



APA Colorado Board Meeting

MINUTES

Friday March 4, 2016

**Aurora Chamber of Commerce
14305 E Alameda Avenue
Suite 300, Conference Room A
Aurora, CO 80012
(Westerra Credit Union Building)**

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m.

Roll call:

Present:

Stan Clauson, President
Michelle Stephens, President Elect
Jessica Ibanez, VP External Affairs
Leah Dawson, Secretary/Treasurer
Sarah Davis, Professional Development Officer
Russ Forest, Southwest Area Representative
Wade Burkholder, South Central Representative
Anna Gagne, Central Mountain Representative
Tamra Allen, Northwest Area Representative
Scott Bressler, Metro Representative
Susan Wood, Legislative Committee Co-Chair
Eric Heil, Legislative Committee Co-Chair
Lorin Crandall, Student Representative
Jonathan Cappelli, EPP Co-Representative
Julio Iturreria, Western Planner Representative

Staff: Shelia Booth, Chapter Administrator

Absent:

Carrie Makarewicz, Faculty Representative
Seth Lorson, North Central Representative
Anthony Avery, EPP Co-Representative
Libby Tart Schoenfelder, Metro Representative
Nate Currey, VP of Communications
Paul Rosenberg, Public Official Representative

Guests

1. Opening Remarks – Stan Clauson, President

Stan welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked Paul for organizing the venue even though he was absent.

a. Introduction Lorin

Stan introduced Lorin Crandall, the new Student Representative, noting that Lorin did the videos for the 2015 awards reception. Stan summarized that David McWilliams had stepped down due to his heavy spring course load. Lorin introduced himself, stating that he was a first year MURP student at UC Denver. Lorin will be fulfilling the remainder of David’s term until the students hold their officer elections in May.

b. 2016 Colorado FAICP Inductees

Stan congratulated the Chapter for getting three new FAICP inductees in 2016. The three inductees, all from the western slope, are:

- Curt Culbertson, President, Design Workshop

- Julie Ann Woods, Snowmass Village Community Development Director; and
- Cindy Houben, Pitkin County Community Development Director

The three will be inducted in Phoenix during the APA National Conference. Stan summarized that Colorado hasn't had any inductees in several years and he was pleased with the outcome.

c. 2016 Karen B Smith Award

Stan then informed the Board that the Chapter had won the 2016 Karen B. Smith Award. Stan read the letter he had received from the Chapter President's Council Executive Committee announcing the award for Outstanding Service to Members. Susan said she was at the CPC Executive meeting but recused herself from voting on the award. She informed the Board that the CPC had positive things to say about the Chapter as a whole and that APA Colorado is viewed as a strong chapter. They felt the application was strong and they specifically mentioned the new Plan Finder tool as being innovative and great. Stan closed by stating that receiving the award was like bringing the award home since Karen was an Aspen planner. The award will be presented on Tuesday April 5th from 9:30-10:45 during the Leadership Honors event.

d. Appointment of 2016 Chapter Delegates

Stan reminded the Board of the email he had sent out to them and the email that Shelia had sent out to the membership requesting volunteers to represent Colorado at the delegate assembly. He informed the Board that the two delegates from the Board were Eric and Wade, and the two delegates from the membership were Derrick Webb, Regional Planner, Denver Regional Council of Governments and April Getchius, Town Manager, Town of Timnath.

e. Change to May Meeting Date

Stan said Shelia will be going to Mexico the first week of May and instead of having Leah be responsible for the Board packet and minutes, he suggested moving the meeting back a week to May 13th. The consensus from the Board was to move the May meeting from the 6th to the 13th. Shelia will contact Seth to ensure that the Fort Collins venue will be available for that date.

Lastly, Stan informed the Board that he will be asking them to reconsider their vote from February regarding the conflict of interest on the Plan4Health RFP. He said he would explain the request later in the meeting.

2. Secretary/Treasurer's Report – Leah Dawson, Secretary/Treasurer

Leah stated that the February minutes were not included this month as Shelia had not gotten them finished. Both the February and March minutes would be provided at the April meeting.

a. February 2016 Financial Report

Leah stated that the Chapter had \$146,503.24 in total assets with \$57,587.28 in checking and \$88,500.40 in savings. She noted that the decrease from the February statement was due to the disbursement of the \$57,750 to Eagle County for the Plan4Health grant. She then informed the Board that the February income was \$14,554.10 with expenses of \$8,500.40 for a net income of \$6,053.70. She concluded stating that the largest income in February was the 4th Quarter 2015 membership rebate from APA in the amount of \$14,349.70. Leah asked for questions and hearing none asked for a motion to approve.

