

TWS – WS Executive Board Meeting
Sunday, April 28, 2013
Martin Luther King Regional Shoreline
East Bay Regional Park District, Oakland, CA

In attendance:

Board members: **Doug Bell**, *President*; **Natasha Dvorak**, *President-Elect*; **Linda Leeman**, *Past President*; **Don Yasuda**, *Section Representative, Membership Services*; **Janine Payne**, *Secretary*; **Rhys Evans**, *Professional Development Committee Chair*; **Laura Patterson**, *Sac-Shasta Chapter Representative*; **Jessica Martini-Lamb**, *SF Bay Chapter Representative*; **Wendy Knight**, *Central Coast Chapter Representative*.

On the phone: **John McNerney**, *Treasurer*; **Rich Burg**, *Awards and Grants Committee Chair*; **Jeff Lincer**, *Southern California Chapter Representative*; **Lisa Ollivier**, *North Coast Chapter Representative*; **Linda Connolly**, *San Joaquin Chapter Representative*; **Adam Yaney-Keller**, *Cal Poly Student Chapter Representative*.

Also in attendance: **Cynthia Perrine**, *Program Director*; **Candace Renger**, *Registrar, Newsletter Coordinator*.

A quorum was present.

President Bell called the meeting to order at 08:35.

President Bell made some last minute adjustments to the agenda to accommodate call-in participants.

Review of Meeting Minutes – Payne

The meeting minutes before the Board for approval were from the Executive Board Meeting on November 2nd, 2012. **Leeman motioned to approve the minutes. Yasuda seconded the motion. Lincer abstained since he was working on a raptor project in Nepal at the time. The motion passed.**

There process of editing meeting minutes was discussed. Yasuda stated that the preferred method would be to edit right there in Google drive while you are there and be done with it. Payne broached the subject of approving minutes online. Leeman was under the impression that in January we had approved doing it such that the meeting minutes would be approved and edited via a ballot form which would be distributed and then returned with each board members approval and/or edits. Leeman asked if we had voted on that during our January meeting. Payne responded that during the January meeting we did not vote on that and had actually decided against going the ballot route. She went on to say that she had misgivings about going the ballot route because she felt it would be cumbersome to receive 19+ attachments as opposed to receiving edits or approval status all in one location via Google docs.

Perrine then raised the concern of people possibly changing her edits after they had been made. She suggested that we have a period of open review where everyone has a chance to make their changes on Google docs directly, after which we have a call for a vote of approval. Dvorak asked about using track changes. In response to Perrine's concern, Payne responded that she had been considering creating a policy for editing Google docs, but since no one was yet editing in Google

docs, it was put on the back burner. Now that we are starting to edit in Google docs we may need to revisit this. Payne recommended that for now the best practice would be to only edit sections that directly pertain to you.

Perrine asked if it would be helpful to have a committee to look at the minutes review process as opposed to having the entire board try trying to figure it out. Dvorak and others agreed that they would be amenable to that. Yasuda suggested to Payne that we include a list of board members so you are able to mark when you have reviewed it so we know who has actually looked at the minutes. The caveat is that everyone would have to go in to Google drive to touch it, but that's the plan. If we had a way where everyone was really diligent in reviewing for some period and would go in and indicate that, we could do some follow up with those that have not. When we can see that most people have reviewed the minutes, we can then call for a vote. Payne commented that the bonus of that method would be that we would be approving minutes that people have actually reviewed. Perrine and Yasuda added that another benefit of that would be that everyone would see their action items. Bell thought it was a great idea to form a subcommittee and asked Dvorak if she would like to participate. Dvorak suggested we play with it over the coming weeks and work out all of the kinks.

Grant approval process – Bell, Burg

Perrine put the grant approval process from the Ops Manual up on Google drive and had Burg and other board members review it. Burg said the deadlines used to be spring and fall and we switched that to a rolling deadline, as applications came in. We recently switched that back to twice a year.

Burg has been advertising the grants in our newsletter; however, responses to the Membership survey indicated that many people are still not aware of them. Perrine emphasized the need for a more intensive approach to let people know about grants. Leeman suggested we send a notice out to the yahoo membership groups to let them know when a grant deadline is approaching; likewise for award nominations. We should be soliciting for these things more actively to increase pool of applicants. Candace recommended that we create a calendar for the organization as a whole.

Patterson suggested that we approve deadlines first before we start advertising them. June 1st and December 1st were suggested as biannual deadlines. Evans asked if there would be a conflict since Burg will also be processing travel grant applications in December. Burg assured him that the travel grant process is relatively simple, and that it should not be a problem. The research grant application deadline was then reconsidered in order to allow applicants enough time to prepare for field season. Burg recommended March 1 and September 1. Perrine said that that would be ideal because the award dates are October 31st and April 30th, and this would give us plenty of time to vet them.

Bell called for a motion to vote. Patterson motioned that we approve the new deadlines for the grant approval process. Lincer seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

****Burg, Perrine, Leeman, and Renger will develop a plan to publicize our new research application deadlines, including sending them out to the Yahoo Membership group, advertising on social networking site, and doing outreach to department chairs. And***

create a “Section outreach Plan” for Awards and Grants. Burg will take lead on this process. (AI)

Jennifer Brown proposal – Bell

The research grant application submitted by Jennifer Brown has passed via email vote with 15 votes. She will be looking at the influence of chytrid fungus on frogs and agriculture on plantations in Jamaica.

