Board Members present:
Allison Warner (President), Marnie Criley (Executive Vice President), Josh Jensen (Program Vice President), Frank Reckendorf (Treasurer), Jim Hallett (Publications and SERI Regional Representative), Adrien Elseroad (Director at Large Position 1), Alaine Sommargren (Director at Large Position 2), Barry Southerland (Director at Large Position 3), Betsy Bermingham (Secretary), Alex Thomas (Treasurer of UW chapter), Ali Wick (Emeritus President)

I. INTRODUCTIONS

II. BOARD ADMINISTRATION

A. Treasurers Report

Frank discussed a few handouts, including:

i. The 2010 financial report, which outlined expenses, revenue, investment allocation and performance.
   a. Frank explained that the investment expenses shown on this handout relate to an endowment fund that was started in 2008. The original investment was approximately $41,000, an additional $12,500 was added to the fund, and to pay penalties associate with the Lynwood conference $10,000 was deducted. At the end of 2010 the endowment has reached approximately $47,600, with an overall net gain of 5.2%. Overall the investments have provided a modest return greater than the S&P 500 and 7/10 Treasury Indexes. Jim explained to new board members that the goal was to build the endowment for scholarships and grants.
   b. Frank reviewed the investment allocations and noted that in 2010 he started to redirect resources into commercial bonds with the first due in 2012 and the second in 2014 with 5% yields to maturity. These are conservative investments; in order for SERNW to forfeit this 5% gain, the firms that were invested in must go bankrupt.
   c. Our investment team includes Sound Investments as our advisor and Charles Schwab manages our stocks.

ii. An SERNW Travel Expense Reimbursement Voucher form.
   a. To be reimbursed for travel expenses, this form must be submitted directly to Frank for payment.

iii. A financial report for 2011, illustrating current net worth, expenses and revenue for the first six months of 2011 plus projected expenses and revenue.
   a. The projection for 2011 is a deficit of $4,530.
   b. The six month teleconference costs for 2011 reached $629; this is twice the total 2010 teleconference costs. The projected cost of this item for the whole year is $1,000. Other projections included $2695 for board member travel to Seaquest, SERI representative travel of $500, Accountant expenses of $700, a planned P.O.
Box for $360 and insurance and investment expenses of $245 and $180 respectively.

B. Options for addressing the 2011 deficit

i. Since a bipartisan deficit reduction commission will only lead to SERNW’s demise (©), Frank proposed:
   a. Asking board members to absorb Seaquest travel expenses if possible
   b. Decreasing the number of teleconferences for the remainder of 2011
   c. Deferring the P.O. Box until 2012
   d. SERNW board member making sure their dues are current
   e. Transferring funds from the Money Market portion of the endowment to the check book to make up the difference.

ii. The board discussed these options. There is interest in reducing teleconference expenses through free or low-cost (Skype) conference call options. The free options would mean long-distance fees for non-cell phone users, Adrien suggested that covering the long distance expenses may be cheaper than high cost teleconferencing fees. Barry has a facility that could be used for quarterly meetings (in person) if there is interest. Allison would like to assign this item to Keith who expressed interest at the July monthly call.

iii. One additional question Frank has is how much reserve will be needed for the B.C. 2012 conference.
   a. Barry noted that with conferences there is a liquidity factor to keep in mind, he though an extra $10,000 would provide a good reserve.
   b. Ali said that $100,000 was needed to run the board and the conference, the joint conference team is halfway to this goal.
   c. Frank asked if there is any need for board members to travel to Victoria to evaluate event spaces. Ali said that we already have on-site representatives in B.C. so she doesn’t anticipate a need for this. Ali also explained that SERNW usually does not pay travel expenses for conference travel, though Allison noted we will have a board meeting there and Frank noted that this is allowed.

iv. The board discussed transferring funds from the Money Market and whether the board needed to approve a specific amount or give Frank authority to decide. The board agreed to take out $4500 from the Money Market fund and transfer this to the checking account.

v. Other fundraisers were discussed including workshops during the conference and on off-conference years. Barry and Frank have led this up in the past, they are planning workshops for B.C. but do not anticipate being able to offer any this year. Ali suggested this can be discussed further within the conference program committee

vi. Ali and Josh have also discussed planning a music fundraising event

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. SERNW BC Conference

Ali reviewed the progress to date and next tasks for conference planning.
i. The sponsorship packet is a major step towards conference funding; Ali is currently trying to nail this down. Save the date and conference symposia call for abstract emails have recently been sent out.

ii. The next task is to populate each conference committee and get them started. Ali has a good list of interest members for each committee. After the AFS conference she will be able to reengage folks who are too busy to participate now, a conference call is planned after the AFS conference. Ali’s goal is to have committees start calls on October 15th. A chair for resource and fundraising has not been identified yet. Ali mentioned that AFS hired Erik Knudsen using a rate incentive (i.e. raise 10k and earn 30% of this towards your organization), if Erik isn’t available she has other candidates in mind.