Motion by Eric to approve the February financial report as presented

Second by Susan

Discussion: none

Vote: unanimous

3. Chapter Administrator Report - Shelia Booth, Chapter Administrator

a. 2016 Colorado Springs Conference

Shelia informed the Board that the Local Host Committee had met the previous Wednesday. She summarized some of the mobile tour ideas including Garden of the Gods, Air Force Academy, Woodland Park, Manitou Springs, downtown Colorado Springs, natural disasters (fire, flood & landslides) and a wind farm. She noted the call for sessions had been extended by the Professional

Development Committee to March 11th. Sarah informed the Board that to date they had received 35 session proposals.

b. 2016 Sponsorship Assignments

Shelia informed the Board that no additional sponsorships had been received to date. She asked the Board to submit five organizations to contact.

c. 2017 Telluride Conference

Shelia said that two of the contracts had been signed but she was still awaiting revisions to the third. She hoped to have all contracts signed and submitted the week of March 7th.

d. 2018-2022 Conference Venue Options

Shelia stated that once the Telluride contracts had been finalized, she would be looking to book future venues. She told the Board about the promotion from Vail Resorts, offering rebates up to 6% back on lodging and 10% back of food and beverage if you book their resorts. Shelia stated the resorts offered were Vail, Beaver Creek, Breckenridge and Keystone. She noted that Beaver Run in Breckenridge was not part of the program. Her suggestion would be to book Vail 3 or 4 years out since the Chapter was just there in 2013, then look at the other venues. She noted that her initial research indicated that Keystone might be the only one of the three that would fit the Chapter's needs. And, even though Keystone doesn't rank high in member's surveys, the conference center is good and the return on investment with the promotion would be hard to ignore. Eric responded that he felt the Chapter should take advantage of the promotion and book two years. He noted that all of the Vail resorts are convenient for the most members since they are located along I-70. The Board agreed that the proposed locations were crowd pleaser locations. Jessica reminded the Board that the Local Host Committee in Vail were enthusiastic and worked hard the last time and even provided several local sponsors. Stan agreed with Eric that the I-70 corridor resorts are convenient to most of the state. Scott inquired if it were possible to book Vail twice and Shelia said yes; however, members in the past have complained when we booked the same resort too frequently. Members commented about booking Steamboat Spring five years apart. Jessica commented on the fact that the new registration numbers were reducing the number of locations we could book and repeat bookings may become the standard if attendance continues to hold or grow. Shelia stated that she would still seeking input from the local planning departments on their interest in helping host the event. The consensus was to move forward with booking the Vail resorts, utilizing the promotion.

e. National Reception

Shelia stated she had sent out a "Save the Date" email and hoped to have the actual event invitation sent out the week of March 14th, or as soon as registration closes and she can get the final list of attendees form each state. She will be working on the menu next week.

f. Transportation Symposium

Shelia said the sessions for the Symposium had been selected by the review committee and notifications were being sent out to confirm the speakers. She will be forwarding the proposals to the Sarah for review by her and/or the Professional Development Committee. She asked Susan if she would work on getting the keynote speaker's session submitted. Susan discussed the event's keynote speaker.

4. Old Business

Michelle informed the Board that the Strategic Plan update and Work Program had stalled but she planned to have them ready for discussion at the April meeting.

a. Colorado Land Use Law Book Contract – Eric Heil, Legislative Committee Co-Chair

Eric reminded the Board of the previous discussion regarding Bradford Publishing and CLE. Bradford went out of business and sold to CLE. Although the Bradford contract allowed transfer and didn't specify that a new contract be drafted, Eric and Stan felt that a new one between APA Colorado and CLE would be beneficial to both organizations. Eric reviewed the draft contract with the Board highlighting a few changes. He stated that the 9th edition had been completed and that

the book is updated every three years. He had suggested this 3-year update be included in the contract. He then stated that in the Bradford contract, APA Colorado received royalties of 10% on print sales and 20% on digital sales and authors were provided a \$5000 stipend. The new contract removes the \$5000 stipend as it was never paid anyway. He also suggested an increase to 15% on printed sales but keeping the 20% on digital sales. In his experience, he noted that most people are ordering digital versions so the 15/20 seemed fair. Lastly, the member discount was increased from 23% to 40%. He has forwarded the proposed revisions to CLE and is awaiting their feedback.

