# 2010 NARRP Mid-year Board Meeting

**Bastrop, Texas**

**October 21-24, 2010**

## Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Thursday, October 21</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel day, Evening social</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Friday, October 24</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 am</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 am</td>
<td>Welcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:05</td>
<td>Secretary’s report &amp; approval of October minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15</td>
<td>President’s Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>SCORP/LWCF – Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>Awards + NPS/NARRP SCORP Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>Update from the NPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45</td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45</td>
<td>Management Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>2011 Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45</td>
<td>Update from the USFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noon</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>Scholarship Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15</td>
<td>Finance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15</td>
<td>Council on Accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>Internal audit – Rick, Sergio and John required. Everyone invited!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00</td>
<td>Adjourn for evening dinner and social</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Saturday, October 23</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 am</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>Development Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>Membership and Communication Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>Partnerships and Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>NARRP Advocacy – Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15</td>
<td>Update from the BLM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*John*  

*Rick, Glenn, Jeff, Pat*  

*Jennifer*  

*Floyd*  

*Glenn, Scott*  

*Hal*  

*Bob, Pat*  

*Jen*  

*John*  

*Brenda*  

*Sergio*  

*Everyone invited!*
ROLL CALL


Liaisons and Guests Present: Hal Hallett, Floyd Thompson III, Pat Gillespie (via phone day 1 SCORP discussion only)

Absent: Not applicable (N/A)

CHANGES TO AGENDA

Various changes were made to the agenda to adapt to late arrivals and early departures. These changes are reflected in the order the minutes are reported below.

REPORTS/ACTIONS

1. Secretary’s Report (Jennifer):

Jennifer passed out a copy of the October Board Meeting minutes for the Board to review. Hal commented that it should be changed under the Awards section that Bob didn’t ask about the alternative plaques for awards. Jennifer noted this change and Glenn made the motion to approve the minutes. Mary seconded the motion. No discussion. The Board voted unanimously to approve the minutes. Jennifer had nothing else to report.
2. **President’s Report (Rick):**

Rick reported that he had been very busy and thanked Sergio for helping with the agenda. He also reported that he had traveled to the National Association of State Park Directors (NASPD) conference and that he had reported on that while on the road during a previous Board meeting.

3. **SCORP/LWCF Update (Rick, Glenn, Jeff, Pat):**

Jeff gave an update that the lame duck session was happening this fall. Rick reported on the Western Conservancy Foundation and that nothing was going to happen with it. Rick explained the money showed up and then was disbursed to pay for the web advertising. The foundation created ads. Heather asked if there would be opportunities to review copies. Rick said that he would get the website that had copies of the ads. Hal commented that it would be important to get it out to those with content to comment on them. Rick remarked that the ads are live but changes could be made. Heather asked if the ads were live to the public. Rick remarked yes but the website is probably hard to find. He also commented that there are blog posts and it was posted in newspapers in Colorado.

Glenn mentioned Michael Wilson’s retirement and what National Association of Recreation Resource Planners (NARRP) should do for it. Rick commented that Michael would be retiring in December and that Pat may know more on what they are doing for him. Heather commented that she hasn’t heard anything on what they are doing.

Bob commented that SCORP is recognized and provides an opportunity for participation by states within various federal programs such as hydroelectric project licensing through the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). He remarked that federal programs use justification for funding based on SCORPs. For example, SCORPs are utilized in the rating systems for LWCF and RTP project. He gave the example of the use of Michigan’s SCORP in a court case and how it was important to a judge. He also commented that we are missing the point. Floyd seconded this. Hal remarked that BLM requires SCORPs to be referred to in plans. Rick commented that he would pass it along in the feedback to America’s Great Outdoors (AGO) report. Floyd commented that outdoor recreation is being led by EPA and it has been silent on outdoor recreation. Hal remarked that his boss hasn’t see what’s in the AGO documents. Outdoor recreation has been more of an afterthought related to being healthy and getting kids outdoors. He also commented that people are expecting it to be badly flawed. Jeff commented that this wasn’t going to be a one-time shot and there will be continual dialogue for three years. He also commented that he heard there was a draft circulating around. Hal agreed and that it is being carefully guarded. Rick commented that they may be doing a dog and pony show and that they may think that
don’t have to do a draft. Glenn commented that implementation was going to be a problem.

Pat Gillespie joined the Board meeting as a guest via conference call. Rick welcomed and asked Pat for updates on LWCF. Pat remarked that in 2011 there would be no change in the apportionment formula. It would be the same as last year. She reported that there is a letter coming from the Secretary for a change to apportionment formula to address certain needs across the country. Pat remarked that folks are still making an effort to figure out how to do it.

Rick asked Pat what was happening in the DC office with Michael’s retirement. Pat reported that Michael would be retiring on December 3rd and they are working on handling the change in the office. There hasn’t been a decision made on how Michaels’s position will be filled. She commented that whatever happens Michael has staffed the office up well to handle his departure. Rick commented that he guesses that it will be something temporary. Pat agreed and said probably an acting position with a close retirement date. Glenn asked Pat if Wayne was hanging in or retiring. Pat replied that he wasn’t retiring and when that day comes it will be hard like Michael’s retirement. Glenn remarked that NARRP would like to do something to thank Michael and would like to know when something was happening. Pat remarked that anytime is appropriate to send something. Michael would like to keep it small with staff for his retirement.

Rick asked if it would be appropriate to have Pat present a plaque from NARRP at the small gathering. Pat replied that she would be happy to present it.

Pat provided an update on SCORP. Pat remarked that she views NARRP as a strong partner in thinking about change with outdoor recreation and appreciates ideas from NARRP. The following updates were provided:

- Uncovered an APA study that National Park Service (NPS), American Planning Association (APA), and NARRP conducted in 1990. It covers a lot of issues that we are dealing with now. Pat would like to send the study to NARRP and resurrect ideas.
  - Shrinking state and federal staff
  - States meeting basic requirements for SCORP but encouraged to do more.
- In FY11, there will be new training opportunities for inside NPS staff and one of the topics is SCORP. Pat would like to discuss with NARRP how NPS could improve technical support to states. She thinks that the training could help develop competency across the nation.
  - NARRP could help by advising on how to share information to states. Also how to tear apart SCORPs on aspects of what is done well and share it across the country.
4. **Awards & NPS/NARRP Award (Bob, Pat):**

Pat commented that they haven’t approved too many new SCORPs this year and don’t feel many would arise to the top. It would be better to look at each SCORP to see what portions are done well. For example, New Mexico did their customer satisfaction surveys well. She remarked that they love to give the SCORP award but may need to rethink it by looking at sections. Glenn stated he thought the SCORP award was for the last five years and not in the last year. Rick commented that we could look at SCORP competency or methodology for the award. He suggested that the SCORP committee get together and discuss. Hal commented that we need to be careful on wording and that an award needs to happen each year. Scott agreed and said it makes the award more legitimate if it’s every year. Pat said she agreed but the pool is dry this year and it needs to be discussed.