Evans asked if the money we had approved to send to National toward the purchase of a new quiz bowl buzzer was ever sent. No one knew for sure so **Evans agreed to look into it. (AI)*

Ballona Wetlands – Bell, Burg (New business)

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW) recently signed an agreement with the Annenberg Foundation to fund a new visitor center and do some restoration in the Ballona Wetlands Preserve north of LA. One of conditions of the agreement is that they would like to build an animal shelter. Walter Lamb, President of the Ballona Land Trust, sent an email to the Section requesting assistance in the form of a “position statement that opposes in principle the placement of facilities for domestic pets on land set aside for habitat conservation and restoration”.

The Board discussed the ramifications of the proposed agreement and voiced concerns regarding the possibility of a feral cat component in addition to the precedent of siting a domestic facility on a protected reserve. The Board considered providing the Ballona Land Trust with one of TWS’ position statements. Lincer suggested that we put this discussion on side burner for now while we gather some more information and get some input from Gonzales. Perrine agreed that we should assign it to the Conservation Affairs Committee (CAC). **Perrine will talk to Laura Bies. Leeman will bring the issue to the attention of Gonzales and the CAC. (AI)*

Membership Survey results – Perrine (Continuing business)

Perrine shared an Excel spreadsheet of the results of the Member Survey. According to the results, almost 44% of the respondents don’t know anything about Western Section awards and approximately 26% felt that they were great as is. Perrine said the salient points were that we need more publicity about awards recipients, better efforts to solicit award nominations, and a broader range of nominees should be considered. However, she, Burg, and Renger have already done a great deal to advertise these awards on the newsletter, webpage and Facebook and she’s not sure how to better advertise. Leeman said she had received direct inquiries from people who would like to nominate someone but are unsure of the process, such as when is the deadline and who they submit the nomination to. We have descriptions of what the awards are, but maybe we need to include direct instructions on our website on how to nominate someone.

Perrine said that in the past when we have solicited the membership directly and asked them to nominate their colleagues, Burg received only one nomination. The Board considered ways to make the information more prominent on our website. Renger

pointed out that currently the award recipients are in the “About Us” tab and the research grants info is in the “Resources” tab. She suggested that we add a new tab where we could both highlight the recipients and outline the nomination procedure.

Burg gave the Board a quick review of the current procedure. Perrine asked how many cold nominations he gets. Burg said that most nominations are generated from board members. Some ideas were vetted for raising the profile of the awards such as sending out press releases of the recipients. Evans had tried this in the past and found it difficult to get them published. Perrine commented that they are becoming more common on social media. Patterson suggested we simplify the process and specify that we only need a short write-up of the nominees’ accomplishments so that people aren’t intimidated by the process. It was concluded that a nomination form for awards would be the best way to go. Knight suggested we include them with the call for papers for the annual conference. ***Burg will look at what TWS has and work on creating a nomination form for the Section. *Bell will direct E. Renger to move current awards information over to new awards tab. (AI)** Yasuda would like shore up national nominations process. Knight expressed the opinion that it might be more effective to advertise locally on the chapter level rather than just posting the information on the website and hoping that people will find it. Perrine emphasized that this is where the Section Reps come in. It is their job to encourage their chapter to participate.

Perrine went over the remainder of the Member Survey results spreadsheet. ***Perrine will email spreadsheet out in excel so graphs aren’t cut off. (AI)** Out of 100 respondents, most were professionals; there were only 3 student responses. ***Perrine will send the survey directly to student chapter reps to encourage student participation. (AI)** Incentive ideas were thrown out including a pizza party for the chapter with the most respondents. The students indicated that the services they most valued were travel and research grants. Campus outreach also ranked high. One of the messages is that student affairs outreach through the chapters is very important

Most respondents were TWS members on all levels although the results may be skewed since the majority of the respondents were professionals. Written comments indicated that would have been more interested in field workshops and social events as students. The way most members initially heard of the Section was through personal correspondence. Across the board, people were generally satisfied. One interesting result was that responses indicated that people were no likely to recommend that their colleagues become members of the Executive Board. Patterson felt that this result was due to lack of communication and people not really understanding what serving on the Board entails.

When members were asked to rank member benefits from high to low, the most valued benefits were conference discount, the newsletter, and networking opportunities. The least valued benefit was Transactions, which did not surprise many board members since this publication has recently been dormant. Most respondents initially joined in the 90’s. Perrine said next step would be to do a targeted student survey using an incentive to encourage participation.

Perrine then shared the results of the newsletter section. Respondents indicated that the format they liked the best was our current quarterly newsletter in electronic pdf format, and close behind that was a monthly electronic “in brief” pdf format with links attached. The least popular was updates through social media, which may be explained by the largely professional demographic. As far as content, “upcoming events” was the most popular, followed by chapter reports, president’s note, officer reports, and book reviews. The financial information ranked lower in terms of importance, although will still be included for the purpose of transparency. There were a lot of comments with ideas for content people would like to see included. People were split 50/50 as to whether they would pay an optional fee for a printed copy. Perrine recommended we scale to actual cost and reported that people were comfortable paying \$5-10 in addition to their annual dues. Regarding publications people were less concerned with the format and more concerned with the quality.

