



# APA Colorado Annual Board Meeting

## MINUTES

---

**Friday March 1, 2013**

**RTD FasTracks Office  
1560 Broadway, Ste. 700  
Denver CO**

**The meeting was called to order by President, Susan Wood at 2:00 p.m.**

### **Roll call:**

#### **Present:**

Susan Wood, President  
Jessica Ibanez, VP External Affairs  
T.J. Dlubac, VP of Communications  
Paul Rosenberg, Public Official Rep  
Jessica Osborne, Metro Representative  
Lor Pellegrino, South Central Representative  
Chris Hawkins, Southwest Representative  
Nate Owens, Student Representative  
Greg Moberg, Northwest Representative  
Kyle Dalton, Legislative Committee Co-Chair

#### **Absent:**

Jeremy Nemeth, Faculty Representative  
Katie Guthrie, Western Planner Representative  
Abby Shannon, Professional Development Officer  
Joe Frank, North Central Representative  
Joni Marsh, Secretary/Treasurer  
Stan Clauson, Central Mountain Representative  
Eric Heil, Legislative Committee Co-Chair  
Erica Heller, Metro Representative

**Guest:** Don Moore

**Staff:** Shelia Booth, Chapter Administrator

### **1. Opening Remarks by Susan Wood, President**

Susan welcomed the Board members and informed them that Shelia would be a few minutes late. She also welcomed APA CO member Don Moore to the meeting.

### **2. Approval/Correction of February 1, 2013 Minutes**

Shelia informed the Board that the February minutes were not completed and would be brought to the Board at the next meeting on March 29<sup>th</sup>.

### **3. Old Business**

- a. **Western Resource Advocates; Water Planning “Roundtable,” Susan Wood**  
Susan informed the Board that she was continuing conversations with WRA and stated the water discussion will have a Front Range focus. Susan asked the Board to look at the list of suggested participants and provide comments.

**Photo Contest.** Susan told the Board that she couldn't get a Fielder photograph donated and offered to write up an overview of the contest and forward it to the regional representatives. The representatives were asked to send the announcement requesting submissions to members in their area. Within the region, the representative would pick a winner from photographs submitted. The regional winners would be submitted to the Board for review and an overall state winner chosen at the March 29<sup>th</sup> Board meeting. Lor asked who could submit the photographs. Susan thought it should only be members, but TJ offered that if

we're getting a photo of good planning maybe it should be open to everyone. Jessica asked if we talked about doing it at our conference and TJ noted that we did discuss that at the previous meeting. Susan noted that there could be first, second, third and honorable mention from each area as well as for the state overall. The top four would be in the state conference contest and/or auction in the fall. Susan will draft the announcement and Shelia will forward it to the representatives.

**b. Awards Committee, Anna Gagne**

Susan welcomed Anna Gagne, Awards Committee Chair, via conference call to the meeting. Anna introduced herself informing the Board that she has been on the Awards Committee for the last four years and when Anne Lane retired she volunteered to take over. Anna gave an overview of the awards process and told the Board she is in the process of recruiting committee members. She noted the current Committee membership is small and the Committee prefers to have representatives from around the state and in various backgrounds. She also noted there was a large turnover in the committee members this year. Anna stated that typically the call for nominees goes out in May and in June the Committee reviews the nominations and notifies the winners. This year, the Committee will be looking at the current awards categories and may make recommendations to change the names. She also acknowledged that in the past the award names have been changed during the review instead of being established before the call for nominees is made public. She addressed the Board's previous concerns regarding conflict of interest stating that in the past, if someone submits an award and is on the Awards Committee, they were not allowed to participate in the conversation. She noted that sometimes that particular nomination was placed at the end of the discussion so that jurors could leave the meeting while their nomination was being discussed.

Jessica I. inquired if the Chapter had ever considered putting the awards review with another APA chapter. Susan noted that it's been mentioned before but hasn't been done. Jessica I. expressed that she thought it would make the review process completely unbiased. Anna said they hadn't discussed it and that ASLA CO had done it, but found there were issues with other state's chapters understanding the regional issues of Colorado. She also thought it might take more coordination to do that.

