

AAA meeting minutes

Wednesday, February 15th, 6-8 pm (MST) - Free Conference Call

Attendance: GB Members - John Stimberis, Aleph Johnston-Bloom, Kirk Bachman, Mark Renson, Mike Schneider, Stuart Thompson, Jonathan Shefftz, Dave, Erich Peitzsch, Maura Longden, Patty Morrison. ED - Jaime Musnicki. Guests - Scott Savage, Clark Corey, Simon Troutman.

Stuart has Damian's proxy, John S has Nick's proxy,

JS: Call the meeting to order.

I sent an email focused on Board and organizational function calling for in person meeting this spring to dedicate a day to that. We will discuss this at the end of the meeting.

Partnerships and memberships

What do we want from increasing revenue and increasing membership? This has been a topic of concern or something we have tried to engage on but don't have a clear goal.

Jaime will have info about Development coordinator position and potential for a good opportunity to move forward but also we really need to be prepared and need to know what we are doing, not just have a vague concept that we want to raise money. Lot's to think about.

Every has the opportunity to speak but keep in mind also the chance to listen.

Scotty. Parting words.

*Effectively, these are my parting words that I didn't give a couple months ago when my term ended... I'd like to ask a question, kind of rhetorical. Please think about it, but don't answer. Other than dealing with new member applications, who has spent more than 1 hour per week this winter on AAA business? I know John, Aleph, Blase, and Kirk have, but I think it's a pretty short list after that. There are 2 likely reasons people don't spend time on AAA business: 1) AAA is not a priority/you don't have time. There is no shame in admitting you don't have enough time – let go and step aside. Don't hang on and take up space. 2) You haven't been asked to do anything by Committee chairs or the Executive Committee. This is an organizational problem that needs to be addressed.*

*Current "AAA priority #3" is 'Board Organization and Function.' There was broad support to change the organizational structure last year when I was the Secretary - to decrease the board size and clearly define committee and board member roles and responsibilities. Having 24 board members fosters a "someone else will do it" attitude – that's human nature. The board formally voted to both shrink and reorganize the board and committee structure. The vote was not close. Read the minutes; it was a clear, overwhelming mandate to restructure. Don't talk about it anymore – it's time to do it. Why does this matter? A great example is that Avalanche Worker Safety and the associated near miss database project (to be launched in the next week) are not AAA projects when they should be. They fit perfectly in the AAA's mission and statement of purpose. We talked to the ED and some Executive Committee members and all agreed that the AAA was not in a position to complete and maintain a project like that. I'm guessing the board's level of action is frustrating for Jaime, the current ED. If you hire a good Development Director, you will need to quickly make the organization function much better or you're liable to frustrate that person. Good staff needs dependable, timely support – it's up to you, as board members, to provide that support.*

*To wrap it up: If you want to go back to being more of a professional club like in years or decades past, that's fine. Don't hire a Development Director, wrap up ongoing projects, and scale back ambitions. If you want to grow and advance the organization, there needs to be a sense of urgency to get the framework, key people, and collective attitude in place now to manage that significant growth. Respect and learn from the past – but don't get stuck in it. I encourage you, the governing board, to live in the present and plan for the future.*

*I'll shut up now and only speak when asked questions.*

JS: Thank you Scotty. Very well done.

JM: Attendance John, Aleph, Kirk, Mark Renson, Mike Schneider, Stuart, Jonathan, Dave, Eric P., Scott Savage, Clark Corey, Simon Troutman, 9 Board members, ED and 3 guests

JS: Not quite a quorum but enough to move along the meeting. Thanks for showing up. Not enough to vote to approve minutes.

AJB: Email me if there are additions to meeting minutes.

We need to vote on September meeting minutes as well.

JM: Avalanche.org, We have spent a decent amount of time at past meetings but have not had a formal vote to update purpose and mission of Avalanche.org and so before I address second bullet point. unfortunately we can't approve if we don't have a quorum. Screen sharing:

Maura is joining.

JM: 10 board members not voting yet but discussing.

ML: Nick might be joining?

JS: Anyone have any proxies?

JM: Screen sharing: Statement of Purpose and mission. As part of our partnership with the National Avalanche Center Simon and I have been talking quite a bit about Avalanche.org and the place that Avalanche.org could hold in the industry. It could be this clearing-house and central portal for avalanche information. Simon and NAC are on board and want to see us execute that effectively and I think the NAC has a lot to offer and contribute to avalanche.org that could help the overall industry to start to have more resources and information in one central place. Avalanche.org. Are there any questions on statement of purpose or proposal here?