The take away message regarding Annual Conference attendance was that people mostly attend based on location and employer support. The comments indicated that affordability and interesting content were the top priorities. The most popular conference locations were Sacramento and Monterey. Future locations in order of preference were Sacramento, Monterey, Santa Rosa, Redding, Reno, and San Diego. Less desirable locations were Fresno and Visalia. There was some discussion about agency employees having a difficult time getting travel allowances for Reno, since it is out of state. Patterson pointed out that since Nevada is a neighboring state it should require less red tape. **She will get more information on applying for neighboring state travel.* So, what keeps people from attending conferences? The biggest factors were workload and financing. Timing and child care also factored in. There were some comments that some of the topics are repetitive. Distance to the airport was also a factor; people are more likely to attend if they don’t have to rent a car.

The final survey topic was workshops. People who come to workshops tend to be already members. They strongly consider location, cost, instruction, topic, and length. The Professional Development Committee (PDC) will discuss the comments with the chapter representatives and address them at a future meeting. The message received was that we need a more robust workshop program. Perrine thinks we need to coordinate with DFW. Perrine also sees an indication that people want chapter based workshops. Students are more likely to attend if they can camp and bring their own food to keep the cost down. They also indicated they are more likely to attend university credit but professionals were not as concerned about that. At the chapter level people are interested in family friendly, social events. One of the tasks Perrine really hopes to accomplish this coming year as Program Director is to propose what the PDC and program will look like.

The survey took about 40 hours to design, implement, and analyze.

Officer Reports (highlights):

Professional Development had a few announcements. Evans announced that he is looking for pre-conference symposia ideas for Reno. He also put in a bid for TWS’

2017 conference. San Diego and Palm Springs are in the running against other possible locations: Albuquerque, Portland, and Seattle. If we end up hosting, Evans, Mitchell, and Busby have agreed to be Co-chairs of the Arrangements Committee. Finally, he announced that Barbara Peters opted out of conducting the resume workshop in Milwaukee. He asked if we were interested in sponsoring Milwaukee as a general open sponsorship or sponsor a specific event such as the Quiz Bowl or Student Professional mixer, etc. He suggested we sponsor the meeting at around \$2,500 and agreed with Patterson that we should attach it a specific event. The general consensus was that we will sponsor an event, which is yet to be determined.

Yasuda announced that TWS has entered into an associate program with amazon.com. If you go through the TWS site and purchase stuff at amazon and they will donate a portion of the proceeds (6% to start, will grow with volume) to TWS. The link is <http://wildlife.org/amazon>.

Perrine reported on the progress of the Field camp which will be held August 5-16 at Swanton-Pacific. They have had a great response, with six registrants so far. Ten professionals have contacted her saying they want to participate. John Perrine is the lead instructor. If anyone on board wants to come teach techniques they are looking for a 2 or 3 day commitment. It is great chance to teach and interact with students. Please let her know as soon as possible. The Section will reimburse instructors for food and travel; lodging is covered.

The students are anywhere from junior standing in college to professionals looking to learn field techniques. Students will earn college credit and professionals can use it toward professional certification. Some of the instructor led activities planned are: Swaim and Morangio teaching herp surveys (eyeshine, pitfall traps, noosing), PRBO employee doing mistnetting and banding, Falxa doing small mammal trapping and track plates, and Layla Harris doing point counts. Areas of need are bats and possibly cameras. Dvorak is a certified tracker and volunteered her services. Bell recommended Walter Klevinger as a possible bat person. ****Board members will submit the contact info of potential instructors to Perrine. (AI)***

Leeman thanked everyone for doing online harassment training and gave the Board a little context as to why it was important. She received an anonymous letter from someone stating they were uncomfortable with one of our board members actions at our last AC. It was a well written letter asking for specific actions, such as a clear policy and training. She discussed it with the Executive Committee. Since it was anonymous, there is no way to follow up. It was agreed that it would be a good idea to put a policy in place so a policy was drafted using language provided by our insurance company. There is no claim being filed. If you have already have received training in the workplace and can provide documentation please send it to Leeman and you won't have to take the online course. Bell thanked Leeman for her tremendous amount of work on this. It was agreed that it is reasonable to also expect student chapter reps to complete the training ****Leeman will follow up with chapter reps and faculty advisors to remind them that this is a requirement. (AI)*** Leeman recognized that we are all volunteers and it is hard to find

time for additional training, but emphasized that it is important.

For Ops Manual purposes, Perrine asked the question, who has the responsibility to send new EB members names to insurance company? Through our insurance company we have access to a menu of services which at the present time Mike Chapel and Leeman have access to. There was discussion regarding whose responsibility that should be. Leeman recommended that they continue the discussion offline.

Lincer asked if we needed a more complete and detailed policy regarding reporting procedure. Leeman clarified that our current policy does address the reporting issue in the last paragraph. Ollivier commented that it is important that we show our Membership that we are taking this issue seriously, regardless of whether or not we have any future incidents.