Eric then discussed CLE's proposal to allow all APA Colorado members to receive a free copy of the book as a member benefit. However, he countered that Chapter members were probably the majority of our customers and that might affect the sales royalties. She stated that in a typical year, the Chapter receives around \$150 - \$150 in royalties so either way it wouldn't drastically affect the Chapter's financial budget.

Susan said that in the past, the Chapter received a free box of 12-24 books to give away or sell. Shelia stated that she displays them at the conference and sells one or two each year. Eric responded that the current contract stipulates the Chapter receive 12 but he could request more. Stan asked Eric if he were asking the Board for authorization to enter into the contract or just comment on the changes. Eric said he was seeking comment but would accept Board authorization to move forward if they were inclined. Julio asked if we had a direct link to CLE on the website to promote the book and Shelia replied no but that she would look into it after the contract was finished. Stan asked the Board if they wanted to authorize Eric to finalize the contract or bring it back. Susan stated that she felt the 40%-member discount was acceptable but did not want to include a free digital version as it might have a negative impact on publication. Eric read from the contract, stating that if sales fall below 100 a year, then CLE doesn't have to provide quarterly payments; they would still publish the book. Eric will ask CLE if book sales fall due to free digital version, how it would affect publication.

***Motion by Sarah to authorize Eric to negotiate and execute the CLE publishing contract
Second by Leah***

Discussion: Lorin asked if professors are giving a free copy and Stan replied no.

Vote: unanimous

b. Plan 4 Health Update – Shelia Booth, Chapter Administrator

Shelia reviewed the summary. She noted the group is seeking a new RFP and had slight modifications to the original proposal due the timeliness of getting the grant completed by September. She then asked the Board if they would like to continue receiving the monthly updates or if they would like to have in an in-person update every few months. Stan suggested continuing with the monthly written updates, but have someone come to one or two meetings in person to provide a summary. Shelia suggested one be at the Avon meeting in July and she would work with them to determine another date to attend in person or by conference call.

Sarah then asked the Board for its opinion on a session proposal regarding the Plan4Health grant during the 2016 conference versus the 2017 conference. She informed the Board that Katie Haas, grant coordinator had inquired if they should submit a session for this year and highlight the process or wait until next year when they can present the process and results. The Board concluded that a presentation in 2017 was the better option.

c. Water Conservation Legislation – Eric Heil, Legislative Committee Co-Chair

Eric stated that the draft bill was included in the packet and that a bill sponsor has been identified - State Representative Jeni Arndt HD53. The bill was drafted by the legislative bill drafter, comments were provided and some revisions made. The initial draft had some mandatory language in it, which has since been removed. The bill is non-mandatory and references the state water plan and provides language enabling water conservation. CML has responded that the language was different than they had expected and they are weary that it will morph into something mandatory. CCI has stated that will oppose the bill because someone on their board is opposed to all water conservation. Eric then said that at some point the bill will get scheduled for hearings and anyone interested in attending and testifying should contact him. Russ asked what the commitment would

be and Eric stated it would involve speaking for approximately two to three minutes, followed by questions. Those attending may be waiting a while. Eric also made a plea for the Board members and Chapter members to make themselves available to their local representatives for comment and questions. Eric and Sol hope to meet with the Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB) since they are the State's lead on water conservation. There are other advocacy groups that are interested in supporting the bill. Throughout the process, the goal is to maintain the good relationship with CML and CCI even if they are not supportive of the bill. Julio asked if there were any reason to go o CML or CCI group meetings and Eric said yes. He noted that CML's policy board and Executive Board meet once a month and the goal is draft a Bill Fact Sheet to present to the various organizations so their legislative representatives and lobbyists are not interpreting it for them. Eric stated that Sol would be available and coaching anyone who shows up to speak on behalf of the bill.

Eric stated that Members and speakers should become knowledgeable of the efforts already in place in our state for water conservation. He followed up that the Bill Fact Sheet can be used as a "Call to Action" for the Chapter. Eric then stated that the consensus from the committee was that making the bill a mandate when there are not standards in place would be difficult. Russ asked what the benefit is of presenting a bill with no mandate, and Eric replied that it's a small incremental step for the future of water conservation. He noted that most communities update their master plan ever 5-10 years and by adding this language to the statute, it's a reminder that water conservation is a priority and important topic to address. Eric stated that changes to the statute to add water conservation language are worthy of mention just like the current language mentions parks. He said the language is enabling communities to adopt policies that tie development to water conservation.