DH: I can see in the notes that the idea is to reduce the redundancy and increase consistency better to have the two combine in the long run maintain NAC visibility and search-ability.

JM: Thanks Dave

BR: I am on.

JS: Simon, Do you have any additions or pieces you would like to highlight from an NAC perspective on how clarifying our mission statement for avalanche.org is important for our partnership?

Simon: Sure thanks Jaime. Hi Everybody. The more I think about it I think it is an integral next step for all of us. It would be a big deal for avalanche centers to improve this website but more importantly to focus it and it would be a really big deal for the public in general in the sense that right now by default by proxy avalanche.org is being used as the portal or the place to go but it's somewhat incomplete, dated and redundant. I think from our perspective cleaning it up is really important like the statement of purpose says there is no doubt that there is some redundancy between the NAC website and avalanche.org and if we can figure out a way to productively combine that information and have one website then that it will be better for all of us. That said I am a little nervous to do it. and the reason why is that there is liability in that. If it doesn't work then it will have been a very bad decision on our part. So to move forward what we need is a strong commitment and a mandate to move forward to get the work done. And I think tonight is a really good example to get back to Scott's comments this is the kind of stuff like if we start this project that can't depend on a Board vote that may or may not come. From my perspective the Board's job would be to approve this stuff and get it moving and then there would be an empowered committee that get's the work done and does a really good job doing it. We are excited about this and we need it to work. That what I would put on you guys tonight is that if you think we can make it work than let's move forward if you see reasons that it will not then let's take a second look at it.

JM: Thanks Simon.

JS: I would add that I think that's a great comment and it's going to work because we are going to allow it happen and fund it not because any of us are going to try to make it happen. Your exactly right that is't going to take a committee and other people who know what they are doing to make the right site.

KB: I really like what I am seeing here. My question to Simon just as we convene as a Board to take this on but I think just looking around within the organization of the avalanche centers that they are in position in key messaging here. What is your take when you look at these five points the degree of support you would have if you drilled down into each of the avalanche centers. Because I think we need their support as well.

Simon: Yes. I think that we have got great support. In this regard Karl and I are really the conduit to those avalanche centers and that support. I think that it right now and it's a diverse groups we all know. There is more decision makers interested in getting together and providing consistent information than we have ever had in the past. This project if done right will move that ball forward. Talking to Scotty and to Jaime the other day if we do this right Avalanche.org has the potential to fulfill an operational need for avalanche centers instead of just a collateral neat thing they support and you know along these lines this integration of messaging this is just one step but as avalanche.org becomes more established and say we stuck the NAC Encyclopedia into it then the next step would be to lobby avalanche centers, to a large degree that has already been done, to basically rather than creating their own content in their safety messaging they simply link or iFrame in NAC Encyclopedia which is now part of Avalanche.org. That's just one aspect but is there a more specific question Kirk?

KB: Yes. The reason I go there in reality that's the acid test to how we deliver consistency is when we get the key public messengers which are the avalanche centers really supporting the concepts that are laid out here and I think you got an array of diverse avalanche centers We have felt on the avalanche education side of things that for a long time that we want more consistent messaging. The proof is always in the pudding as it relates to how forecast centers put their message out and in addition to what degree they support consistency with avalanche education because recreational avalanche education comes up pretty prominently that's what I way in as to how important the relationship is with the avalanche centers.

Simon: I agree with you and hear what you are saying and I think you are right and another aspect that the majority of centers have been contributing to Avalanche.org to support the Google maps specifically for a while now. But there has never been a clear denotation of where that money goes or what they get from it. I see this project cleaning things like that up and giving them a focus. As the budget is laid out and as people understand what they are going to get it makes more sense for them to contribute and it also makes more sense for them to be engaged and support the initiative. This is one of those things if we makes something good people will be crawling all over themselves to be a part of it. If its just mediocre than it will just be status quo.

JS: I agree. Specifically we need to make something that is more than just good to in order for it to work. Simon and Scotty do you guys really think we can be the portal for everything avalanche and if we can be that and design a really good website are people going to go to it? How is it going to engage? Is there a plan?