Bell asked about background checks. The insurance company recommends them for anyone involved with children. Perrine said last year we had the Cal Poly students who were leading kid walks get background checks through the YMCA, but they are now in the YMCA database. In the future we could do this through City Parks through their program working with kids, but if we're going to have multiple programs working with kids there is a need to get our own code to use for Trustline checks and fingerprinting. Leeman mentioned that our insurance company offers criminal background checks that we can access through our member benefits. There was some confusion as to whether or not that includes Livescanning. **Leeman will look into what kinds of services our insurance company provides to see if livescanning is available through them. She will summarize the results and send them out to Allboard. (AI)*

Continuing Business:

Ops manual policy discussion – Perrine

The Ops Manual is relatively straightforward to update, but it's a challenge to keep track of what has been updated already. Also, we have a list of policies that need to be incorporated. Perrine wants them to be in the relevant topical sections, but not all policies have an obvious place. Dvorak suggested having a policy section that links back to the subject areas. We want it to live online, but the question is what is the best way to do that.

Leadership Institute – Yasuda

At our last meeting we conducted a conceptual vote of support for the idea of partially sponsoring the Leadership Institute. TWS has since received a matching grant from the Dallas Safari Club (DSC) but they are still looking for contributions from the subunits. DSC matching grant. We did not settle on a dollar amount. They are looking for \$1,000 – \$1,500. *Rhys motioned \$1500 in sponsorship of TWS Leadership Institute (LI). Yasuda Seconded the motion.* Discussion: Patterson asked for average cost per participant. It averages \$1,000-\$1,500, most of which is for travel. Yasuda stated that TWS did not get much through online donations. But have received \$10-11,000 of conceptual support from the subunits. They're hoping that the seed money will open the door to go after other funding and grants. Evans felt it worthy of commentary that

there are several distinguished alumni of this program that are active members of the Section. Patterson assured that she supports the LI but is curious about our contributions in context with budget and other contributing subunits. Bell called for vote. ***The motion passed unanimously. *Yasuda will let Bies know to send an invoice to our Treasurer and President. (AI)***

Role of Program Director and Section Representative – Perrine/Yasuda

Perrine is running for Section Representative to TWS Council against Jeff Lincer. Should she win, her contract states that she can't vote. If she does not win, she would like to carry on her position. If she wins, we have to decide if we would change her contract to allow her to vote so she can do both. Would there be a conflict of interest? Evans did not see a conflict since there is no personal gain involved. Perrine has discussed the workload issue with Yasuda and feels that it is doable. There are benefits to her assuming dual roles. TWS would pay for her travel to national meetings and she would have access to a whole new network people to help further our Section objectives.

At this point Perrine left the room so as not to influence the discussion. Leeman pointed out that Perrine might have to abstain from voting on her own contract. Yasuda said according to SCPP p135 she would indeed be required to abstain. From a staff perspective Renger offered that sometimes it's hard to separate volunteer from staff billing hours, but Perrine works more than she bills for. Leeman doesn't feel that is an this would be an ethics violation per se, but is concerned that often the Board does not have a lot of opposition to ideas and it may give one person more influence or sway to hold two positions. Yasuda pointed out that as the Program Director, she does not vote currently, so that would not change her level of influence. Martini-Lamb added that if the Board was directing her to do something, we would have to be really clear in what capacity we are giving that direction.

Leeman explained that Perrine and Renger have contracts with a scope of work, task with associated hours and submits invoices for those hours. She is directed by what the Board thinks she should focus her time on by the assignment of tasks and scope of work. Yasuda elaborated that the challenge is to clearly delineate the scope of work so we are clear about what is volunteer and what is an add-on benefit that the Section should be paying for. It is the President's role to review the invoices and provide that oversight of the subcontractor invoices. Leeman said that one of the benefits of having Perrine on the Board is that she provides continuity and background history, but there is also the possibility for squishiness. Several board members suggested we wait for the election outcome and deal with it then. Knight was concerned that we not wait until after the fact. Patterson suggested that Perrine work with Yasuda and look at the issue further and make a recommendation to the Board.

New Business:

Chapter payments to workshop instructors – Knight

There was a question from one of the Chapters about paying a workshop instructor. Bell was under the impression that the Chapters had autonomy. Evans concurred and

explained that the Section has developed some guidance for instructor compensation but not a policy. We break it down to how big the event is, how long the event is, and how big of a role that instructor plays. Knight said that last year it was brought to her attention that instructors for the bat workshops weren't paid. Evans elaborated that they did not get paid, but were reimbursed for travel and given perks such as honorary lifetime memberships and free entrance to annual meeting, etc. Knight added that it seems that the people who led the kit fox workshop the last two years were not getting compensated and were choosing not to participate again unless they were paid. The Central Coast Chapter decided to pay them and Knight wants to make sure that is OK. She asked if they are at liberty to offer perks such as conference registration fees, etc. Evans responded for chapter events absolutely, for section events, possibly. Connolly said her chapter also planned kit fox workshop Cypher offered to do his time as volunteer but following the event their board voted to give Cypher and the co-instructor honoraria. Evans said there is a compensation model and guidance. ****Evans will send out honoraria policy to section reps. Payne will upload to Google drive. (AI)*** Another thing we have done in the past is to make a donation to a project of the instructor's choice.

The PDC has quarterly conference calls to facilitate chapter workshop planning and prevent competing workshops. By default Chapter Reps are on that committee unless they can find someone else from their chapter to serve on it. Perrine is working on developing a policy to help guide chapter coordination.