Jeff asked if training and connections to other federal agencies were happening this year. Pat replied that we need to look at how federal agencies are appearing in SCORPS. She commented that she would like to look at it and take some time to figure it out including how to do it with Federal coordination with SCORPs. Bob commented that we need to be aware of what federal agencies are looking for in supporting their programs. If federal agencies aren’t in the SCORP then it becomes useless to the federal agency. Pat agreed. She also commented that she didn’t have a handle on this and has not made effort to see how federal agencies are using the SCORPs. Floyd stated that the Transportation Law has a 20 year requirement that they must incorporate them. It also indicates that an agency listed as a partner in SCORPs needs to step forward. He commented that he wasn’t sure why recreation doesn’t use the same methodology as transportation. Pat remarked that it’s because SCORP is seen as a requirement that is led by the state and the NPS is providing the guidance. She also commented that states could be asked to coordinate with federal plans. Floyd remarked that states could be required to incorporate federal agencies into SCORPs. Pat replied that a discussion would need to happen to address this. Glenn commented that the AGO report is coming out and that he will be shocked if planning is not in the report. Pat said people are holding their breath for the AGO report. Glenn asked to let NARRP know what training may be needed for SCORP and will see what can be done for the 2011 and 2012 conference. Pat replied that she would like to sit down with folks to lay out priorities on SCORP training needs. Scott remarked that SCORP training is a value in the short-term but worries that an unfavorable outcome in the AGO report may result in a decreased priority of SCORP planning by the states. Pat commented that this has been going on for a long time. States are having the person running their grant programs also as their SCORP person and they aren’t contracting out the SCORP but doing it themselves. She also remarked that funding is still happening but a lot of work needs to be done for SCORP to become an effective tool.
Pat recapped that she would send the APA report to Brenda and after the Board meeting get a group together to discuss SCORP. Pat commented she didn’t want the report released in a newsletter because it has a lot of old information and don’t want folks to think we are going back to this. Rick commented that we could put it on the NARRP library. Bob remarked that we need to state why SCORP is important other than funding since states are not getting much funding. This approach has been happening for ten years. We need the agency saying we need to do this because it’s valuable regardless of dollar amount. Currently, the staff is saying we have to do it when it should be the agency. Scott commented that NASPD needs to get involved because directors not very knowledgeable with SCORPs or put SCORPs out of state parks and put them under another office. When state parks are short on funding then they drop state planning. Rick remarked that was a good point and SCORPs should have governor’s signature on it. Bob commented that a letter needs to go to the governor and not the state park directors. Rick commented that there isn’t a problem if the funding comes through. Glenn said yes there is a problem because there are still dumb downed plans. Pat commented that there isn’t a carrot right now. Heather remarked even if there is a carrot even big states don’t have a match. Pat said yes she has been hearing this from out west as a concern. Heather stated that states get the importance of SCORP but don’t have the resources. Hal suggested that a small committee get together to scope it out. Rick agreed. Hal commented that all the federal agencies have NARRP liaisons in D.C. and could discuss. Glenn asked if we still wanted to do a session to elevate SCORPs at the 2011 conference. Pat replied yes but we may need to think of doing the sessions a little different. Glenn said that we have the freedom to change the SCORP training and he would give Pat a call to discuss. Pat signed off at 9:20am.

Heather continued the conversation and commented on having the NPS training at the conference. She said that it would be hard to get regional staff out to the conference because they have a ceiling on travel costs. Mary commented that this may be an opportunity to get it on NASPD’s agenda. Hal remarked that ground works needs to happen before we put it on their agenda. We need to come up with a proposal before discussing the same things over and get someone visionary to work on it. Hal said he would rather have Bob work on this than plaques. Rick commented that we are waiting on the AGO report. Hal remarked that folks are banking too much on the AGO report. We know it will say something about the outdoors. Jeff commented that this could go towards next year’s report. Hal commented that it could be written into Bureau of Land Management (BLM) policy. John remarked lets get proposals in front of someone with money. We could scrape together funding to do a demo rather than a white paper to show rather than propose. Hal said all these years of SCORPs and there is nothing we can show. Glenn commented why not get any money from the Department of Interior (DOI). There isn’t a lot of money being given to recreation. Floyd suggested that NARRP file a letter for new forest plan rule to emphasize recreation more. Rick remarked that want to see what happens with report and discuss this at the December
Board meeting. Brenda commented that if we finish early on Saturday that we could pound out some ideas.

5. **Budget (John):**

John handed out a balance sheet for the budget and balances for the endowment fund. He went over the items in the budget. John remarked he was still working with Dan Haas from River Management Society (RMS) to get NARRP’s portion of the 2010 conference proceeds. He commented that it is NARRP’s policy to maintain sufficient cash reserves to pay for two years’ of operating expenses without additional income. He called out the items with higher costs this year. For example, $700 in professional services and Board travel was up this year with $9500. John also went over the endowment fund. He said he looked over six months to see where to rebalance. John said he will talk to the finance committee to see how to invest in terms of risks when we get the conference funds. John commented that we had a lot of spending in the spring and need a better way track expenses. John asked where the BLM cooperative agreement stood. Hal replied that he would talk more about it with the Finance committee. John remarked that Brenda’s allocations come under budget as she didn’t need as much time with QuickBooks. He commented that in past years the net income has been 10% of the total revenue. He said if we don’t spend as much and do well at conference he would like to bump up the net income.

The Board responded to John’s budget presentation with the following comments with the majority related to the 2010 conference:

- There were other conference expenses like ribbons, etc. that we paid for and didn’t ask to be reimbursed from RMS. (Brenda)
- The conference registration spreadsheet is not a budget and we need to get one for the archive files. (Brenda)
- Do you think we will be able to get this? We don’t know how they tracked items. (Hal)
- We won’t be able to compare the 2010 conference to future ones because this one wasn’t a typical conference. The attendee numbers were higher. (Brenda)
- Do we have enough information to file a tax return? (Hal) John replied we already filed.
- Do we have enough information if we get audited? (Hal) Glenn replied that he was sure he saw expenses.
- The Montana NARRP/Wildlife conference budget was laid out beforehand. (Jeff)
- We were the driver in the Montana conference but with RMS. (Brenda)
- The BLM agreement was to be with RMS and NARRP and now there are issues with RMS budget tracking. (Hal)
- We didn’t get final numbers from RMS until last week. (John)
- It takes awhile to close books. (Glenn)
- Partnerships can be hard but they pay off. (John)
- Partnerships are good but we need to figure out how to improve it. (Hal)
- This was the first time not being the top dog and it was a learning experience. (Sergio)
- Surprised RMS didn’t have something more formal. (Brenda)
- RMS had a lot of self-confidence going into the conference. (Rick)

John remarked that once we receive the money from RMS that he would revise the balance sheet and the endowment fund. He also said he plans to run the income/expenses every couple of months. Hal asked if he needs the Board’s approval on rebalancing. Jeff replied that the Finance committee can make a recommendation. Sergio commented that the Finance committee can agree on the risk and provide the Board with a recommendation. Glenn asked if he is expected to make $25,000 at the 2011 conference. Brenda commented that number seemed high. Glenn remarked that when we have conference budget that we can talk more about expectations for the conference. Sergio commented that changes may occur to the budget throughout the meeting so it would be better to amend the budget tomorrow. Rick stated the audit meeting will be at 4pm. Jeff remarked that the $6-7,000 net income is low and we need to think where it should be at the end of Fiscal Year (FY). John commented that it needs to be 15% and in agreement for net to go up. Floyd asked if the scholarship fund was offline. John replied it was in a savings account. Floyd asked where most of the funds were coming from. John replied a few from Board members but mostly from auctions.