Deryn asked about eligibility of projects outside the state. Anna said the nomination language says you can submit a project from outside the state but it must relate to an issue in Colorado. She informed the Board that in the last four years, no one has reviewed projects from out of state. Typically the Committee threw them out because they thought they weren't relevant. Susan said she thought the projects should only be Colorado projects because we are APA CO. She said the Awards Committee should explore this further and if we aren't going to accept projects from out of state, then we should change the nomination language. Greg said it depends on what we are giving the award to – the project or the firm. If it's the project, then it should be in Colorado. Chris agreed since the project and/or firm could apply in their own state for an award and our awards should have a geographic limitation. Someone noted that other state APA chapters do accept nominations from other states. TJ suggested a new category for a Colorado individual or firm with a project portfolio that could include projects outside of Colorado. He felt APA CO should celebrate not just Colorado communities but also Colorado planners. Paul inquired if we have given awards to projects that were done by out of state planners and Susan confirmed that we have. Susan expressed agreement that APA CO should recognize the projects in

our state as well as the planners in our state. Susan reiterated her position that it should be a Colorado project but she said the Awards Committee should look at it in detail and come back with suggestions.

Susan asked if Anna had been successful in recruitment thus far and Anna replied that she's only had one new member, Anna said she will be contacting past members and past award winners to recruit members for the Committee.

c. **APA CO Region Map, Chris Hawkins**

Chris summarized the information in the packet and said he looked at the *Planning Matters* newsletter from 1<sup>st</sup> quarter 2010 regarding the proposed change in the region map. He reminded the Board that the revised map was brought up last summer for action, but the Board agreed to table the item while he researched it further. Chris relayed to the Board the responses received from other Chapters regarding how they assign regional representatives, noting the responses were all different. He informed the Board that the national regions are based on population, concluding that at national it's more population based. Chris expressed that he wanted to have a discussion about the mapping policy and review the changes with the Board. He recommended that a subcommittee be formed to look at this more and come up with some options. He felt it would be a mapping and demographic exercises for the subcommittee. He directed the Board's attention to the membership numbers by region provided by Shelia. He stated the subcommittee should have mapping options available before the conference this fall.

Susan reminded the Board that last summer the proposed map would have affected three regions and Chris had questioned why the changes were made. Greg said the original mapping committee was looking at the Front Range, the membership numbers and the disparity in the metro areas. Greg said he joined the original committee because the Northwest region was bisected by Garfield County. Based on his research he found there may have been a problem between the Northwest representative in office at the time, and the APA CO members in Garfield, so they pulled them out. The other issues that came up during the mapping process were distance to training events and having similar planning issues. For instance, a planner in Ouray with his APA CO representative in La Plata had difficulty attending trainings in his own region. Greg noted the focus became on issues within each county and access for members to training and events. Greg noted that today regional representatives are open to allowing members outside their region to attend their events. He also noted that when the map was being review, the Central Mountain and Southwest representatives didn't have much to say because they were going off the board.

Chris agreed that Garfield County doesn't make sense and suggested that two or three Board members get together to talk about the mapping more. Lor questioned if the regional names can be changed, preferring to call them southeast and northeast instead of South Central and North Central.

Susan summarized that the Board wasn't ready to make changes to the map right now and suggested the Board continue the work that Chris started. TJ recommended the Board take a broader look at the map and not rush it. Paul asked if there was ever a discussion about splitting the Denver Metro area geographically into two regions and Jessica O. noted that Erica and she broadcast throughout the entire region and work together. She stated she didn't believe there would be a benefit to geographically divide it. Susan asked if any of

the representatives have had questions/concerns from members about the map. Chris said he hadn't but had heard confusion about if the map had been changed or was going to be changed. Susan stated the Board should form a semi-formal group and asked Chris to head it up. Chris agreed and Susan said it should be primarily regional representatives. Chris stated he would like to have a list of APA CO members by County. He asked Greg to work on the committee and Greg agreed as long as Chris would be the chair. Chris requested participation from someone in the Front Range and Jessica O said she would help and offered to ask Erica as well. Lor agreed to participate. Susan suggested that all regional representatives participate.