Simon: That's a good question. Just to clarify I don't think this thing should be everything avalanche. I think that would be a mistake. I think that is a very big thing and would be hard to do. What I think this thing should be specifically is a portal to information, backcountry avalanche information, professional backcountry avalanche information and a portal to good recreational educational content or classes. To expand upon that if that's the background in terms of being that portal what interesting is that it's already being used that way. I keep this running tally of places that I find the Avalanche.org web address and the most recent spot ( I have 10 or 12 of these) is the Tyrol Government between Innsbruck and the Italian border has Avalanche.org listed as the place to go to get information on "US avalanche warning services." So yes it is already used far and wide, in strange places. The goal would be if you are living Washington you are probably going to have NWAC book marked but if you are traveling or if you want to look around the country Avalanche.org would be the place to go. I see it being very powerful on the education side because and it might be harder to do a good job on the education side but that is a place without a doubt be a good useful to for the public. if you are

looking for a class in a specific place and from an avalanche center perspective it would be nice to not have to manage all these classes and answer questions, just be able to say "go to Avalanche.org." or link your calendar to avalanche.org.

JM: I feel like your question John is a great segue into the actuals, some of the vision on the redesign right now Avalanche.org does mostly just sit out there it's not the most interactive site and those are some of the pieces that Clark has worked on trying to address in the proposal he prepared for the Avalanche.org redesign.

Stuart: Simon I have a comment for you. I think this is a really good idea. Without getting into the discussion of the redesign of the site I think conceptually it fits into what Kirk has done over the last few years and it conceptually fits into the organization very well. I think the key to the success of doing it is not particularly the makeup of the Board as Scotty implied but the people that commit to do this that are empowered by the support of the Board to go ahead and do it. Their creativity to put it together so it becomes the site that you are discussing. Not Board members actually being involved in actually doing it other than promoting it and supporting what you or whomever you have assembled to do it as was done with the pro/rec split with Kirk. That is the formula for success with it.

Simon: Yes I agree. I will add that stability within the Board is integral to every bit of business that you guys conduct. I know you agree with that. What I heard Scotty say was not specific to this project I was specific to the AAA in general and where the AAA is going to go in the future. Frankly every time you have a Board meeting you should have enough people on the phone for a quorum. It's just fundamental.

Stuart: I don't disagree with you that's why I am here.

Simon: That wasn't a personal comment towards you that was just a comment in general.

Stuart: Jaime did Damo text you and give me his proxy?

JM: I have not received any texts or emails.

JS: Got a text from Damo to giving proxy to Stuart.

JM: We need 13 for a quorum. We need one more.

ML: I will text Nick for his proxy.

JM: What we are hearing here is that folks are in support of the proposal here. I haven't heard any questions and as Stuart pointed out and as the NAC proposal states we will need a nimble empowered project committee. This will be our most effective tool for executing on this project. That will be a top priority to comprise that.

JS: Correct. Our goal here is to officially vote to formally approve that mission statement and purpose.

JS: One question as we move into the redesign as Avalanche.org do we need still maintain [amerianavalancheassociation.org](http://amerianavalancheassociation.org) as well or could these be combined into one with professional information and public information?

JM: That is an interesting question.

Simon: I will speak to that. From my perspective I don't know if I have thought about enough to have a strong opinion but my gut reaction is that I think that would be a mistake. The reason I say that is that I think the committees to make these things happen are going to look differently. And I think the AAA itself has plenty to fill a website. Websites can have too much information. With Avalanche.org I hope we can streamline and improve rather than make something larger. I know the combining at face value sounds like streaming but I think it would do just the opposite.

EP: I agree with Simon and that there are two different audiences. I think the audiences are somewhat discreet and I think leaving them separate at least for now is probably a good idea.

JM: One thought that I have is related to the recreational audience which is an group that the AAA is trying to reach more effectively so I could see some value there. I agree that information overload makes it not that useful but I do think a priority should be having a clear connection

from Avalanche.org to the AAA website that appeals and directs both professional and recreational folks from Avalanche.org to AAA.

EP: I agree connecting is critical but for now leaving them separate.

KB: Question for Jaime. Do you see the AAA trying to garner active membership with recreationists engaging with AAA at the membership level?

JM: I would say with how we define membership now no at the membership level. At the TAR subscriber or the AAA supporter level there is definitely an ongoing conversation about membership levels and whether we are going to revise some. I don't see recreationists having voting rights within the AAA organization like pros or affiliates have. Different categories in my mind.

Stuart: One of our guiding purposes is public safety and recreational users are key to that and the concept of membership I think we differentiate between members and professional members.

Following the concept of the pro/rec split we need some mechanism by which recreationists join the AAA the same way you would join the National Geographic Society which brings you into the public safety sector but doesn't give you a professional voting voice in the organization. This could be a method and a tool and an approach to accomplishing both those things. To utilize how this is done to encourage a member not a pro or an affiliate.