John ended the budget update with stating that the budget was going well and we weren’t spending as much as anticipated.

6. **USFS Update (Floyd):**

Floyd provided the following United States Forest Service (USFS) update:

- Jim Bedwell is pushing for a rollout for framework on sustainable recreation. A lot of the items from NARRP’s white paper were included. A sixth principle was added to the framework (Integrate recreation program with watershed and wildland fire.) There will be a video on the framework. It will also define an all lands approach. The sustainability framework will discuss how to implement it including: outreach to communities, a Rivers, Trails, and Conservation Assistance (RTCA) model built into the USFS, analysis of recreation areas, and staff needs that can facilitate, leverage and work on partnerships.
- Looking at the 401 series for recreation planning such as getting recreation planning and social science into USFS series.
- Working on a program for communities to have local transportation that connects to federal lands. Also working on scenic byways with Department of...
Transportation (DOT). The DOT is reorganizing with an Office of Livability. Also working on a travel promotion piece with Dept. of Commerce.

- The chief has new regulations on the forest plan rule out to the public. There is a lot of talk about recreation. Floyd complimented the BLM on integrating recreation planning for their resource plans.
- Visitor Capacity:
  - Still a struggle to get funding to revise tools.
  - Asked for a panel of experts to re-visit visitor capacity.
  - Figured out staff was needed to do it at a cost of $4 million. This idea was dropped.
  - Need to have BLM, NPS, USFS, United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) meet and decide if all are using the same recreation visitor capacity methodology. Then shape a plan of action once on the same page.

Floyd announced that he would be retiring and his last day with the USFS would be December 31st. He commented that he would like to put his name out there for NARRP Board nominations. Floyd said he will work with Jim to identify a new USFS liaison.

Rick asked Floyd if the USFS was going to embrace sustainability with the history of resource extraction. Floyd replied that the USFS has a history of leadership such as Leopold. He thinks the USFS still has that spirit in the belly. Under the Organic Act and the Multiple Use Act we still have a long way to legislation. Floyd commented that he thinks the framework will work. He remarked that it needs leadership intent and change including the following:
  - Need support of right persons all.
  - Community enhancement through recreation. Folks are excited about this.
  - Professional series change.
  - Don’t have capacity but need to invest in folks that can do it.
  - Want to work at an interagency capacity.
  - Need to work with communities.
  - Need to build a community of practice and working with Sergio on this.
  - The reality is a lot is determined by budgets and leadership.

Jen asked Floyd if he knew about RecLink that is being developed by the University of Minnesota for the USFS. Floyd replied yes and that it came through a cooperative agreement. He commented that he invited Sergio to look over it for NARRP. Sergio said he would get with Jen on reviewing it for NARRP.

Jeff asked Floyd when the planning rule will be out for the public to comment on. Floyd replied probably by the end of the year (Dec. 31st). There will be 60 days to comment.
and roundtables in Jan./Feb. They are pushing to have a new rule out by November 2011.

John asked how the travel management plan was going. Floyd replied that all have to have a Motorized Vehicle Use Map (MVUM) in place. The minimum was being done and now analyzing all roads. Trails do not need to be included. The winter season wasn’t addressed and now they are working on a process. Floyd gave the example of Gallatin National Forest in Bozeman. All forests have targets for score cards and they will find there is a minimum required. Gallatin said that they need to look at the whole piece (motorized, non-motorized, and winter trails). Then folks wanted to implement the plan and they begin looking for money. This is a good example of cooperative planning.

Hal inquired if there were any USFS update related to BLM. Floyd replied that they are rethinking Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) with BLM and visitor capacity. Hal asked if any issues that would be related to BLM to discuss. Floyd replied that they need hear from other than businesses on visitor capacity. He asked what NARRP thought. Hal commented that there is a problem with one fits all. This issue continues with the NPS in Yosemite. The court says they need to provide a number and the NPS is having issues with providing a number. We don’t have an across the board methodology. NARRP identified some good models on how to identify a number. Floyd commented that David Cole talked about where we are and that we need to have some flexibility. Hal remarked that the 9th Circuit says capacity means you need to have a number and they want a number so judge knows if the number has been exceeded. Floyd remarked that the USFS/BLM is trying to work together on a uniform approach that works for each of their unique agency missions.

Floyd also gave an example of the high intensity recreation area (Red Rock Pass) in Sedona. It has been contended the USFS has unfairly charged an entrance fee for an area rather than charge for individual sites. If the partner had to charge for individual sites they would have walked away from the partnership opportunity. Bob commented that he didn’t realize the fees were going back into the maintaining the facilities.

7. **Management Report (Brenda):**

Brenda reported 228 members (76 individual, 130 institutional, 4 retirees, and 18 students). She commented the membership is staying steady.

She remarked that she has wrapped up the cleaning of the QuickBooks. Now she is in the maintenance mode of reconciling the books monthly. Brenda said up until this meeting she has charged per hour for maintenance so she could get a good idea on how much time it takes. She stated that she would like to add 4 hours/month to her contract to address bookkeeping duties.
Rick commented that he was glad that she brought it up and would like to discuss her changing responsibilities. He asked if we should consider the manager writing checks. Jeff commented that the relationship is good. John said he could keep doing it as it allows him to monitor the finances. Heather asked if there was an issue that prompted this change. Hal suggested that the bills could go to Brenda and John could approve Brenda writing the checks. Jeff commented that we aren’t writing that many checks. John remarked that in a small organization the treasurer writes the checks from his experience. He suggested that the Finance committee to talk about it and going forward when his term ends. Rick commented that the treasurer is a volunteer and the manager is paid. Brenda is a lot easier to chase down.

John responded that Brenda’s request for an additional 4 hour/month fits within the budget.

Floyd remarked that he would like to know how renewals were going. As USFS liaison he could help with renewals. He asked to be kept informed and that he could brainstorm. Brenda responded that renewals were going alright. She said Region 6 didn’t renew since Terry Slider retired. Brenda commented that she contacted Region 6 but got no reply. Floyd said this is a good example and said he could help with this. He said it would be more powerful if it came from Floyd than in an unsolicited email from NARRP.