Chris said he would start an email exchange. Kyle asked about the scope of the group, concerned that there seemed to be several policy questions. Chris said he sees it as an overall policy consideration and trying to have better distribution of the members to representatives. Greg stated he thought it was a great idea to take a broader look and to try to get it done before the state conference.

Chris asked if there would be a Board meeting at the Western Slope conference. Greg said it's hard to run the conference and attend a Board meeting.

#### **4. Secretary/Treasurer's Report, Joni Marsh**

##### **a. Financial Report for February**

Shelia reviewed the February financial report with the Board, noting there was an income of \$8,825.98 and expenses of \$7,392.28. She suggested adding a line item in the 2014 budget specific to the national conference.

***Motion by Paul to approve the February financial report.***

***Second by Greg.***

***Discussion: none***

***Vote unanimous.***

#### **5. Chapter Administrator Report, Shelia Booth**

##### **a. Vail Conference & Call for Sessions**

Shelia informed the Board that she had completed her first site visit and met with the Local Host Committee (LHC). The LHC began discussing possible themes and have also suggested a bowling tournament for one of our events. LHC members volunteered for the various specific committees and were told to start contacting local sponsors to give them prior notice of the event.

Greg inquired why conference speakers are required to register for the conference. Shelia relayed that the LHC also asked about a registration discount. Greg expressed that if a speaker isn't staying for the entire conference, they shouldn't be required to register. Susan said the Chapter policy has been that speakers have to pay if they are planners but non-planners do not. She also stated that the Chapter offers a one-day registration option as well. The requirement to register is on the documents asking for sessions. The Board questioned if requiring registration might be limiting our speaker submittals. It was suggested to offer a speaker rate. Shelia noted there were several last year who spoke at the conference but didn't pay. TJ inquired if the registration requirement is a financial requirement, and if so could it be off-set with sponsorship. Susan suggested forming a subcommittee to come up with some ideas. Greg stated his thought is that the policy should be that if a speaker is coming they can stay for the day and we won't charge them, but if they stay for the entire time then they must register. Paul said if the impact is only financial, then we raise the registration fee because membership gets the benefit of the

speaker. Jessica O. said some of her colleagues are attending the National conference to present and National requires them to register which is an additional expense to their travel costs. She said her colleagues are becoming disenchanted with APA because of this.

**b. Transportation Symposium**

Shelia noted that the Symposium sessions have been chosen and there are three AICP presenters and planners on the panels. She informed the Board that registration is open and costs \$65. Susan noted there will be a panel discussion with Elizabeth Garner.

Don Moore noted that the state conference has 90 minute sessions and if speakers have smaller presentations they could be combined. He also offered the idea of having mini-sessions of 45 minutes.

Shelia mentioned that the LHC was investigating the idea of doing a tract that would focus on a local or regional problem and involve membership in the solution over the course of the conference. Susan suggested bringing in the national community assistance team for it. Susan also noted that the APA president is in town for the RMLI conference.

**6. New Business**

**a. Synchronized Elections/APA National, Susan Wood**

Susan reminded the Board of last month's discussion about the synchronized elections. National began studying this a few years ago because they felt if elections were all held together they would get a better turnout for National APA elections. She expressed her concern that local members might not vote if it's tied to a National APA election and suggested APA CO will need to encourage involvement to get a good voter turnout. She informed the Board that we currently pay for our elections and would not have to pay for it if handled by National. She stated National's election cycle is close to ours but we would have to shift a little. National requested each chapter and division sign a resolution stating we would participate and if they receive 80% participation they will move forward with it. The change would not affect the 2013 cycle and the Board would have to make changes to its bylaws if the change goes through. Susan read the resolution to the Board and noted a change striking the language regarding taking office.