Jaime: I like that thought but I want to continue with Avalanche.org

Stuart: What does Simon think?

Simon: I think it's a great idea.

John: Before we get into the redesign. Another call anyone have any comments on the mission statement and purpose? Even though we can't officially vote now.

Stuart: I think it's good.

JS: I will take silence as no additional comments. There will be a vote electronically later. Let's continue with the redesign plan.

JM: Reference the homework assignment that was sent out. I have been talking quite a bit with Clark and Simon about this and the resign ideas. Clark and Chris Lundy put together the proposal. Clark is on the line right now as a resource. Broad overview is redesigning the website look and feel making more modern and then really trying to enhance features that already really popular such as the accidents page and the course provider listings and the home page with the Google map. That's the initial phase and then have a post launch phase 2 where we are continually trying to update and keep content engaging and interesting so that people have a reason to come back to Avalanche.org. That it is not a static website that get updated every 3-5 years.

Clark and Simon do you have any additions? Any Board member questions?

Clark: I don't have any additions as long as everybody got a chance to take a look at this. Jaime you had a good summary. Make it easier for people to use.

Simon: It's good from my end. It looks like a simple project but it's not simple to do it well. The phase approach is really important. We picked the things that we are kind of doing well and build a framework to build on for the future. Long range plan in mind and have short range goals. Goal is to do it well.

JM: John you have Nick's proxy.

JS: Now we can vote. Additional comments on the redesign project?

Jonathan: We now have a quorum my daughter is about to go to sleep. Should we make some votes.

Jaime: You can give your proxy to someone.

Jonathan: I can give my proxy to Mark if you are still on the phone.

MR: I am still on the phone

JS: With Avalanche.org any additional comments?

Stuart: What are we looking at of investment from a dollars standpoint?

JM: Phase 1 estimate that Clark came up with was 165 hrs of work for an estimated \$9900. For

reference in the Avalanche.org account right now we have about \$11000 above the \$50,000 core from the original donation. Seems like that money could be used for this.

Stuart: I think that project would be a good use for that money.

KB: I really like the idea. I see the key piece to this is integration which will drive consistency in that first step in my view is a tighter relationship between the NAC and the AAA. I think that's going to go a long way with creating a shift in our culture. If we see movement by the NAC to this environment it's going to start things moving towards consistency. I think it's actually a really important project.

JS: Vote to formally approve the mission statement of purpose which we have already discussed.

Stuart: I make a motion to formally approve the statement of purpose for the Avalanche.org redesign

KB: I second.

JS: Is there any further discussion? Any Nays on adopting the statement of purpose? I will take the silence as all in favor. Approved.

JS: Vote to approve the proposed redesign as stated in the document not to exceed \$9900. We have discussed.

JM: \$9900 is the estimated cost. Maybe don't say not to exceed?

JS: We should have an approved limit. And vote again if it does go over.

JM: What if we put it at the current excess in Avalanche.org account. \$11000?

Stuart: What if we put the limit at \$10K and leave \$1000 as a cushion?

JS: Clark are you still here?

Clark: Yeah.

JS: Does capping it at \$10K seem reasonable?

Clark: Yes. Things don't always go as planned. We will be very transparent and let folk know if some aspect is taking longer and flag that and explain financial ramifications if we continue. We could either get more funding or decide to cut back on more features.

JM: Our initial draft budget is another topic for tonight. There is an additional \$10K in the budget draft as a line item for general web maintenance work. From a budgeting perspective and a decision making perspective that might be a way to shift things around and another way to address it.

JS: Other thoughts? Putting some value as we approach that estimated cost and reevaluate where we are going is fine. We don't have to lock ourselves in. I will leave the to someone's motion if we are going to approve this.

MS: I motion that we approve the \$10K for the budget for the Avalanche.org redesign and that we get notified if it is going to be more and adjust at that point.

Stuart: I will second.

JS: Any other discussion related to that motion?

BR: Can we put a timeframe on that notification? Months? Weeks? Before the due date?

JS: That sounds good. Clark what do you think is reasonable?

Clark: A half way check point would work.

Stuart: Could you just give John and Jaime periodic reports that you could relay to the Board? As to the progression of the work and the expenses?

Clark: yeah absolutely. We haven't defined any meeting timeframes. I was undertake assumption that we would be checking in on a very regular basis on items like that. I think by July if the target date is the fall we will have a good idea if we are on par for the course or not and after be checking in on a regular basis to keep tabs on that.