Shelia inquired when the Committee would be needing her assistance to get the draft bill and Call for Action out to the membership. Eric said they would shoot for next week.

Julio then directed the Board's attending to the wording in lines 17 & 18. He said that the term "location extent" typically refers to public utility and some might get confused. Eric countered that that the only changes proposed were those marked out and all other language was existing and would remain. Julio suggested they consider correcting terminology in this section with this bill if possible.

5. New Business

a. THUD 302B Letter – Stan Clauson, President

Stan informed the Board that he had received an email from APA to the Chapter President's asking each Chapter to sign a letter in encouraging congress to provide the highest funding available to THUD. Upon reviewing the request and letter, Stan discussed the request via email with a few Board members and they agreed that the letter was consistent with the Chapter's adopted goals and Stan signed the letter and submitted it.

b. Partnership Goals – Jessica Ibanez, VP External Affairs

Jessica summarized her request to the Board. She stated that she was asking the Board for feedback regarding Chapter partnerships with for-profit organizations. She reminded the Board that the last time the issue was before them, was with the initial proposal for the Plan Finder tool. At that time, the Bard wasn't comfortable with a partnership with a for-profit organization and the company's logo being on the Chapters website. Ultimately, the Chapter applied for a CPC grant, was awarded it and the page was developed.

Recently, a consultant contacted her to discuss becoming an official partner with APA Colorado. The partnership would be detailed in an agreement and would offer highlight proposed benefits to the for-profit company and Chapter members. The consultant is proposing to offer Chapter members a discount on services in exchange for the Chapter recognizing and endorsing them as an official partner in emails and on the website. The consultant also mentioned working with them on webinars to highlight their product. Jessica said she had reached out to APA National to see if they had a policy on this and they said they do not, but it is on their list of things to do. Jessica then

discussed the pros and cons of partnering with for-profit companies. She said that if the Chapter partners, then it is endorsing one company over the other and possibly one member over another. Non financial partnerships may also cannibalize the Chapter's sponsorship which is a major part of its income each year. Susan asked if Jessica had provided the consultant with sponsorship information. Jessica replied that she did and the consultant indicated he wasn't interested in the sponsorship packages as he felt their company would get lost in a pool of sponsors. He felt that the packages did not provide a direct benefit to his company.

Jessica said she felt the Chapter was not sophisticated enough at this time to do partnerships like that being proposed. She said she also felt that the Chapter and Board should focus on completing the partnerships with core allies first before moving on to for-profit groups. Susan said he agreed and she thought it was good to be thinking about this issue now, possibly drafting a policy on the topic, making sure for-profit partnerships are transparent, and that its clear why the Chapter would enter in to one with a for-profit company. However, she countered that even with a clear policy it could seem like the Chapter is favoring one over the other. Stan then offered a situation where a company such as ESRI were to request endorsement/partnership. He offered that if ESRI were to offer Chapter members a 20% discount in return for Chapter endorsement, it could be a significant benefit to the members and might be worth considering. Shelia noted that the Chapter doesn't currently endorse its Elite sponsors and Stan countered that in a way it does because we allow them to speak at the conference before a keynote. Susan stated the issue doesn't seem to be cut and dry and maybe the Board should look at drafting a policy. Russ stated he felt there is a difference between an endorsement and a strategic alliance. He said that if it is a positive benefit for membership as a whole, then we should consider it.

Jessica said she could negotiate with the consultant at hand and bring the proposal to the Board. Stan then addressed the Board stating that the question before them is if they want to say no to for-profit partnerships, consider them on a case-by-case basis, or use this current proposal to flesh it out at a future meeting. Eric said he would like to see the Board focus on partnerships with nonprofits. Julio offered the public sector policy, which is that no recommendations are ever given, not even lists of consultants. Russ said that CCMA has a policy that allows "strategic partners" but they will do not endorse or partner for for-profits. CCMA "strategic partners" are similar to a sponsor. Russ asked if they would be putting the Chapter's logo on their emails and website and Jessica said yes. He concluded that doing so would seem like we're endorsing them. Susan asked Stan if drafting a policy on this issue is something he thinks the Board should spend its limited time and resources doing. Sarah offered that the Chapter wait to see how National handles it when they get to it. The Board consensus was that its time would be better spent working with allied groups and fostering those relations and partnerships.