Bell asked if there is a mechanism to coordinate field trips. The SF Bay and ~~Sae-Shasta~~ [LP: maybe UCD?] chapters both went to Pinnacles on same weekend. Perrine thinks should revisit creating an online calendar for all of these events, perhaps on Google. Patterson feels that it will facilitate more student involvement. It would be great to have a section for upcoming events on the website. If chapters have events they would like to advertise please send it to Evans who will send to Eric. ****Bell and Evans talk to Eric to find out what options are available for an online calendar. (AI)*** Perrine would like something more user based so that Chapters could directly advertise their events. Perrine recommends each chapter needs to have Gmail account, create identity for chapter on Google and then we could link calendars together. The trick is how do we make it show up on our website.

****Renger will list board meetings on calendar and also advertise them in our newsletter so members realize that they are invited. (AI) *Perrine will send action item to chapters to create their own Gmail accounts. (AI)***

Newsletter content opportunities – Renger

Renger thought it would be fun to add some new columns to the newsletter. Also, if there is someone on the Board who could look for newsworthy articles and send them to her, she could include them in the newsletter.

According to Perrine, previously, the newsletter editor solicited articles and would keep up with what was happening in the biological community. The newsletter had an active role of soliciting articles. Renger has done a fabulous job and really perfected the layout but we've had challenges getting content. Hawk is our Newsletter Editor but really just

focuses on the editing and does not soliciting content. It is great that we have newsletter coming out on deadline but we are falling short on interesting content and local . Perhaps we need to revisit newsletter editor as board position. They would not replace what Renger is doing. They could actually feed ideas to Renger and she can do the legwork. She recommends shorter articles from board members so we have more space to include general interest information and fun things. Lincer suggest we have section on “hot topics”. We always have holes to fill - little tiny sections for text. Should we gage the interest from people expressing interest in helping board. Yasuda suggested we form a committee.

Perrine thinks Bridget Souza might be a good fit for an electronic media committee. We would like to have both electronic updates and big newsletters tri-annually. The type of person were looking for would be attending board meetings and voting on issues and in on all behind-the-scenes activities. How do we create a voting board position. Yasuda said the President can appoint an ad hoc committee but if it’s going to be permanent we need a bylaws change.

Perrine thinks it is a great idea to have a Copy Editor and a Content Editor. ***Patterson motioned to propose a bylaws change to the Membership to add a newsletter content editor as an appointed voting position. Leeman seconded the motion. Bell called for vote. Twelve board members voted in favor. McNerney abstained since he was not present for the discussion phase. The motion passed. *Perrine and Renger will draft a description of the committee and Chair position and send them out to Allboard. (AI)*** Once we have description it will go to Allboard and everyone will be asked to distribute it. ***Yasuda will craft the bylaws which the Membership will vote on at our next member meeting (AI).***

Treasurer Report:

McNerney gave a brief overview of the Operating Budget Summary. ****Bell will send the draft budget out to Allboard. (AI)*** Chapel advised McNerney to promote a flat budget because if we have >\$50,000 the reporting to the IRS becomes an issue. Therefore McNerney is proposing a flat budget. Chapel proposed a simpler format with just twelve general categories. McNerney opened it up a little more so it is clear what we are spending money on. We have a new line item for ADA compliance. It was the Board’s will to create a surcharge for the ADA fund at our last annual meeting and some workshops. Chapel felt that it would be too difficult to keep track of as we are accruing it and reporting it. He would rather put a line item in the budget so we don’t have to worry about writing it into budget.

Also included in the budget is a temporary part time contract staff person, which was discussed among the Presidents and Renger at the Annual Meeting. Renger indicated that she could use some help with registration and conference details. We certainly have money available to pay a part time contract. This is open to more discussion but preliminary discussion will be amongst the Executive Committee.

We had a really profitable conference. The workshops did well; the Natural Resource Communication workshop only broke even, otherwise we are looking good. Leeman asked a question about the budget. She has been involved in discussions with Chapel regarding the issue of our balance. She suggested we think about investing that money into member services, which is one of the things the IRS is looking for. Are there any services we can provide to our membership? Several ideas were discussed for dealing with the surplus. Payne asked if we could increase the board travel stipend for those who don't have employer contributions. Leeman suggested we do a cost of living adjustment for our contract staff. Renger talked about supporting EB conference registration. Evans asked about putting more into student grants and travel. We also want to have registration fee for Reno be as inexpensive as possible to maximize participation. Reno could manage our conference to be net zero. The 2013 operating budget won't include the Reno budget. Evans cautioned that we need to be prepared to help out agency employees with travel or a snowstorm. Bell will send the Operating Budget out to Allboard. McNerney suggests we approve the operating budget and then work on a supplemental spending plan afterwards.

McNerney has been talking with Chapel about moving \$50,000 from savings into the Schwab account. We currently have \$125,000 in the Schwab account, \$45,000 in the Donaldson Trust, and \$156,000 in our savings account. The status of the money in our Schwab account is that it was moved from an investment account to a holding account because it was losing money when the economy tanked.

Yasuda commented that we really need to develop a strategic plan over the next couple of years that looks at this and tries to get us back in balance. Leeman reminded everyone that the strategic planning process may incur costs, such as an outside facilitator and meeting and travel costs. Yasuda asked if we put a net zero budget in place and stop accruing money, would there still a need to spend down this year, and if so, how much? McNerney will follow up with Chapel on that. Right now we have almost \$350,000 in assets so if there's an interest to benefit the membership this year we could certainly do that. Lincer offered his philosophy that when we think of putting money into an endowment versus of putting it back into the membership that they are one in the same because we are doing a service for our members by creating a large endowment which adds stability to the organization. McNerney feels that we are in the position to do both, invest in the endowment and also invest in direct member benefits.