Stuart: The concern is that if it goes in excess of the \$11000 in the Avalanche.org account that we need to know that in a timely manner. If that is all likely to occur.

BR: I think a status report and revised estimate at the halfway point we be my concerns if we can add that I would be happy.

Stuart: Mike will you add that to your motion?

John: Can we get a read back of the motion?

MS: We have a limit at \$10K for the Avalanche.org redesign phase 1 and we get an update mid project sometime around July.

BR: Review with any revised estimates and time frames that will be approved at that time or not.

Stuart: John, Patty is going to join.

JS: Motion is that we approve the \$10K for the budget for the Avalanche.org redesign and we get an update mid project sometime around July with a review of any revised estimates and time frames that will be approved at that time or not.

Seconded by Stuart. Any opposed please speak up. Approved.

Simon: Thanks for your time. I am going to sign off.

Clark: Also signing off. Excited about the project.

JS: Development Coordinator position update Jaime and Aleph

JM: Application closed on January 25th we received 9 applications Aleph and I have been the interview committee. We selected 4 candidates to interview. One candidate got another position so we interviewed 3 candidates. We have a clear top choice. Our position description, as discussed in the previous meeting, we weren't necessarily looks for someone with fundraising and development experience. We were willing to work with someone to develop those skills if they had other pertinent experience and the right combination of personality traits and that sort of thing. We were open to someone with experience. Right now we have a candidate with quite a bit of experience and seems quite excited about the potential of working with the AAA in this position. Her name is Natalie Spencer. She lives in Sun Valley and we had a follow-up interview with her on Monday morning that John and Maura joined in on. I had another conversation on Monday afternoon to answer more questions. Where we stand now is that Natalie has prepared a proposal for more of a Director of Development and Strategy position. Her background is such that she can help with both development and some big picture strategic thinking for how we are managing the AAA, running the organization and the direction we are going to maximize our impact. She sent that over yesterday afternoon we will look at more closely. The bottom line is that she is very driven and has great experience in both the non-profit as well as the for-profit world in terms of raising capital. She presents herself very confidently in the impact that she thinks can have in a fairly short time period. The biggest take home for us is to feel like we can fully direct her energy and expertise. And make sure it's going in a direction we want and make sure we are willing to jump on board and see some very large changes in terms of revenue coming into the organization and what the AAA needs to do support that revenue coming into the organization to see those changes happen. Natalie self admits that she is not someone who will putter around or have a high tolerance for inefficiency. Those are some areas that we are going to need to be willing to improve. My perspective is that she could be exactly what the AAA needs in terms in helping push us to that next level in both our organizational function as well as clearly bringing in more philanthropic \$\$ to the AAA. Have not officially offered the position to her yet. That is where we are leaning. We have a second candidate who if someone like Natalie hadn't applied would be a good fit. Aleph, John, Maura additional thoughts?

AJB: It does seem like it is a game changer for the whole financial situation for the AAA or could be.

ML: She clearly has the background to change the financial revenues and change the financial picture and the stability of the organization. She also has interest in leading strategy and redefining the job above and beyond the one that was advertised. I do think some more discussion is in order to make sure that we are comfortable with that. It certainly takes some steps that we didn't anticipate ourselves. Also I like to see us again consult with Mia Axon and get her perspective before offering her the position. I think regrouping again before we offer.

Stuart: Can you send her proposal along?

Jaime: Yes. After we as a hiring committee review it.

Stuart: I would like to get a sense of the differences that you're just discussing. I think we really need

a professional development director. She sounds very interesting to me.

PM: I am here. Sounds good to me.

KB: In reality the thing that jumped out was that she doesn't want to putter so as long as her strategy is aligned with being able to work with the key staff of the AAA and you specifically Jaime that's the main criteria. I would like to know that we are developing the products we defined and trying to fund them.

JM: We talked a lot about what the various products and programs that AAA currently has and talked grouping things into things like a publishing fund and an education fund and then a general operating fund and how she approaches different potential donors and match donors with specific projects.

KB: She is excited about the AAA?

JM: Yes. At first was skeptical that she would be a good fit. Natalie has some ski guiding background and just completed her Level 3. She just stepped away or sold her start up and has a one year old kid and is in a place where she has time and energy for this and wants to have an impact in the avalanche world. And wants a flexible position that doesn't take up all of her time.

KB: She is mainly interfacing with you and with committee work.