Glenn touched back onto the discussion of Brenda’s duties and hours. He asked Brenda if she was comfortable on her non-treasurer duties for salary. Brenda replied that she has kept track of her hours but she would need to review. Glenn asked if she would be interested in adding hours. Brenda replied that it would be hard to say because her recreation planning consulting workload is variable. Mary asked Glenn if he was meaning short-term hours and if he had something in mind. Glenn replied that we talk about this without Brenda. Brenda left the room.

Rick began the discussion with adding the additional four hours for reconciling the books. Sergio asked if this was reasonable. John replied yes and that she is good and reminds him on bills that need to be paid. He said that at first when she signed on he was apprehensive on the workload Brenda diagnosed. John commented that he called the accountant and she reflected what Brenda said on the amount of work needed. He said it makes sense to keep her on for 4 hours/month. She is very detailed and a quick study on databases. Jeff asked if the online project was done. John replied yes and we will be finishing $2500 under and a small bill to the accountant. Jeff asked how many hours a month total. John replied he didn’t know.

Glenn remarked that Brenda started with 10 to 12 hours and now she is up to 16 hours. We need to be mindful of this as her maximum hours. He commented that NARRP isn’t
too many years from having an Executive Director but not right now with the budget. Glenn said it was too unfortunate she wasn’t interested in the hours. The Development Committee needs someone to go out and raise funds. John asked if we could find someone else to volunteer. Heather commented that it is valuable to have consistency that Brenda could have provided. Sergio remarked that is why we changed the treasurer duties. Jeff suggested that we need to have Brenda research finding someone cheaper than Memberize and with using credit cards. He also commented that the website do over was okay but it could have been better. Sergio agreed and that we are tapped out with the current provider and would like to visit this during the Membership & Communications Committee.

Heather asked about the question on the table of the additional four hours. John commented that Brenda’s contract goes to October 31st. Sergio asked Brenda bills time for Bastrop. Scott asked if Brenda bills her hours with descriptions or lump sum hours. John replied that she does on accounting but not her other duties. Jeff commented that her invoice is pretty straight forward. We could make a decision next year if we want to put it out as a more formal bid. Either way even if happy with incumbent it is a good business practice.

John made a motion to approve payment of up to $170/month from October 1, 2010 to September 31, 2011. Heather seconded the motion. Sergio commented that we need to clarify what it is for. John made a motion to approve payment for Brenda up to $170/month from October 1, 2010 to September 31, 2011 for Quickbooks accounting related to her duties. Heather seconded the motion. No discussion. The Board voted unanimously to approve up to $170/month.

Glenn suggested that we put together a personnel committee before October 1, 2011. Sergio agreed and said look over a six month period and discuss duties, etc. Rick said he will discuss this with Brenda and explain this as a good business practice. Sergio suggested that Rick ask Brenda if she is comfortable with additional duties of fundraising. Heather commented to also ask about her fundraising skills.

Brenda came back into the meeting. Rick informed her that the Board passed the additional four hours.

Sergio requested that we talk about awards since it was passed over when we were talking with Pat. Rick agreed and commented that we talked about the SCORP award but not the other NARRP awards.
8. **Awards (Bob):**

Bob remarked that the committee has one person and that there really aren’t a lot of people nominating folks for awards. For example, consultants are not coming forward. Rick commented that the award is a bigger deal in their communities.

The following comments and suggestions were give on improving awards:

- We need to look at local level to where the conference is taking place for awards. (Bob)
- There are a lot of worthy people but it’s the lack of people submitting the nominations. (Hal)
- We haven’t decided who to target. (Bob)
- We need to give awards and need to be proactive. (Hal)
- The Scholarship committee exploded and folks are interested in helping. The Awards committee needs support like the Scholarship committee. (Glenn)
- Floyd said he was willing to help with this in whatever capacity.
- We need to emanate where we want to go with sustainable recreation. (Floyd)
- We have someone associated with the conference sit on the awards committee. (Rick)
- Rather than requesting conference sessions through an RFP, Glenn has been tracking down must-have presenters that have good stories and projects to relate. Rather than rely on submissions, we track down the best. We could have some strong award nominees among the conference session speakers. If our award process does not result in nominations, perhaps we need a new process. (Brenda)
- Put non-NARRP members in touch with NARRP members to submit nominations. (Hal)
- Talk with folks and with other conferences. (Glenn)
- Glenn should share his intel on session presenters to see who might be a good award nominee. (Brenda)

Bob asked the Board if we should only have one award category. Sergio commented that we need to elevate the awards so people want them. Heather said we shouldn’t give out 2 or 3 awards in each category, just 1. Rick commented that is typically one but sometimes more. Rick asked if our nomination process was fairly easy compared to others. Bob replied that our process is easy. Rick asked if we need an Awards Committee. Floyd, Hal, and Scott agreed to be on the committee. Hal asked how many categories. Bob replied four. Heather suggested that it be streamlined with fewer awards.

Sergio asked for an update on the plaques. Bob reported that he has been coordinating with Caroline. He said that we need to come up with a basic design that everyone will be happy with. Bob commented that he still needs to ask how Caroline’s husband did.
the lettering. Rick suggested to do everything but the lettering. Heather commented to take them to get engraved. Brenda asked Bob if he came up with some designs. Bob replied yes a couple ideas but needs a theme. For example, RMS has a river flowing. Heather and Mary both suggested using NARRP’s logo.

**Other Comments & Discussions (before lunch)**

Heather informed the Board that she would be absent from Board activities due to maternity leave starting at the end of January for maternity leave. Her term is over in May but she is interested in running for a position again. As for her current term she said she could look for someone or ask her NPS supervisor to appointment someone in her place. Heather also said she would like to contribute something before January.

Rick commented that four months isn’t a lot of time to get someone. Heather remarked that maybe she could cover two months since she will be part-time two of her maternity leave months. She said that she would likely not be at the 2011 conference. Jean commented that it takes a lot of time to find someone. Hal suggested since Heather has an interest in returning that we give her a leave of absence. Glenn suggested that the SCORP committee is the most logical place to contribute to before January. Rick recapped that the SCORP committee as being Pat, Glenn, Heather, Bob, and Scott. Scott asked if he would be reviewing for awards and the NPS piece. Rick replied both. Scott said he was interested. Rick said he would like to sit out from the review piece. Glenn stated the review piece would be Scott, Bob, and Glenn.

Heather also announced that Rick Potts was leaving. Brenda asked if he was going somewhere else or retirement. Heather replied that she is unsure. She also commented that this leaves a NPS liaison spot in NARRP open and a black box in NPS for direction.