McNerney motioned to move \$50,000 from the Wells Fargo savings account to the Schwab investment account. Leeman seconded the motion. Discussion: Last year made the Schwab account made \$8,000 in dividends. Dvorak asked for confirmation that transferring the \$50,000 does not need to be dependent on approving the operating budget. McNerney said yes, it was just a matter of moving money and will not affect the budget. He does needs to find out if there is a penalty if we need to remove it. Patterson asked about the urgency of the moving the money. It is not urgent but could be earning much more interest than it is presently in our Wells Fargo account. McNerney point out that if we move the \$50,000 we will still have \$130,000 for the year. Since McNerney has created a flat budget in the \$80,000 range, that would leave approximately \$50,000

available should we decide we would like to access it for any reason. Moving the money is not going to prevent us from turning that money back into student or membership services. ***Bell called for vote. The motion passed unanimously.***

Transactions Update –McNerney (see report)

McNerney sent out summary report from the Transactions Visioning Subcommittee meeting notes. The challenges we've had over past few years includes lack of participation and keeping a Transaction Editor. Recently, we did some marketing to let people know about it and we did not see much return on that effort. The subcommittee was formed in an effort to breathe some life into Transaction.

McNerney provided some background on the history of Transactions and gave a summary of the subcommittee's recommendations. Initially, it was just intended to cover material from the annual conferences and over the years opened up to general research. One idea generated from that subcommittee is to change the name from Transactions to Western Wildlife. Peer review is still important. There will still be an editor. They would like expand the focus of the publication more to include students and young professionals in addition to professionals. They would also like to open it up to include more descriptive content such as field notes, reviews, and editorials. It would need to be available and searchable online and an electronic submission and review process to make it more editor friendly. Germano, interim editor, would like to have everything done electronically. They are still discussing publishing options.

Some questions were generated regarding cost recovery. The Transactions used to be paid for, then it became a member benefit, and finally it was free. If we put a little more effort into it, should it be free to members or require a subscription? Should it be open access or pay per download?

The final recommendations of the subcommittee, per the report, are: *It is my recommendation that the Board consider and approve the subcommittee's recommendations, including changing the name to **Western Wildlife**, moving to a total electronic process, and opening content to include wider variety of communications. Finally, I recommend that the Board allocate appropriate funds for the creation/enhancement and maintenance of a journal specific webpage. Additional Board discussion and direction is needed regarding a fee structure, if any.*

McNerney motioned to accept the recommendations in the last paragraph of Transactions Visioning Subcommittee's report. Lincer seconded the motion.

Discussion: Payne asked for clarification that it would be electronic distribution only. McNerney said we still have to decide the question of access, whether it would be a members-only benefit. Yasuda said one possibility would be to make them members only for at least the first year, although that becomes problematic because then you have to password protect them. This could be one of the member benefits we were talking about investing in and the Section could cover the cost. Patterson asked about the budget and if we could use the \$2,500 allocated for Transactions toward that end. Several members

voiced the opinion that they would like to see it free and accessible to all. Yasuda asked who is going to frame out what is acceptable for publication and get broader scoping out to the Membership to solicit content. McNerney responded that we will need to work on marketing and may eventually go to multiple issues per year. There was a discussion about representation of taxa. Dvorak suggested we increase our scope to include all species and not just focus on mammals and birds. Martini-Lamb asked if we would publish the previously submitted manuscripts; McNerney answered affirmatively. We will follow up with authors to confirm they still want to publish those old manuscripts. ***Bell call for a vote. The motioned passed unanimously.***

Leeman thanked McNerney for all his hard work on this. McNerney asked for access to the shared Transactions folder on Google drive. It has been already been shared with Perrine, Germano, McNerney, Cypher, and others.

Annual Meeting, Reno – Dvorak/Renger

The planning committee is Dvorak, Renger, Perrine, Evans, McNerney, Leeman, and Bell. Renger expressed interest in hearing everyone's ideas. Patterson asked about participants from NV. Leeman said we should reach out to Kelly Stewart. Leeman, McNerney, and Renger met with her when they were touring facilities. She is a UNR professor with good ideas, local presence, and a connection to the university. Dr. Stewart, Dr. Matocq, and other Professors will be involved.

Renger asked the Board for conference planning ideas. Perrine suggested we set a five minute limit and have a five minute brains storming session. Leeman offered the idea of moving the welcome reception to Tuesday night and have the poster session and chapter meetings on Wednesday night. We have received feedback that having the welcome reception and chapter meetings on the same day is too much. We would start the conference Wednesday and end Friday at noon. Round tables and Working Group meetings would be on Wednesday morning. The survey indicated that people want a shorter conference with fewer concurrent sessions. People want more networking time and this format would give us the chance to do it. Renger pointed out that often we do four instead of three concurrent sessions because we can't get big enough rooms to accommodate everyone, but this year we have more space available. Evans asked if we would do Monday or Tuesday pre-events or not. Perrine said there was a lot of interest in an advocacy workshop with Terra Rentz.