JM: Her relationship with individual Board members and the Board as a whole is important to her. She will be interacting with the Board on a regular basis.

KB: You have the best instincts. I guess this will be something we are voting on

Jaime: No, not really, the position has already been approved. This is more of an update and opportunity for discussion and questions.

ST: Does she get that she is working for you?

JM: Yes. And we will be collaborating because of our different and complementary strengths. She understands my role as the ED.

Stuart: We don't want a parallel situation.

JM: yes ultimately she reports to me.

JS: Closing for follow-up on Development position. I came away with a few questions being are we ready for someone like this as a Board and as an Association for some pretty big changes? If those answers are yes then I think someone like Natalie could help us realize more than we ever thought was possible but in order for that to happen we really need to determine what is possible and where we are going as an organization.

JS: Budget discussion.

JM: Screen sharing budget.

Open to questions. My idealized budget that we discuss now and into the next few weeks. Then vote on it at the Spring meeting.

Expenses: What we do? What we want to do? That drives the revenue that we need to bring in. Trying to increase revenue and imagine what we need to do to have things happen.

Staff compensation. Slight cost of living increase. part of the deal with Natalie. If and when she brings in capital investment. staff compensation would increase significantly however that would only happen if she brought in the money. TAR is similar to years past

Pro training: Idealized budget. Avalanche.org redesign at \$10K Regional workshops at \$20K we would like to see growth there, with philanthropic support. Another volume of snowy torrents, page for that

Insurance has increased. Worker's comp. Other new insurance piece is a professional liability policy for that helps covers us for the pro-training program.

Total expenses: just over \$300,000

Revenue:

Membership Revenue, \$10 increase for pro members and \$5 increase for affiliates. And budgeted for %20 growth. In looking at number for this we have attained %20 growth last year.

We will have some revenue from Pro training workshops.

Donations/individual and corporate and grants. This really where we are going to make up

the difference. We are looking at \$125,000 we need to be to be philanthropic support of some sort. Questions? Suggestions?

JS: Jaime will you be able to send this to the whole Board?

JM: Yes. Sent yesterday and is also in the Drive.

Stuart: This looks like a reasonable starting point. Corporate is comparable.

Individual donations? \$10K this year, \$9K last year? \$3K prior.

Stuart: Grants? JM: Grants \$15,500 we need to focus if we want increase.

Stuart: Expenses. Includes Development coordinator? JM: yes. \$27K

Stuart: Snow Torrent production is a future production? JM: yes, next volume

Stuart: I think this has potential for working. If the development director can make some money. I think what you put together is reasonable.

JS: Budget is open for discussion prior to next meeting. Things to still accomplish.

JS: Meeting minutes to approve.

September Minutes.

PM: makes a motion to approve September Meeting Minutes. EP: seconds.

Additional comments? All in favor. Motion passes.

December Minutes.

Stuart: makes a motion to approve the December Meeting Minutes. MS: Seconds. Additional comments? All in Favor. Motion passes.

JM: Membership list for ratification. Screen sharing. 17 Pro members.

Additional comments? Questions?

PM: How does it work for folks on hold?

Stuart: They will get approved next meeting. All the ones that are there have been approved by myself and the section reps. Holds are from section reps.

Stuart: I make a motion that we approve these 17 individuals for professional membership. Second: Mike S. Additional comments? All in Favor. Motion passes. 17 approved.

Stuart: [REDACTED]: Andy Deitrick has declined to approve. Ethical question for Aleph and Dave.

JS: Spring Meeting. Two day meeting in person. Allowing more time for discussion. And a second day of tackling the governance issue. Approved these changes and move forward. Get it all hammered out and move forward as an organization.

JM: has some dates and talked to the facilitator about her availability.

JS: Does this sound workable?

EP: This sounds like a fabulous idea. Focusing on the governance and moving forward with that with concrete tangible results is a great idea.

MS: I think it is great idea. There are some difficult decisions. It think in person makes a lot of sense to me too.

KB: Any preferred dates?

JS: May? Late April?

JM: Facilitator May 6th and 7th. May 14th? Flying isn't an option that weekend.

JS: Let's take it to the poll. Jaime can you do that? Propose a few locations and dates.

EP: Can you propose a few early June dates?

JM: Yes. We would then need an April call meeting. I will include the first two weekends of June. I will send out a Poll.

KB: Discuss change overs at the committee level at the April Meeting. Publications, Education and Research.

JS: Wrap up. Comments or lingering business? Call meeting to an end.