations. Then what happens? Is the BOD to move on the recommendations or should this go back to membership for process and review?

Tony: If the BOD appoints the group/committee then it is the responsibility of the work group to report back to the BOD. The BOD can then decide what to do, though they should go to membership and receive feedback.

Barry: Should we amend the motion to include a statement that the BOD will present this to full membership?

Dick: There is no conflict with Strategic Plan. This work group can be complimentary and while there may be some overlap, there is no conflict. The world won't stop while we develop a Strategic Plan so we need to move ahead with expediency and mesh with the attitudes of the current Director.

Deanne: Part of the intent of the work group is to involve the next generation. There are lots of great people who stepped up and they already had a meeting. The Strategic Plan not the same process – this group's work will feed into the Strategic Plan. We need to move forward.

Scot: Dick and Tony have agreed to mentor, but not run, the work group.

Tony: Deanne will assist and find a facilitator.

Liam: The relationship of group and Strategic Plan is still fuzzy. The report is just a recommendation – it seems it won't have an implementation requirement, whereas the Strategic Plan does carry more weight. In a sense, the work group is secondary to the Strategic Plan.

Tony: One order of the group is to help ANPR implement their goals, which would include the Strategic Plan. The group may duplicate a few things but it won't negate the impact of the Strategic Plan.

Liam: Then chronologically, it seems the Strategic Plan needs to come first.

Tony: Yes, but sometimes the order isn't perfect.

Dick: Supports Tony's words. Sequencing is wonderful if there is time. However, the reality is that ANPR has real challenges in membership and economic viability. The work group may or may not complement the Strategic Plan perfectly but ANPR needs to figure out some issues that need to be done in the interim.

Stacy: There is no conflict here. This effort can be beneficial in going through the process to revise the Strategic Plan. The Plan as it stands now does call attention to these same things. This is a positive effort and will provide some bricks

and mortar and give ANPR a better idea of what our youth see as ANPR's future. We have a Strategic Plan we can continue to work under.

Scot: in a poll, only about 3 of about 50-60 folks have read the Strategic Plan in the last year. We need an action plan.

Liam: In favor of the idea – only needed clarification.

Barry: AMENDMENT TO MOTION - *to vote on the proposed amendment and add to the motion that the "BOD will present to the membership the work group's report before taking any action"*

Bob – Seconded

VOTE:

Unanimous approval of the amendment. 7-0

MOTION: *"A work group will be formed in 2010 to consider issues pertaining to future of ANPR. This work group will submit a written report to the BOD by April 1, 2010 and the BOD will present this report to the membership before taking any action"*.

VOTE:

Unanimous approval of the motion, 7-0

Scot: do you need anything else from the BOD to get this moving?

Tony: Applications for members to join the work group are out and the core of the group is formed. Tony will look to the BOD if something falls through or they need further assistance. Because the group is doing this for the BOD, board members need to be available at any time for phone calls and discussions. The group expects the BOD to be available for assistance.

Dick: This is not a closed group – any input is welcome. Ideas, thoughts and comments would be appreciated.

Scot: Anyone on the BOD have any problem with the group as it is? Does there need to be a BOD member involved?

Membership Response– Tony, Dick and Deanne are assisting so it seems to be under control.

Tom Banks: There was some discussion about drawing in non-ANPR members. Is there a way to do outreach?

Scot: Maybe this is something for the group to think about.

Tony: They may have some volunteers who aren't members and one task of this work group is to get new members.

Liam: Suggests that it would be helpful to get input from people who are not members on some issues.

Scot: Some of this information is in the employee survey.

Teresa: There are 250 members of ANPR's Facebook fanpage and a discussion group could be started here.

Liam will update Facebook

JT Townsend: MOTION -*The money in the Gale fund will be used for the oral history project discussed by JT Townsend earlier in the meeting.*

Seconded- Bruce McKeeman

Discussion:

Bob – how much money is in the fund and how much is needed?

Scot: There is \$5000 in the fund currently

JT: Not sure of the exact cost of digitizing this material. At this point, he is asking to earmark funds.

Scot: The Gale Family concurs that this seems like a good fit.

Patrick Hattaway: If the Gale family feels this is an appropriate use of funds, then we should respect this.

Bob: Strongly supports the project but is uncomfortable earmarking the money without a cost. Could we earmark the money subject to a budget?

Butch: No problem with concept but does wondered about family involvement.

Scot: Family concurs that this is a good project.

Liam: Is JT asking for the current amount of money in the Gale fund or do you also want any money added to the fund as well? Is this fund in perpetuity?

Scot: There is no firm plan for how long this fund will last. This will be a lengthy project and we'll continue to earmark any funds coming in for the Gale Fund to this project if motion is approved.

Liam: Once this oral history project is over, does this mean the end of the Gale fund?

Patrick: JT is simply trying to use the money for a specific project.

Scot: He is also trying to get matching funds.

JT: We need to earmark the money first of all and make sure the money is used for a good purpose. We'll be in a position to be more successful in conversations with NPF, etc. if we have a good use for the money.