Dvorak reviewed meeting structure. The Tuesday night welcome session will have food. The Wednesday night poster session will have passed hors d'oeuvres. Renger suggested we look into renting some hotel rooms so that we can have food at the chapter meetings. The question is would the Section or the chapters pay for the room cost. It is the chapters' choice. Dvorak wants to think about this strategically so as to encourage attendance. Evans' expressed concern that it be easy to go from one meeting to the next. Renger liked the idea of having the Members Meeting followed by drinks or have it before the poster session. We learned our lesson last year and will be sure not to schedule it against competing activities. Some field trip ideas were thrown around, such as snowshoeing at Sagehen. Knight pointed out that it was awkward last year having

the bat working group meeting during morning sessions. We won't have that problem this year, since they will be Wednesday morning. We will probably also have Friday afternoon working groups to accommodate those that belong to more than one.

Another idea Perrine had was to have a keynote speaker kick off the entire conference since we have a room that will accommodate up to 900 people. Renger and Evans were concerned that the schedule might be too crowded. We could start sessions at 2 o'clock.

Renger said that she will send out a Doodle poll and invite everyone to participate in the planning conference call and then we can fine tune. Dvorak would like us to invite the Reno folks to join the discussion for symposia topics. She emphasized that it is important to her that the conference address both the California and Nevada audience, since they have such different styles. She sees responding to feedback and changing the structure to address people's concerns could be an opportunity to attract people to Reno.

****Candace will set up conference planning call and will invite board and Nevada people we would like to invite.(AI)***

Annual meeting location 2016,17 – Bell, Leeman, Evans

2015 will be in Santa Rosa. We have gone to Sacramento every third year but the conference venues are too small. Leeman asked about the conference center, but that is too big. Perrine said we would consider 16 in San Diego. Renger tried really hard for San Diego in 2015 but the catering minimums were huge. The closest we could get was La Jolla but that was too small. Payne's opinion was that it is really important to have 2016 in Southern California since our Riverside conference was well attended and so long ago. Lincer suggested the San Diego Convention Center. Evans and Perrine agreed that we need to go South for 2016. Evans suggested Riverside. ****Renger will send out RFPs to Riverside and LA. (AI)*** Monterey and Hawaii were suggested as a location for 2017. McNerney feels that if we have strong attendance in 2016, the next one should be HI. Perrine argued for a conservative location in 2016 so we could do HI in 2017. It would serve a lot of members if the Nationals conference ends up being in CA in 2017 as they would have an alternative if they could not swing travel to HI.

Collaboration with FWS Youth Programs – Bell, Perrine

FWS youth programs asked us to join in a junior duck stamp contest. The Klamath Basin River Research Tribal College students have a collaborative program with NASA, NOAA, USGS, NPS, US Forest Service, Bureau of Reclamation, Humboldt State and other universities to look at the thermal refugia in the upper and midsection of the Klamath Basin. This collaboration is part of an effort to develop new tribal leadership capabilities in the wildlife profession. They're interested in forming a partnership with us. We very well may be interested in this, but Perrine advised that we go through the strategic planning process first. We need to determine our priorities before we respond. We're getting a lot of requests for these types of collaborations and Perrine suggests we defer these until we put a plan together. In the meantime, Lincer suggests we get more information from them regarding their expectations.

TWS-WS Involvement in CA Wolf Management Stakeholder Group – Leeman

Last year Leeman was invited by DFW to participate in a stakeholder group as the department was faced with developing a wolf management plan for CA in response to OR7 coming in from OR. She has already participated in several stakeholder meeting groups. DFW is hoping to have a draft by September of this year. Most of the meetings have been in Sacramento, so it has been convenient for Leeman to attend. The last meeting was in Redding, however, and she was not able to attend due to logistics.

Leeman had two questions for the Board regarding this issue. First, she was wondering if the Board wants to continue to have the Western Section participate. She is participating as a TWS-WS representative and is there to represent TWS' position, as described in National's position statements. Payne offered contacts for some wolf biologist she has worked with in Montana if we have any interest in consulting them for advice. Leeman clarified that a lot of species experts have been pulled in independently to the stakeholder group, so we don't need the scientific input at this point. Dvorak feels that our role would best be served in the public policy arena. McNerney the primary issue is that our issue is not the ecology, but the policy, smoothing ruffled feathers or mitigation to ranchers.

McNerney asked Leeman if she had consulted Gonzales, and if it was the CAC's domain. She replied that she certainly can, but wanted to bring it to the full board before the subcommittee. Patterson was wondering if the Board wants to continue to participate in the wolf management plan if the primary role Leeman was providing was being a conduit of national policy to the state level. That is done. Payne thinks that it is important to be involved at this juncture because we may be dealing with this issue for years to come. Even if we don't have a lot of additional advisory input at this point, it is important for the Western Section to maintain a presence and participate. McNerney pointed out that DFW is now charged with putting together the plan. They have already received stakeholder input and that draft will go out for review and we don't necessarily need a physical presence to maintain the request to be involved in reviewing the document. Leeman clarified that DFW is asking for the stakeholders to inform the contents of the plan and to do a first review of the plan before it goes out to the public for a comment period. The stakeholder input carries more weight than a general public comment, so Leeman thinks the role we serve is important.