Motion by Eric not to engage or pursue partnerships with for-profit organizations.

Second by Russ

Discussion: none

Vote: Unanimous.

Stan offered that Michelle could put this issue on the Work Program for consideration in future years.

Stan then informed the Board that he was asking them to reconsider its vote on the conflict of interest issue at the February meeting. He stated that procedural steps require that the vote to reconsider must be done at the meeting immediately following the original vote, and the motion made to reconsider must be done by a person voting in the affirmative on the original vote. Stan then relayed his discussion with Jim Peters, FAICP, Ethics Officer. Mr. Peters was hired by APA because the AICP Committee wanted to have an established process and point person for ethical issues. Mr. Peters chairs the AICP Ethics Committee.

Stan said he relayed the history of the Plan4Health Grant, the RFP announcement and application process, and the decision by the Board regarding Board member's conflict of interest in applying for the RFP associated with the grant. Stan stated that Mr. Peters said he didn't see a potential violation of the AICP Code of Ethics in any way. Mr. Peters said that if a Board member were acting

under private knowledge that was not generally available to the public, then it would be a violation; however, in this case everyone applying for the RFP was on a level playing field, having been provided the same information. In addition, the RFP was advertised to the public and not just the Board. Mr. Peters felt that as presented, the action could not be a conflict of interest with respect to the AICP Code of Ethics. Mr. Peters then stated that he thought the situation and question were interesting and that a decision like this would have a negative effect on the private sector planners being willing to volunteer on APA boards, especially if that person's firm was denied the possibility of bidding on RFPs. He went further to state that it might even affect sponsorships as that might be considered an extension of that kind of thinking.

Mr. Peters then noted that the Chapter may have erred when it deleted the responsibility of the PDO to review ethical questions. Stan noted that at one time, a Board member stated that the only person who can advise on ethics matters is the appointed National officer. However, Stan stated, that the PDO is the point person for ethical issues at the Chapter level.

Mr. Peters relayed to Stan that he would like to have the Colorado Chapter PDO draft an email to him and he would submit the situation to the Ethics Committee in April. Mr. Peters will be asking the Committee for an advisory ruling. Stan informed the Board that the advisory rulings are considered amplifications of the AICP Code of Ethics. In many cases the Code doesn't drill down to the matter and advisory rulings are in place as a guide.

Stan concluded that for all the previously discussed reasons and because another private sector Board members has expressed interest in his/her firm applying for the second RFP from the Plan4Health Colorado grant, he would ask the Board reconsider the February vote, then immediately table the item until after the Ethics Committee has reviewed the issue and Mr. Peters has responded with their decision.

Susan said she did vote in the affirmative at the last meeting and would like to make the motion to reconsider since APA has a strong ethics code and the proposed process is a good way to resolve the conflict.

Motion by Susan to reconsider the February motion concerning the code of ethics violation (Item 5.a. vote #2) and directing the PDO to draft a letter to the Ethics Officer and the Ethics Committee

Second by Jessica

Discussion: Eric said he agreed and reminded the Board that some of the concerns mentioned by Mr. Peter were also mentioned at the last meeting. Eric then stated he would like to work on the letter with the PDO since he wanted to ensure the Colorado non-profit rules were stated within it. He reminded the Board that APA Colorado is a non-profit, it is subject to the State's non-profit rules, and those rules should be considered as part of the re-review. He stated he would request a disclosure regarding the rules and that the Board should eventually adopt some kind of guidance on this issue. The Board concluded the overall guidance would prove the best way for representative to serve on the Board and committees without burdening them. Russ asked if the letter could have the Committee consider a disclosure policy and Eric said he would suggest something to them.

Vote: Unanimous

Stan stated that the item was now up for consideration. He then asked for a motion to table the reconsideration.

Motion by Eric to table the reconsideration

Second by Sarah

Discussion: none

Vote: unanimous

Susan said the Ethics Committee is revising some of the rules and are requesting comment from members. The request and link were included in the latest *Interact* email.

The Board then did a brief discussion on the role of the PDO in reviewing and deciding ethical matters. It was clarified by Stan, based on his conversation with Mr. Peters, that if there is an ethics complaint, it should be directed to the Ethics Officer, Jim Peters. If it's a matter of understanding what the considerations are, then the PDO is the point person to help provide guidance.