Sergio revisited SCORP awards discussion. He commented that we keep the SCORP award as an excellence award and asked why we made it a 5 year window for some reason. Bob commented that the same crew of SCORPs comes up. The appearance that if a state didn’t get the award the first time and then gets it the next time is not appropriate. We should only announce the winner not all the nominations. Bob commented that the same crew of SCORPs comes up. Its fine for us to know but everyone else doesn’t need to. Brenda remarked that the only award she gets a call on is the SCORP award and folks want to know how to get it. We shouldn’t tinker with it. Heather agreed with Sergio’s earlier comment about keeping the SCORP award as an excellence award but commented that SCORPs haven’t been excellent recently. She also commented that she liked Bob’s suggestion on announcing just the SCORP winner.

Rick changed the subject and asked what to do for Michael Wilson’s award. Glenn said also one for Floyd. Hal commented that Gary Marsh was also retiring. He said at the very least just a letter and doesn’t have to be a special award. Mary commented that
Floyd received the Distinguished Service Award. Sergio suggested putting something in the NARRP newsletter. Brenda remarked that Michael doesn’t want a big thing but it’s important for folks to know who is retiring. Rick commented that he has seen them done as a resolution and mentioned in a newsletter. Hal informed the Board Gary’s retirement party is Dec. 2nd and it would nice to have something to present him by then. Rick stated that we would give letters to Floyd, Michael, and Gary. Bob suggested that we throw in extra lines for Floyd for all that he has done. Rick commented to send him a line or two extra that should be added to Floyd’s letter.

9. **2011/2012 Conference (Glenn, Scott):**

Glenn provided a briefing paper on the conference, a draft 2011 conference budget, and a conference program structure handout. Glenn went over the briefing paper which included the conference’s theme, location and dates, conference hosts, agency partners, organizational partners, target audience, conference planning committee, and other roles to be confirmed. Glenn commented that we needed to go over other roles to be confirmed. The following comments and roles were identified related to the “Other Roles to be Confirmed” list:

- Development of printing of conference notebooks – Glenn and Scott
- Registration & Website maintenance – Brenda confirmed and that we will use RegOnline for registration.
- Menu selection – Heather (Glenn will email menu choices.)
- Awards and Program – Bob
- Awards Program MC – Rick
- Hospitality Room Supplies – John
  Glenn commented can rent for $250/night a two-story suite (hospitality). The 2nd floor has 6 bedrooms ($500/night) but we don’t have to rent it. We would get the 2 beds/2 baths for $250 rate with a 1st floor kitchen. John will stay here since he will be maintaining this room. Suggestions for renting the other 6 bedrooms would be for the scholarship students or for out-of-state travel attendees.
- Hospitality room – Scott (This room will shut down at 11pm.)
- IT Captain – Scott
- RegOnline and credit card details – Jeff and Brenda
- Silent Auction – check-in; forms; room layout; record keeping; processing – Mary and Marcella
- Live Auction – items; MC; control Tom; record keeping; volunteers – Mary and Marcella
- Auctioneer – Tom C
- Field Trip Captain for morning departures – get people on right transport; signs – Sergio
- Students – on-site host, volunteer assignments – Jennifer
• NARRP election (forms, process, tallies, reporting) - Jennifer
• Banquet MC – short program – Rick
• Closing MC – Jeff
• APA credits – Glenn

The following discussion occurred over the APA credits. Scott informed the Board that we have to pay a registration fee for APA credits. It is an upfront fee of around $900. With this investment we would have to ensure we get enough registrants signed up for APA credits. Scott asked how much the conference registration will be. Glenn replied $360. He also asked when the APA conference will be and where. Glenn replied in May in Boston. Brenda asked if we can advertise APA credits at the NARRP conference at APA events and their website. Scott replied that we can put it on their website and the Colorado APA website. Scott said we are in a holding pattern for the APA credits until we do more groundwork. Mary asked if certain sessions qualify. Scott replied not all sessions will qualify. Jean commented that folks will look at how many credits they can get in a day. Glenn asked what a credit is. Scott replied 1.5 credits for a 60-90 minute session. Mary commented that we would need to bring folks from outside NARRP. Jean remarked that with travel restraints folks are going to want APA credits if they can only go to one conference in a year. To stay certified planners and landscape architects need 32 credits every 2 years. Landscape architects have continuing education credit requirements that vary with each state where they carry a license.

• Scott stated that he would give an update at the next conference call.
• Coordinate with session leads - Glenn
• Coordinate with room hosts – Scott
• Sponsorship and exhibitor booklet and program – Glenn
  -Brenda asked if we were going to mimic last year’s sponsorship booklet or do it in house like other years. Glenn replied we will do it in house.

Glenn went over the conference program structure handout. He stated that there will be concurrent sessions with each having three blocks. Glenn pointed out that the banquet and live auction was moved to Wednesday instead of the last day so we won’t lose folks. Salazar was invited to the AGO luncheon but he hasn’t confirmed. Floyd suggested inviting Harry Sherman too. He said he has seen Salazar and Sherman show up together before. Scott commented that the Governor of Colorado is the fallback. Glenn commented that Pat Noonan, NASPD, OIA may be on the AGO response plenary. We will need a powerful panel to get responses from audience. Glenn stated that in the closing session we hope to get some students involved with it. Floyd suggested charging students with Outdoor Nation follow-up.
Brenda inquired about the required one annual business meeting. Hal said why not have it at the annual meeting. Glenn replied that it wasn’t attended well this past year at the conference and people just wanted to get out there. Mary remarked that in the bylaws it says the business meeting needs to be at “a selected place”. Rick suggested combining the Business meeting with the Board meeting. Glenn asked about having it on Wed. at 5:30pm. Heather suggested on Tuesday and bribe with pizza and beer like RMS. Glenn commented that we need to have a business meeting so we can announce the election results. Jean commented that it allows members and opportunity to comment. Glenn suggested having it in the hospitality suite. Jeff agreed and said we could have food and drinks. Glenn said the food is expensive.

Glenn went over the concurrent session topics listed in the briefing paper. Glenn asked if there were any we should drop or other suggestions. The following comments were provided:

- There are no state agency session leads. (Bob)
- River and trail plan, SCORP, county open space planning, and alternative transportation will attract folks for APA credits. (Scott)
- Missing topics related to urban outdoors. In the west outdoor recreation is out in the wilderness. In the east it is just getting outside. (Bob)
- We don’t want it to be too local so good observation. (Scott)
- Youth mentioned but not the aging population. (Bob)
- The aging population could be put in with AGO themes. (Scott)
- Some are familiar with AGO but at the conference people may not be aware of it. (Bob)
- Is it consistent with the conference theme or just putting it in because it’s an interesting issue? (Scott)
- How to do more with less in parks is an issue. (Bob)
- The Intertwine Alliance is a great model (government, non-government, and corporate sponsors) for connecting people outdoors. It may be of interest to conference attendees interested in urban outdoors. Could probably get one or two folks from the alliance to serve on a panel at the conference. (Jean)
- Scott suggested a 15 min. synopsis from the northwest, one from the northeast, etc. to make a session. (Scott)
- Lots of things happening with private entities stepping in (ex. Vail Resorts) (Floyd)
- Item 13d needs to be connecting to technology not just Facebook and Twitter. For example, applications, interpretive signage, etc. (Heather)
- Fermata could help with 13d. (Brenda)
- Glenn suggested that Heather talk to Michael about Intertwine Alliance. Don’t want to lose urban aspect. (Glenn)
- It could be part of a RTCA session. (Heather)
• Better information out on pre-trip planning. We could have someone from KOA or the National Reservation System. (Floyd)
• Before we go down the road all of these could be their own conferences. What is unique about Colorado? (Hal)
• With connecting theme we need to talk about trip planning. We will just be touching upon these at conference. (Floyd)
• We can’t talk about youth without technology. (Heather)
• We have 12 slots and those below the dark line can’t be moved up. (Glenn)
• Conference attendees have stated before that some sessions are too basic that they want more in-depth discussion. We need a strong slate of sessions. (Brenda)
• Technology needs to move up to the 12 sessions. (John)
• Does anyone want to take on putting together a technology session? There is a guy up in Glacier doing a lot of cutting edge social media. (Glenn) Heather volunteered to help shape the panel but doesn’t have contacts. Rick and Brenda also volunteered to help.
• REI and other contacts are very interested in this kind of stuff. (Floyd)
• There was a session at NASPD on technology and they had all the vendors there for it. (Rick)
• Rick volunteered to be the technology lead.
• Fear that people have a lot of knowledge but we need to drill down so there is a value for coming to Breckenridge. (Hal)
• Technology and youth are the buzz but we need to see it in application. For example, if Fermata can show it. (Hal)
• Fermata works with more tourism related technology that has been implemented at a few sites. (Brenda)

Glenn went over the early estimated 2011 conference budget. He reported the budget is based on the $360 registration fee. It went up $10.00. The field trips will range from free to $100. Glenn said he needs feedback on fees for exhibitors. He commented that the budget is based on 200 attendees. We will have to pay $900 and cost of rooms for AV help instead of the $7,000 bid. The following comments were provided:

• Rick asked if we received any complaints about charging field trips as a separate fee. Sergio commented that it is harder for agency folks to get reimbursed for it. Mary remarked that is depends on what kind of field trip.
• Scott asked about having a sign-up sheet for auction items. Mary commented that we had gotten away from that but will work on it.
• Brenda said she would talk to Heather Bennett to see how they got so many items donated in Pittsburgh.
• We need to ask around to get a local idea for attendee projections rather than have an assumption of 200. (Bob)
Brenda commented that we typically base the budget on an attendance of 100. 200 seems to be very optimistic. In the past, 140 has been the highest attendee number at a solo conference.

Sergio asked how accounting worked with students on registration. Brenda replied that it is reflected as a zero.

Rick asked about guaranteed rooms. Glenn replied 320 room nights (80 rooms at 4 nights).

Hal asked if there would be a social hour for exhibitors. Glenn replied on the first night.

Mary suggested that exhibitors could be paying for a lot of expenses. Glenn said he would be putting sponsorships together.

Floyd suggested adding a byline to the conference theme.

Bob commented that we need to be careful about how we focus the conference. We don’t want to drive easterners away.

Heather stated that it makes sense with sponsorships with industry connections.

Jean suggested that we have more than one byline with different ones targeting different audiences. Heather commented that we need to drill down to picking a sub piece to target not multiple sub themes.

Rick asked about what we will talk about with SCORP. We may not need a session.

Brenda said she did some quick math to see how scalable the conference would be. If we scale down to only predicting 100 registrants the cost per registrant would be $382.

Jeff asked if meals were a fixed cost. Glenn replied yes.

Why do we need all the snacks? (Brenda)

We could get sponsorships for the food. Do we need help with the sponsorships? (Scott)

Need to go out to the town of Breckenridge in person to ask for auction items. (Jennifer)

Will ask three folks to out. (Scott)

Made contact with all the exhibitors at the NASPD conference. (Rick)

Add a fourth track? (Brenda)

We said we wouldn’t go over three. (Glenn)

We also have next year to drill this down. (Hal)

What if we don’t achieve the number? (Brenda) Can’t we cut a meal from the budget? (Jeff). This is something easy to do. (Glenn) Do we need to have so many food purchases to get room rate? (Brenda) Yes (Glenn)

Think the chances of there be 300 attendees than 150. (Glenn)

200 sounds like a lot but we hit the numbers at RMS. (Rick)

Breckenridge is a central location and airport. (Hal)

What about the shuttle cost? (Mary) $79 one person, one way. (Rick)
• Food options? (Floyd) There are many options in town within walking distance. (Glenn)

2012 Conference

Rick reported that he talked to the Louisiana state park director about hosting the 2012 conference in New Orleans. Jen went over the benefits of having the conference in New Orleans. Hal asked about the temperatures. Jen replied that April may be better than May. Floyd suggested Dave Dahlquist as a good contact. Rick asked for any thoughts. Hal remarked that it sounded good.

10. Scholarship Committee (Jennifer):

Jen provided an update on the last Scholarship committee meeting on October 6th with a handout. She informed that the committee reviewed and discussed the following items:

• 2010 Scholarship committee work plan
• 2010 Scholarship program
• Improving the 2011 Scholarship program
• Funds for the 2011 Scholarships

Jen also went over items that the committee wanted to discuss with the Board at Bastrop including a proposal for 2011 Scholarship funds. The following items were discussed:

What amount to award per student?

Jen remarked that we have been awarding up to $500 per student. The committee feels that we need to decide on either 1.) continue to award up to $500 per student, 2.) award each student with $500, or 3.) in-state up to $500 and out-of-state $500. The Board discussed and Jen made a motion to provide each student with a $500 conference scholarship. Heather seconded the motion. No discussion. The Board voted unanimously to change the student conference scholarship award from up to $500 to $500 for each student.

What is our target number of student scholarships? (Last year we awarded 11)

Jen asked what our target number is for awarding scholarships. Is it based on the money we have? Bob commented that this is a good idea. Sergio remarked that this goes back to accounting. Glenn and Jeff commented that we need to be very clear on spending on scholarships. Glenn suggested that we move general operating over to real costs in the scholarship fund including registration fees. Bob asked about the auction dedicated fund. Jeff commented that we can put as much of the general fund into the scholarship fund as we want. Bob remarked that it doesn’t make sense putting
the auction proceeds into the scholarship fund if the general fund is subsidizing it. Does the public know we are subsidizing the scholarship fund other than from the auctions? John remarked that we are 501(c)3 and we need to push the education aspect of NARRP. Sergio asked at what point do we set a target number of scholarships to award rather than what money we have and the number of applicants. He also commented that some years the amount of auction proceeds changes but this shouldn’t affect giving scholarships.