***Motion by Paul to approve the resolution with the changes noted.***

***Second by Kyle.***

***Discussion: - Deryn asked if this would affect the student election cycle and Nate said it would be tough if they were required to sync as well.***

***Incoming students would only have a couple of months with outgoing Board members. Currently, it's convenient for first year students to run for positions that open in the following fall.***

***Vote: unanimous***

**b. CASTA Partnership Agreement, Shelia Booth**

Shelia summarized the agreement and noted that TJ is the point person on the conference planning. TJ stated he is still looking for speakers and Kyle and Deryn said they would help. TJ told the Board the conference topics he is working on are a) capital improvement planning, b) performance measures and c) one yet to be determined. He reiterated that conference attendees are operators who don't understand the value of planning but MAP 21 forces the issue. TJ asked the Board to forward speakers or topic ideas to him within two

weeks. Susan expressed her concern with the timing of the fall conference but TJ stated that APA CO might not provide the CM credits for the fall conference if it conflicts with our own conference.

***Motion by TJ to approve the partnership agreement with CASTA.***

***Second by Greg.***

***Discussion: none***

***Vote: unanimous***

**c. Emerging Planning Professionals (EPP), Abby Shannon**

Susan introduced Deryn Wagner to the Board. Deryn stated the group has been working on a mission statement and goals and researched similar groups in other states. They also want to distinguish themselves from the student chapter. EPP is planning their official kickoff on March 21<sup>st</sup> and are trying to have a broader outreach and establish a more open process. Susan asked if they want others to come or just emerging planners and Deryn responded that anyone is welcome.

The next step for the group is to set strategic goals about how often they meet and what they want to accomplish. Deryn stated EPP had the idea of developing their own logo, but couldn't according to APA National's branding policy. EPP is asking the Board for support in moving forward. They would like to have an EPP group on LinkedIn, Facebook and the website and believe the group might benefit more by having their own page. TJ stated he was torn on the topic of multiple sites and accounts because having multiple lines of communication doesn't mean *more* communication. He thought it might be more confusing to have multiple websites, Facebook pages, accounts, etc. He stated that the new website might have enough tools to set EPP apart within the framework of one website. He also acknowledged that based on our demographics, most of APA CO members don't follow Facebook so maybe EPP demographics are a better fit for it. Susan noted that EPP is a subset of APA Colorado and should operate under its umbrella. Jessica I. said she would prefer to keep it centralized at first and try the new website. If that doesn't work, then the Board could look at it again. TJ offered to make Deryn an administrator or EPP the administrator of the Chapter's Facebook page.

Jessica I. asked about implementation strategies, and Deryn said they have a few and are trying to work through them and tie into other organizations groups that are similar. TJ noted there seems to be a dual mission to connect young planners to seasoned professionals and to create a network of young professionals. Deryn noted that a mentoring program would be a secondary goal. Susan said National has been researching the fee schedule and have suggested a reduced rate for young planners who are new in their profession because typically, the company doesn't pay for membership. TJ expressed a concern that the group and the meetings not turn into a happy hour. Deryn stated this has already been discussed and one person in the group is very vocal that it not. She said that each event will have a topic for discussion to help avoid that. Lor suggested keeping in touch with the area representatives and find out how many emerging planners are in each region.

***Motion by Greg to approve the proposal with the removal of logo, Facebook and LinkedIn.***

***Second by TJ.***

***Discussion: Paul said if they see the need later for their own accounts and web pages, they should bring it back to the Board.***

***Vote: unanimous***

d. **Combination of Media & Outreach Committees, Jessica Ibanez**

Jessica I. said she and TJ discovered there are several overlaps between the Outreach Committee and Media Committee and decided a super committee would be the way to handle it. They summarized the new committee's proposed charges and stated the next step would be changes to the bylaws and strategic plan. Paul stated he thought it was a good idea and Greg agreed. Susan said if they are separate, there are functions that might be lost if they are combined. She questioned how the chair position would be identified. TJ said it would function like the Legislative Committee with co-chairs. The roles of the two have separate delineations and it would be one committee that has several subcommittees with real tasks. He told the Board that he sees the committee having a pretty strong structure. He confirmed that it hasn't all been flushed out yet but they will continue to work on it. Nate asked if there will be more opportunity for input. Jessica said they haven't established priorities yet and that would be the time for input from others. Nate said he would be interested in advocating for the students. Greg asked if the request was to combine the two committees now or to look at it in more depth. TJ noted that the formal combination would be the bylaw changes. The consensus from the Board was to have them move forward with combining the two into one super committee.