Bob: Proposes an amendment to the motion to say "earmark some funding from the Gale fund" and "subject to a periodic review and approval of a general budget"

Liam – Seconded

Stacy: This fund is in place to honor Gale and his vision and commitment. The Fund will be alive as long as people continue to put money into the fund. The money is there to be spent.

Barry: Called question the motion be amended to say ““earmark some funding from the Gale fund” and “subject to a periodic review and approval of a general budget”

Bruce - seconded

MOTION: *Amend the motion to say ““earmark some funding from the Gale fund” and “subject to a periodic review and approval of a general budget”*

VOTE:

Unanimous approval, 7-0

Dick: There should be an approval process procedurally and JT should come to the treasurer for approval for spending the money.

Lee: A budget really needs to be submitted.

MOTION: *“ANPR will earmark some funding from the Gale Fund for the oral history project, subject to periodic and general review of the project budget”*

VOTE:

Unanimous approval of the motion, 7-0

Amy Gilbert: MOTION - *To change the ANPR Mission Statement by removing the phrase “to provide a forum of social enrichment” and replacing it with the phrase “to provide a forum for professional enrichment.”*

Kendell: As mission motions may be quite involved, we might need to put a time limit on this discussion.

Bruce: Since a motion was passed to establish a revitalization work group, let’s pass this on to the group to work on.

Barry: This is a substantial change that needs to go back to the membership. We may need to check on who can approve this.

Sam: This was the first act of the workgroup – one of the first recommendations.

Bob: This is a huge change that may not even be in the BOD’s authority. We should act with speed but the motion is too premature to vote on at this point. Membership needs to have more input and exploration. We should remand this to work group for their consideration.

Bruce: It is more appropriate for the group to bring their recommendations as a total whole rather than piece by piece.

Deanne – This is good input but this generation is interested in moving quickly and not getting bogged down in discussion. We are asking new people to be involved and we need to accept their style.

Gregg Fauth: This could go on the ballot as part of the election.

Dan Moses: It is too premature to vote on at this point.

Scot: The bylaws can be amended by 2/3 majority vote of the Board of Directors at any duly called meeting **or** by valid vote of membership where those casting votes are 2/3 in favor of change. 51% vote needed for a ballot if president takes it to the floor at Rendezvous.

Dick: There is no reason to hesitate on this. We asked for input from younger generation and we need it. However, this may be a little premature.

Erin: Director Jarvis wants us to be seen as professional organization – we need to shift focus from social to professional.

Amy: There is no need for the word social to be in our mission statement. The idea of a social organization is already inherent in our existence. A problem of perception exists and we need to sell ourselves differently.

Scot: If the word is taken out, is this really going to change how we operate?

Leland: Why not keep both words in?

Bob: This is not the time to make this decision. Not an objection but we need to proceed with future thought. We have established a group, and set a timeline, and the group needs to move ahead using a process.

Patrick: Amy's point is well taken. However, changing words is not going to change anything, though we don't necessarily need to keep the word in.

Mallory: Afraid of sending a mixed message – we say we want change but we don't seem open to it. ANPR is seen as social organization and there is not a whole lot of credibility. If we want to gain this, as well as the ability to travel on government time/money, we need to change our perception.

Liam: We have already commissioned a work group to deal with changing the Mission Statement and this falls within their purview. This is not the time to deal with the specifics. Piecemeal is not the best method and we are already on an accelerated timeline.

Bob: An important lesson learned is knowing the implications of decisions. Let's not turn this into a generational battle. No one thinks this is a bad idea; this is just not the time and the place to make this change.

Dick: Argues the converse and there is no concrete impact that this change would make. Social enrichment is not going away.

Emily Weisner: Pushing a vote might lead to a negative consequence which sets a bad tone for this group.

Amy: This motion is just to demonstrate a change in the way things were done vs. how they may be done now. We can make this the work group's first agenda item instead.

A vote might be symbolic but the only place this is going to be seen before the work group gets together is in the magazine.

JT Townsend: MOTION - *to table this discussion*

Tony: What does tabling the motion mean exactly? Can the BOD direct the work group to consider it?

Scot: Tabling means this can be given back to the work group or the BOD President could bring it back up at any meeting of the BOD.

Sam: What is precedent for changes in the Mission Statement?

Scot: They have been voted on by email and conference call by the Board of Directors. This is in fact how earlier this year the Board voted to change ANPR's mission statement to replace the phrase "park ranger" with the phrase "National Park Service employees of all disciplines" in several locations.

Bob: Other viewpoints are valid and don't necessarily make those people your enemy. The dynamic in the room is interesting and disturbing. We are polarized about something we're not arguing about. This is not a generational issue. We are all on the same side that we need to make this a more professional organization with more recognition.

MOTION: Table the current motion before the Board and remand changes in the Mission Statement to the work group

Bob- Seconded

VOTE:

6 – in favor

1 – opposed (Scot)

Motion to table passed and the issue is remanded to the work group.

President closed official Board of Director's meeting and gave Ranger Rendezvous 32 to a close at 12:10 PM