Mary made a motion to award up to 10 student scholarships per year for NARRP conferences. Hal commented that we can’t commit to future Boards but we can for 2011. Heather suggested that the motion also include that it is for student travel costs and that we provide them with a conference registration and a one-year membership. Mary made the motion to award up to ten student scholarships to include a $500 stipend for travel costs and hotel, a registration waiver, and a one-year membership in 2011. Glenn seconded the motion. No discussion. The Board voted unanimously to award up to 10 student conference scholarships in 2011.

Do we include conference fee waiver as part of the cost per student? & Do we include the 1-year student membership as a cost per student?

Jen asked the Board about including the registration cost or not. John commented that we should and so did Sergio. Brenda remarked that it isn’t a real cost. It is just moving money from savings to checking. Sergio disagreed and said it was a real cost. Floyd commented that if we do it this way and the auction becomes a supplement. Sergio commented that we account for all expenses and then decide set number after we evaluate. Jeff asked if when we file taxes if the $500, registration fee, and membership are reported. Bob commented that we should show the real cost. Jeff remarked that this is not the real cost of what we give the students.

11. Finance Committee (John)

John announced that he would have a meeting later. He also commented that he would like someone to volunteer to look into e-commerce for something cheaper. Sergio volunteered to look into it.

Rick moved the Council of Accreditation discussion to Saturday at 1:30pm. Rick then adjourned the meeting for the day at 4:47pm.
12. Development Committee (Glenn)

Three functions for the committee – policy, board development and fiscal development. Their primary focus has been on the AGO implementation. Under fiscal development, they’ve been working to develop relationships with some associations and people that may, in the future, yield financial contributions. They’ve managed to translate some of those relationships into conference sponsorships and exhibitors for 2011.

Glenn pointed out that other conferences generate significant revenue from the sponsors and exhibitors associated with conferences. Those relationships take time and work in excess of what conference co-sponsors have time for. Glenn suggested that we might want to consider revising this in the future, perhaps dedicating a specific person or position to cultivating and maintaining these relationships. Bob and John suggested that we should look at service providers (i.e. GIS, consulting firms, aerial photography, etc.) rather than product vendors since those are the services NARRP members more typically purchase. Glenn agreed this all needs careful thought and attention.

They developed a SCORP proposal that’s been tabled pending the release of the AGO report. Rick mentioned that the Western Conservation Foundation (the source of the $20k marketing shot) might be interested in this. They are trying to engage them in the conference in some fashion.

The committee has also been working with the BLM on the cooperative agreement. Floyd reminded all that under the 1998 law change FWS became very involved in wildlife dependent recreation and offered to assist Glenn with developing those relationships.

13. Membership and Communications (Sergio):

Membership Fees – bylaws state we can increase membership fees up to 10% per year. We raised individual and institutional rates last year by $5 each. The discussion recognized that economies haven’t improved and that we’re already raising the conference fee so raising the membership fee might not be prudent. The intent is to
have the membership fees support the cost of running the organization and we could go another year and still be ok. Sergio made a proposal that we not increase fees this year and there was consensus. Glenn suggested we put this in the newsletter with a heads up that fees would likely be increasing next year.

Brenda suggested that we start including a paragraph summary following board meetings that would go into the newsletter. She suggested that this would be added to Jennifer’s tasks. Hal reminded us that the distribution is very large so topics should be of general interest only. Brenda thought it could be a highlight of decisions. Glenn and Rick thought this should more appropriately sit with the President as part of his responsibilities.

Sergio wanted to resurrect the idea of having an academic fee structure where the professors would pay a membership fee and it would include some number of student memberships. Heather asked what the institutional membership structure is. It’s $75 for the first and $70 for each additional member, so there isn’t necessarily a parallel there the way there is in other organizations. Brenda suggested surveying our current academic membership to see what they think of this idea and what fees would be appropriate. Glenn thought we should also explore with faculty what would be incentives for them to participate.

As part of trying to reach out to Academic institutions and students, Sergio also suggested a change to the website to include an academic page (like we have a vendor page) that would include targeted services for University programs, clearinghouse for research, etc. Hal pointed out that the more of this we do, the easier it is to justify the pending agreement with the BLM. Rick also reminded us this fits well with our 501c3 status.

In reaching out to Universities we typically rely on NRPA’s list, which is limiting since it only includes those who are accredited in recreation, leaving out other relevant planning fields and disciplines. Heather suggested the committee generate a preliminary list to share with the Board and we can add universities to it.

The committee will do some additional research to answer questions raised during the discussion.

Web Site – The committee is suggesting that we’ve reached the limit of what our current web host is able to provide us and our needs have outgrown what the host can provide. Brenda is happy with the membership management function. Heather thought it likely we could find a new service that could step up the professional look of the website and some of its functionality. Brenda suggested we could un-bundle some of the services. Glenn agreed that we have higher level people looking at us and our first impression is very important. Sergio and Brenda also mentioned that we’re interested in additional
functionality. The committee will explore our options with an aim to implement an updated site before conference.

There currently isn’t a line item in the budget for a new website. There will be costs associated with migrating existing content, redesigning graphics, site plant, etc. Whatever product we choose must allow Brenda to make updates without extensive knowledge in specialized programming languages. Jeff suggested the committee also needs to look at the current website to decide what needs to migrate over, and then decide what else we want to add. Rick said we need to look at hosting also. We’re currently hosted in two places and we may want to consolidate. He offered to host for free.

Policies - At the very least we need to update the policies to merge the functions of the membership and communications committee. Rick also suggested we might want to reconsider the executive Board functions, but Brenda reminded us this is in the bylaws and would be more complicated to change than just updating the policies. Rick felt as though having an executive committee duplicates the full Board and in these days of instant communication, decisions can be arrived at easily. Hal suggested that there’s no reason to lose a tool we have; the president can choose to use it or not. Glenn suggested that we revise the Vice President of Operations functions because it’s become the “King of all committees” and that position shouldn’t also serve as a chair of committees.

Brenda will look at the policies and provide a marked up copy to the Board for the next meeting.

Sergio reminded us that we need to broaden the membership of the committees to include general members, not just Board members. Hal suggested adding a solicitation to the newsletter. Mary suggested adding a solicitation to the web page.

14. Partnerships and Benefits (Rick, Brenda):

The only exclusive benefits available to members are the “News from NARRP” and a discount to the conference. Brenda asked what to do about solicitations to be added to the News from NARRP list from non-members, particularly when the requestor is in a position to provide a benefit to NARRP. Board discussion fell into two areas of discussion. Is there a greater benefit to NARRP to provide this as an exclusive service of membership, or is there greater value in broad distribution?

In the end it was decided to grant access to anyone who asks for it, then follow up with them in six months or so with a membership solicitation and a request that they contact NARRP to keep receiving the newsletter if they don’t choose to sign up for a membership.
15. **NARRP Advocacy – Update (Rick, Glenn, Jeff):**

The committee pointed out that several of our DC connections are leaving and there will be some work to develop new relationships. There is likely to be another face to face meeting in DC for the committee to develop these relationships, once these new staff people are in place.