Leeman's second question to the Board was if there was someone on the Board who might want to serve as her backup when she can't attend a meeting. Most meetings are in Sacramento. Lincer volunteered to help. Leeman asked Payne if she would like to as well. Payne said as she indicated via email to Leeman months ago when this initially came on our radar that she would like to be involved. She added that though she doesn't have a lot of policy experience, she does have some experience collaring wolves and has participated in rancher outreach and mitigation. The meeting will be in May or June. Patterson commented that at this point our role would be reviewing this document. Lincer said if Payne wants to attend the meeting she can, but if she has a conflict he is happy to do it. McNerney is also happy to be involved. Leeman will keep the Board apprised of the status of the review process. Bell added that at stakeholder meetings, it

never hurts to have all the stakeholders present at every meeting and it is better for the long term success of the process for all to be present.

Executive Board Retreat, Reno, NV – Bell

The location of last year's retreat in Alamo is available. We thought of doing it Reno and killing two birds with one stone by dovetailing it onto a potential site visit for the Annual Conference. Renger really needs to get to Reno this summer whether it be as a board or with a small group. Evans emphasized that it is crucial that Renger, Perrine, and Dvorak get up there. Perrine was concerned that if we try to combine annual conference planning and strategic planning objectives into one meeting that one or the other would lose out. Board feedback has been that the entire board doesn't need to be present at the conference facility planning. Perrine recommends that the core planning group go to Reno. Possible retreat locations suggested were Swanton Pacific, Chimineas, and Pepperwood. The Doodle poll narrowed the date down to the weekend of September 21st. **Perrine will check if Swanton is available for our retreat on those dates. (AI)*

Wrap-up

Leeman asked about upcoming meetings. We will need to vote on the budget. Renger will be setting up a conference call for meeting planning. We can schedule a conference call in July. **Renger will set up doodle poll for July conference call. (AI)*

Perrine announced that the SF Bay Area Chapter is holding a Remote Camera Workshop July 11-14th at Pepperwood Preserve, cosponsored by the Section. Budget approval can happen online. **Martini-Lamb will check if Pepperwood is available as a backup retreat location for 9/21. (AI)*

Leeman reminded the board that at our last meeting we approved the purchase of a high quality polycom phone. **Yasuda will purchase a new one. (AI)*

Bell thanked all of the participants for hanging in there so long on a Sunday, particularly those on the phone.

Knight motioned to adjourn. Patterson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned 17:42.

Respectfully submitted,

***Janine Payne
Secretary***

Voting summary:

Leeman motioned to approve the Executive Board Meeting Minutes from November 2, 2012. Yasuda seconded the motion. Lincer abstained since he was working on a raptor project in Nepal at the time. The motion passed.

Patterson motioned that we approve the amendments to the timeline of the grant approval process. Lincer seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Rhys motioned \$1500 in sponsorship of TWS Leadership Institute (LI). Yasuda Seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Patterson motioned to propose a bylaws change to the Membership to add a Newsletter Content Editor as an appointed voting position. Leeman seconded the motion. Bell called for vote. Twelve board members voted in favor. McNerney abstained since he was not present for the discussion phase. The motion passed.

McNerney motioned to move \$50,000 from the Wells Fargo savings account to the Schwab investment account. Leeman seconded the motion. Bell called for vote. The motion passed unanimously.

McNerney motioned to accept the recommendations in the last paragraph of Transactions Visioning Subcommittee's report. Lincer seconded the motion. Bell call for a vote. The motioned passed unanimously.

Action items:

- Burg, Perrine, Leeman, and Renger will develop a plan to publicize our new research application deadlines, including sending them out to the Yahoo Membership group, advertising on social networking site, and doing outreach to department chairs. And create a "Section outreach Plan" for Awards and Grants. Burg will take lead on this process.
- Evans will find out if the money pledged to purchase a new quiz bowl buzzer was ever sent to National.
- Perrine will talk to Laura Bies about providing information to the Ballona Wetlands Land Trust.
- Leeman will bring the Ballona Wetlands issue to the attention of Gonzales and the CAC.
- Burg will look at what TWS has and create a nomination form for Western Section awards.
- Bell will direct E. Renger to move current awards information over to new awards tab.
- Perrine will email Membership Survey spreadsheet out in excel so graphs aren't cut off.

- Perrine will send the Membership Survey directly to student chapter reps to encourage student participation.
- Patterson will get more information on applying for neighboring state travel from state agencies.
- ALL - Board members will submit the contact info of potential instructors for the Field Camp to Perrine.
- Leeman will follow up with student chapter reps and presidents to remind them that the sexual harassment training is a requirement.
- Leeman will look into what kinds of services our insurance company provides and see if livescanning is available through them. She will summarize the results and send them out to Allboard.
- Yasuda will let Bies know to send an invoice for our Leadership Institute contribution to the Treasurer and President.
- Evans will send out honorarium policy to section reps.
- Payne will upload the honorarium policy Google drive.
- Bell and Evans will talk to Eric to find out what options are available for having an online calendar.
- Renger will list board meetings on calendar and also advertise them in our newsletter so members realize that they are invited.
- Perrine will send action item to chapters to create their own Gmail accounts.
- Bell will send the draft budget out to Allboard.
- C. Renger will set up conference a Doodle poll and invite board and Nevada people to an annual conference planning conference call.
- C. Renger will send out RFPs to the Southern CA area for 2016.
- Perrine will check if Swanton is available September 20-22 for our retreat.
- C. Renger will set up doodle poll for July conference call.
- Yasuda will purchase a new high quality conference phone.