iii. The board discussed committee issues, Adrien asked whether each conference organization will have a representative on each committee or if there will be joint committees. Ali said there will be joint committees and noted that this may make teleconferencing an issue due to the need for international calls. Frank asked whether a B.C. representative for the sponsorship committee has been identified. Ali said she is still looking for the right person; her first choice could not participate. Frank emphasized the importance of communicating with the B.C. organizations soon and asked if Jim would see the B.C. rep at SERI. Ali assured the group that the B.C. organizations are very engaged; she just received an update two days before from them.

iv. Allison asked if the board should have a conference planning committee, Frank would prefer this discussed at monthly board meetings rather than through a new committee. Barry suggested a couple extra board meetings prior to the conference.

v. There was some interest in visiting the conference site and having a face to face meeting with B.C. representatives. Ali noted that the logistics of the event space can be handled by the B.C. groups.

vi. Allison asked if anything else was needed from the board. Ali just wanted to know if any board members cannot commit to more than one committee. Alaine and Frank said they would prefer to just serve on one committee. Ali mentioned that there will be no action items for the board until October.

B. SER GB Proposal

Barry reported on the status of the SER Great Basins proposal

i. Barry thanked all the board members that provided comments. The proposal would affect four counties in SERNW’s jurisdiction. SERNW’s proposal is to keep all areas outside of the Great Basins eco-region as SERNW.

ii. The delineation of SERNW versus SERGB district extents was based on counties as well as eco-regions. Adrien noted that the original GB proposal contained forested areas in addition to shrub steppe habitats; she provided a modified boundary with the forested areas removed from the GB’s area. Allison noted that Caroline at SER has said that the debate over jurisdictions based on counties versus eco-regions is still being worked through by SER. We have not heard back from SERGB yet on the proposed changes.

iii. There was a discussion on holding a joint conference with the GB chapter, Ali suggested engaging them now but Jim pointed out they aren’t yet recognized as a chapter.

IV. RECURRING BUSINESS

A. Strategic Planning Group
Adrien reviewed the Strategic Planning Group’s work to date and upcoming tasks

i. Adrien explained that the Bing group is now the Strategic Communications Team. Adrien is the chair and Allison and Jim are also on the committee.

ii. The goal of this group is to communicate to members and provide outreach towards expanding membership.

iii. One of the first tasks was to initiate email blasts that provide outreach to members over the web and encourage them to access the SERNW website. There was a general discussion about topics for these blasts, including restoration highlights and book reviews. Allison compiled the first email blast, she would prefer if this responsibility was rotated throughout the strategic planning group. The group would like further restoration highlights to come from SERNW members. Frank asked how the highlights were received. Jim said that we have had more hits on the website and more “likes” on Facebook since the email blast was sent out.

iv. Other ideas for engaging SERNW members included giving non-monetary lifetime achievement awards for restoration work, profiling local ecologists throughout SERNW’s region, including graduating students’ research abstracts, advertising webinars, having board committees provide updates (one committee per month).

v. Frank and Jim agreed that we will need to include time for editing the blasts as there were a few issues with the last highlight.

vi. Barry noted that he would be interested in being on the Strategic Planning committee in the future; he is especially interested in the fundraising aspect of this work.

B. Grants Committee

Barry discussed the work and objectives of the Grants committee made up of himself, Adrien and Frank. Barry also provided a handout that covers key issues.

i. The objective of the grants committee is to administer a funding source for students that can help meet SERNW’s primary goals and objectives. The grants program allows SERNW to reach out to key groups. Barry discussed the importance of engaging students early on, which can provide encouragement towards restoration fields.

ii. Barry discussed the eligibility criteria and went over the student research grant rubric.

iii. An issue to discuss further is the limit of grant funding; this is a conversation that needs to happen between the treasurer and the board.

iv. A Grant review committee will be needed. The need for setting categories for review based on amount of money awarded was discussed.

v. The final step in the grant process is the feedback mechanism – reporting back on outcomes, did it help primary goals? A report for email blast would be appropriate related to this element.

vi. Some items discussed by the board included the need for grantees to report back on their research, Barry suggested this could be added to the rubric and student research could contribute to restoration highlights. Ali noted that part of the rubric a few years ago was to require recipients to be on the following years grant review committee.

vii. Alex asked why age was included within the eligibility criteria. Barry explained that it was included with the notion that a grant may not be appropriate for a nine-year old for example. However youth programs such as the boys and girls scouts have provided excellent researchers in the past.
viii. Barry noted that a final rubric will be available for review by the board in the next few months.

ix. Allison asked if there will need to be a grant selection committee, Barry answered that this will be necessary.