6. Committee Updates:

a. APAS Student Committee – Lorin, Student Representative

Lorin said they have three professional development events coming up. On Friday March 11th, APAS will be hosting a student-professional speed networking event. The event will provide resume review and Q&A with a professional planner. He stated they are still looking for professionals to come help from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. He then moved on to the spring Job Shadowing program. Hosts will be contacted to make sure they are still interested and asked to identify time between April 1st and August for the actual shadow. Students are then required to contact their host or lose their spot. Lorin then stated that on April 1st from 1:00 – 5:00 p.m. the College of Architecture will be hosting its career fair. He stated they would love to have some planning agencies and private firms participate. He then concluded his update stating that on March 17th there will be a joint event WTS to discuss the I-70 project. Lorin then said the Student Sustainability Committee is working on an energy panel for some time in April. They hope to focus discussion on how planners can play a role to upgrade infrastructure.

b. Awards Committee – Anna Gagne, Committee Chair

Anna said the Call for Nominations will be distributed the week of March 7th and close on April 1st. She stated there were no changes to categories or descriptions from the previous year. Jessica asked Anna to consider including the new FAICP inductees and the Chapter's Karen B Smith Award during the Awards reception at the conference.

c. Emerging Planning Professional – Anthony Avery & Jonathan Cappelli, Committee Co-Chairs

No report.

d. Healthy Communities Initiative Committee – Susan & Libby

No report.

e. Legislative Committee - Eric Heil & Susan Wood, Co-chairs

Susan stated that she had emailed the Board a commentary and summary for discussion. APA's Legislative and Policy Committee has drafted a Water Policy Guide. She said the draft guide is now available online and they Committee is requesting comment. She noted that the Committee doesn't draft a new policy guide every year but they have been active the past few years. She concluded stating that the Colorado appointed delegates will be presented the guide during the Delegate Assembly in Phoenix. Susan then asked Lorin to have the Sustainability Committee to review and comment on it.

Susan then stated that Jason Jordon, APA's Policy Director, announced the addition of Jeff Bates. Jeff will focus on state government affairs.

Russ asked if there was anything new on Tiff and Eric said the Speaker of the House was not willing to entertain new language. However, there are committees who are still meeting and hoping to submit revised legislation. Shelia then stated that the Committee had set the date for the 2016 Planner's Day at the Capital, which will be April 11, 2016.

f. Outreach & Communications Committee –Jessica Ibanez and Nate Currey, Committee Co-Chairs

Jessica thanked Shelia for getting the newsletter out, noting the new format and asked the Board to provide any comments. She then said she had met with ASLA and they talked about opportunities between the two organizations. Jessica said that they are a smaller organization than

APA Colorado but they are interested in partnering on networking and educational events. They also discussed exchanging newsletter articles.

g. **PIC Review Committee, Eric Heil**

Shelia stated they had a second PIC certification. Eric and Stan said the committee would meet again soon.

h. **Professional Development Committee – Sarah Davis, Committee Chair**

Sarah stated that the Committee had its second conference call and currently has 13 members. She noted that several of the members have been active on the Committee for several years. She then said the Committee had agreed to extend the Call for Sessions one more week to Friday, March 11th at 5:00 p.m. To date, there have been 35 proposals submitted. The Committee decided on the review criteria, which will be a little different than in past years. They added two new criteria: 1) applicability to a broad audience – is it a niche or is it something people can take and apply and 2) does it fit the conference theme.

Sarah then stated she has received 12 rsvp's for the AICP Exam Prep on March 26th She then stated that, in APA National news, they are proposing changes to the ethics standards and additions to CM qualifying events. The AICP Commission is considering CM credits for pro-bono work and volunteering on APA boards, committees, chapters, etc. The pro-bono would be a maximum of 8 hours per reporting period. They felt the additions could be an incentive to get people involved and to give back for member's volunteer time. Sarah concluded by asking the Board to comment on the proposal and that it had been advertised in the Interact email.

Jessica asked about speaker diversity for the conference and Sarah said that the Committee would be looking at that this year.

i. **Sustainability Committee – Libby Tart Schoenfelder, Board Liaison**

Shelia relayed Libby's updated and said the Committee is working on quarterly events. They are in support of the water conservation bill.

7. Board Member Updates: None

Meeting ended at 3:57 p.m.

Motion by Jessica

Second by Susan

Discussion: None

Vote: Unanimous

APPROVED 4-15-16