The committee also needs to work on an AGO implementation paper (with a SCORP slant) once the AGO report is released.

Glenn and Rick have leads on possible audiences for the report.

16. **Update from BLM (Hal):**

The BLM feels the relationship with NARRP has been very beneficial to them. They used the document Glenn prepared on benefits based management to course correct and just last week issued new instructions regarding their land use planning and specifically in focusing development investments in recreation land use management areas. The rules are available on their website (document number IM-2000-004). Contact Hal for a copy.

Like USFS, BLM relies heavily on fees to support their recreation offerings. Their approach to interpreting their authorities has been more conservative than the USFS’ approach, but the loss of that authority would negatively affect their ability to provide services and infrastructure requested by the public.

They’re in the process of developing updated guidance on issuing recreation permits. BLM has also been proactive about implementing carrying capacity numbers and this has been working well for them so far. There are some areas where they have shared management responsibilities with other federal agencies and the decisions of those agencies may influence how BLM interprets carrying capacity on their properties.

They’re still pursuing an agreement with NARRP, pending budget. They’re hearing they are likely to have a CR through 2011. They can’t provide an update on the 2012 budget situation, but keep an eye out for the President’s budget.

In addition to recreation planning they are also taking a look at travel planning to move it out of recreation planning and into landscape level planning since it’s bigger than just recreation. The goal is to move to a system of designated, purpose driven routes.

BLM is losing Gary Marsh, their deputy, who is retiring.
They’re trying to beef up their social science capacity. There’s also a greater interest in visual resources, visitor services and alternative energy development. They’re hearing less about recreation at the Department level to the point where DOI is no longer mentioning it as a priority.

Glenn questions whether NARRP should have a relationship separately with the National Landscape Conservation System group since they’re separate from Hal’s section. Hal thought yes. That section is more focused on preservation than recreation.

17. Review and Update of Strategic Plan (Sergio):

Sergio handed out the plan to review and add updates. See hard copy. Scott suggested making our vision statement more visible on the website.

Update on Accreditation Plan – Sergio was waiting on NRPA to provide guidance and an agreement. This is now completed. NRPA hopes to roll out the program in 2013. Sergio thinks it will take NARRP about a year to develop a recommendation to NRPA. We’ll want to engage our academic partners and engage our membership first. NRPA is hoping that we’ll help develop standards and core competencies, then in the future participate in accreditation process for universities who are applying under recreation planning. Jeff wondered if our expenses were covered. Sergio reminded us that there was a fee associated with the partnership and that when we participate in an accreditation some (all?) of our expenses are covered by us. Sergio suggested this was a point of further discussion with NRPA if we get that far in the process.

We need to come up with three different categories of information: pre-requisites, standards and core competencies. Hal suggested that we look to the agencies that have already developed some core competencies for their professions and invite them to be part of the team. Glenn volunteered to head up contacting the various agency professionals who have been working in this area.

18. Planning Book Update (John):

The next set of chapters is coming along. Jean and Bob offered to help review a chapter. Given the subject matter, it was agreed the next sections should go to the whole Board for review before being released to the public. We need to be careful not to endorse any particular methodology, but to provide a compilation of possible approaches. John was also looking for specific names to serve as peer reviewers. He’s got a possibility for chapter 8 lined up. It was decided to break supply and demand into two separate chapters.

John needs to provide an update to Brenda for the website. John is also suggesting we re-sequence the chapters to get those done first, out. Instead it was suggested those
links could go live first rather than changing the actual chapter order. John would also like to step back into more of an editor role rather than serve as an author. Rosemary will move more to graphics and layout. Bob will review a disk of information that might serve as source material for future chapters.


Up for re-election – President (Rick), VP of Operations (Sergio), Treasurer (John), 3 at-large (Mary, Bob, Heather). Candidates will be solicited four months prior to the conference. Slate needs to be finalized six weeks prior to the conference.

John would like to step away from the Treasurer position and run in an at-large capacity. Mary would like to run for an at-large position. Rick would like to not run again for President in order to provide for fresh leadership, but Rick hasn’t yet decided whether or not he will run for another position and if so which one. Bob also hasn’t yet decided whether or not he will run for another position and if so which one. Heather said she would at least run for an at-large position and might be interested in the VP of Operations position depending on work load at NPS. Floyd is interested in running for an at-large position.

20. Other Issues/New Ideas:

Scott observed that there are other fields that can prepare people for careers in recreation planning that aren’t so specific to recreation (i.e. urban planning) and suggested that there’s also an opportunity for NARRP to grow the organization at the local and localized regional level. Rick and John expressed support for the idea of integrating better with urban planning. Brenda mentioned other organizations that also touch on recreation planning as a piece of what they do.

Jean suggested we might want to partner to offer a parallel track in those organization’s conferences.

It was observed that some organizations provide automatic memberships to students as a way to both grow their membership and provide a service to the profession. Rick suggested we might consider this as a perk for those universities that go through the accreditation process we’re developing.

Items to Explore:

- Sponsor tracks within other conferences e.g. APA; concerns expressed with this is putting too much work on board members.
- Offering free memberships to students e.g., Society of American Foresters offers free memberships to full time students.
Explore new website host; consider the ability to list job postings on the member’s side only of website.

Membership fee structure:
- Consider agency membership of $350 which would include x# of staff; currently $75 first member in an agency and $70 for each additional
- Concern over ability of federal agencies to cover costs to renew individual memberships
- Some restrictions with Memberize.

2012 Conference - Rick and Jen are pursuing a conference for Louisiana. Heather, Sergio and Mary volunteered to be on conference committee. Rick has spoken to the Corps of Engineers and LA State Park director. Possible partners or suggested session topics or presenters included: Louisiana Land Trust, Regional Development Authority, Hatfield-McCoy Trails in W. VA, National Coalition for Promoting Physical Activity, Climate Change.

It was suggested that other associations be considered as future conference partners: OWP, APA, NASORLO, National Association of Environmental Professionals, George Wright Society, Scenic Byways, ASLA, and the Rocky Mountain Land Use Institute was suggested.

21. Revisit Budget (John):

MOTION: John made a motion that when the check from River Management Society ($26,600 for conference proceeds) is received next week, $2,000 be moved to the Endowment and $24,600 be moved to general operating funds. Bob seconded. Motion passed.

Discussion took place regarding holding such a large balance in checking account. The discussion was on if we should not put some money into a short term CD or other investment vehicle that would get us a better return.

MOTION: Sergio made a motion that would grant the Finance Committee permission to reallocate a portion of the General Operating Funds to take advantage of short term higher interest earning account. John seconded. Motion passed.

Next Board Meeting

The November 9, 2010 board meeting is cancelled.

Next board meeting: December 14, 2010

Rick adjourned the mid-year board meeting at Bastrop at 3:00 pm (CDT)