C. Student Guild Update

i. Alex joined us from UW. Allison mentioned that Keith is establishing a guild at Portland State University. She asked if a Montana chapter has been engaged, Marnie has not engaged them yet.

ii. Alex gave an update on the UW chapter. The group has a restoration site on campus that they work on 2-4 times a quarter; the ESRM100 professor and his students are engaged in this endeavor. While the guild only has about 12 members, they usually have at least 40 people at restoration events. They have done good work and impressed the UW grounds department, they are hoping they will have a new site soon. Last year they also co-founded a talk by Jack Nesbitt on campus, which filled one of the larger lecture halls. At the start of the next school year the focus will be on promoting the society.

iii. Betsy suggested checking in with the Landscape Architecture department for members and possibly partnering with Daniel Winterbottom’s undergrad design/build class. Alaine mentioned checking in with the Center for Urban Horticulture and Biology. The Geography Program in the Environment may be another avenue for members.

iv. Alex is also interested in setting up a panel discussion with local restoration leaders, he has spoken with Lisa Kuranee of the Friends of the Cedar River Watershed about this idea. The board agreed this is a great idea and encouraged him to solicit the network for panelists. Alex would also be interested in any handout materials to promote SERNW, especially the primer. Allison and Caroline can help with this.

D. SER Representative

Jim went over the latest updates from our parent organization (SER)

i. There was a chapters meeting call a few weeks ago. Jim explained that SER’s staff has grown from 2 to 6 people and has moved from Arizona to Washington D.C. The upcoming Mexico conference is the first event organized by this larger set of staff.

ii. A few growing pain issues have been identified. One is the need for a new membership database that is tied to the website. SER has hired a consultant to rebrand the organization; this will mean a new website in 9-12 weeks. Since SERNW’s website is tied to the parent website, we will need to move to the new system too.

iii. The international organization has about 2,000 members, which is low compared to other organizations. One remedy that will be employed is to restructure members so there are just three membership levels; this will mean that the basic membership fee will increase slightly to $50. Because of the concern over membership numbers, SER has made some suggestions for how chapters consider membership. If SERNW membership but not SER INT membership will no longer be an INT associate member.

iv. SER is developing a “restorationist” certificate program that will be rolled out in 2013. Frank was concerned about the structure of this program and transparency within the SER membership, Jim has not seen any detail on this yet and could not comment.

v. Jim noted that one of the issues with the SER journal that has been identified is that it is primarily used by academic members and much less so by practitioners. There is a potential
initiative to develop another communication mechanism specifically for those practicing in the field; Jim will be able to give more detail after the next SER meeting.

V. BOARD ASSIGNMENTS

A. Academic Counsel and membership engagement discussion
   i. Jim explained the Academic Counsel and its relationship with the Bing group. The counsel has lost many of its members who had made contacts with potential academic members. Jim has a list of interested academics but does not have a mechanism to communicate with them.
   ii. Frank noted that there is a growing disconnect between academics and practitioners. The board discussed the issue and ideas to help fix this. Jim noted that one aspect of the counsel is to facilitate temporary student employment during the breaks.
      a. Alex noted that a list of internships, research opportunities sent to the undergrad list serves would really help students and help reengage these relationships. Allison noted that the GRN network might provide a way to facilitate this. Betsy suggested that a note at the end of each SERNW newsletter soliciting these announcements could be sent to her and then relayed to department list serves.
      b. Another idea for facilitating academic research was to archive and make searchable restoration highlights by ecosystem type that could be used by students.
      c. Adrien suggested a restoration question included in each newsletter with answers to the question compiled and included in the following newsletter. Josh noted that he has used LinkedIn for this purpose. Adrien asked if this could be added to the Facebook page. Jim thought it might make the page too busy (Facebook is predominately being used for event announcements). Adriene asked if there is interest in creating a listserv for this purpose. Allison noted that this would need a moderator.
      d. Alex brought up his interest in organizing a panel discussion with practitioners and academics. The board agreed this would be a great event. Frank suggested the topic of engineered log jams; Barry and Frank have been compiling monitoring results on installations. Alex will begin work at the start of school; he is hoping that the event could be held in winter quarter. Allison noted that she would be interested in helping with this initiative.
      e. Alaine noted that there is a lot of interest in half-day continuing education workshops. Is there interest and energy in holding these? Josh was interested but thought this would be more feasible after the conference. Betsy suggested an informal brownbag format.

B. General Committee Assignments
   i. Board Development: Marnie and Betsy
      a. Allison will contact Hem to see if she would be available for this committee as well.
   ii. Programs – Conferences: Josh and Ali
   iii. Website: Jim and Betsy
   iv. Academic Council: Jim, Alex (for UW engagement)
a. Allison would like Keith to be involved as well.

v. Grants: Barry
   a. A Grant Selection Committee will be needed, Barry will send out final rubric in next few months.

vi. Strategic Communications: Adrien, Allison and Jim

vii. Restoration Highlights: Hem, Ray and Alaine

VI. BOARD MEETING SCHEDULE FOR REMAINDER OF 2011
   i. The next board meeting is scheduled for September 20th.
   ii. Frank asked if monthly meetings are necessary. The board generally agreed that they were needed; Allison suggested that Frank provide a treasurer’s report quarterly instead of monthly.

VII. ACTION ITEMS
   i. Frank will transfer $4500 from the Money Market account to the checking account.
   ii. Allison will contact Keith to check-in on conference call options.
   iii. Barry will finalize the grant committee rubric.
   iv. Allison and Caroline will provide Alex with more SERNW primers for student outreach.
   v. Another Restoration highlight is needed – Allison will receive submissions this month and forward to the committee.
   vi. Allison will finalize committee assignments.