e. **Chapter Administrator 6-Month Review, Susan Wood**

Susan noted that Shelia has been with the organization for 6 months and this coincides well with employee reviews scheduled for the beginning of the year. Susan talked about the review cycle and the documents used to do the review, noting that the budget was approved with a pay rate included. She requested Board members provide feed back by the middle of March, stating that constructive criticisms are welcome. Prior to the next Board meeting, Susan said she would meet with Shelia and have a formal review. At the March 29<sup>th</sup> meeting the item will be discussed and voted on by the Board. If something bears further discussion, Susan recommended the Board members contact Susan to discuss.

**7. Committee Updates:**

a. **Legislative Committee, Kyle Dalton**

Kyle summarized the report, noting there wasn't a change to any positions on any current bills. He then talked about Planner's Day at the Capital on March 25<sup>th</sup>, stating that the notification went out via email and will be on Facebook and the website. The structure of the event has changed with the briefing time being extended. The participants will have the option to meet with their legislator or can opt out. Lor stated she liked the longer briefing and training time and inquired if non-planners can attend the event. Kyle noted that this topic had been discussed and it was decided that non-members can attend at a higher rate this year. Non-members would not be scheduled to meet their legislators. Kyle explained CM credits will be offered for the briefing and hopes that if the Committee is able to make people more comfortable with the process they will be more willing to meet the legislator.

Lor stated she appreciates the updates, but noticed that there doesn't seem to be much happening. Kyle agreed stating this year the focus has been on gun control and other non-planning related issues.

b. **Sustainability Committee, Erica Heller**

No report.

c. **Sponsorship Committee, Erica Heller**

Shelia summarized the recent activity, the status of the flyer and relayed the LHC comments regarding the price being too low and how in-kind donations would be addressed. She said all of these items would be discussed at the next Committee meeting.

d. **PIC Review Committee, Greg Moberg**

Greg noted Eric has agreed to look at all the PIC and APA CO documents.

e. **Media Committee, TJ Dlubac**

TJ stated that he had received 12 proposals for the website. The deadline to submit was the 25<sup>th</sup> with a goal to have the company chosen by this Board meeting followed by a kick off the following week. He informed the Board he wasn't able to make that happen due to schedules and followed up with the companies to push everything back two weeks. He said the new plan is to review the proposals next week and interview the week after. TJ, Jessica I, Shelia, Nate and Kyle agreed to review the proposals. Susan stated she would like to review them, but would not be involved in the interviews unless needed. The recommendation will come to the Board on the 29<sup>th</sup>.

f. **Outreach Committee, Jessica Ibanez**

No additional information to report.

8. **Board Member Updates:**

Nate informed the Board that on March 15<sup>th</sup> from 12 to 2 p.m., the students will host a career fair with mock interviews. They currently have 12 professionals who will come to help out. He stated that if others would like to participate, they are welcome. The event will be at the Webb building. EPP would like to have flyers at the event.

Shelia informed the Board of an email she received regarding a proposed student planning competition in Littleton. She and Jessica I will meet and discuss the event in depth with the organizers in the next week or two. Nate said the next student rep might want to help with the event.

Lor mentioned the South Central event and noted she only had two RSVPs to date. Susan thought it might be worthwhile to reach out to Douglas County and Shelia confirmed that she did email members in Douglas County.

9. **Other Business**

None.

**Board meeting adjourned at 4:28 p.m.**

**APPROVED MARCH 29, 2013 BOARD MEETING**