

Wednesday July 10, 2013 - Annual Business Meeting (Part 1) Called to order 3:45 pm CDT

- **Treasurer's Report – Adnan Akyuz** – Membership Dues (65) collected \$4,760, Annual Meeting registration (80) \$18,710, Extra Ball game tickets (24) \$1,920, and NCDC SCEP Funds (2nd Installment) \$48,722. Total income \$74,112 (First installment was \$33.3K in December). Expenditures Baseball -\$8,000, SCEP -\$46,134.67, Hyatt Regency -\$5,500, Postage Stamps \$18.40, AASC Pins -\$210, Luncheon Speaker Honorarium -\$100, and Hyatt Regency -\$9,770.11 for total -\$69,733.18. Bank account Reg saving \$2.43, Royal Money Market Acct \$120,722.86, Share Draft Acct \$74,124.18 (June 28), PayPal Acct \$407.75 for total available balance \$195,257.22. Annual Mtg cost \$18,710 registration \$900 extra tickets, Hyatt \$15,270 and \$8000 Cardinals. Total in \$20,630; Total Out \$23,270; Balance -\$2640. AASC covered that. What period does dues cover? We ran a negative for the meeting, because we had to make some commitments before we knew what attendance could be, with travel restrictions.
- **Annual Meeting Choice for 2015** – Dennis Today – We started having our meeting selections two years out and wanted to move east, central and west as rotation. We do not currently have any specific formal presentations ready, but a few places in play. New Mexico proposed last year, and still an option. Open for discussion. Next year is 25th anniversary of meeting in Atlantic City, NJ. But transportation is now easier, and the timing is an issue as after third week of June it gets more expensive, maybe Cape May in southern NJ, and a ferry to Delaware. Would also be 125th anniversary of COOP. What time frame would be acceptable? Would June be a problem for anyone – CA yes. But we have had it before in June. Some quarter system schools are still in session 2nd week of June. We may get some more ideas this evening, and perhaps have a proposal tomorrow, otherwise we will defer to doing this over the e-mail. Need to have decision by end of August.
- **Proposal to Restructure the Association** - Stu Foster – Everyone has seen the proposal for restructuring so we would like to discuss it, and get everyone's thoughts. The sense of Exec Comm (SC members not including partners) is that we have an opportunity ahead of us to make some changes that can be beneficial to the organization. We think it is a good recommendation for the organization. Would implement institutional membership and new mission, vision statement, executive director and goals. Don't want to move too far with one proposal and want Exec Director input on some future strategies and objectives. We reworded our vision – view of the world as we would like it to be. Mission - the everyday marching orders to do on a daily basis in pursuit of that vision. Goals support state programs to sustain state offices. Facilitate interaction and collaboration among providers of climate services at the state, regional, and national levels. Champion in-situ climate monitoring networks. We should take that as a priority. Promote research and development of climate products and services in cooperation with stakeholders. Encourage timely and effective communication of climate information at state and local levels. Promote education outreach that increases climate literacy amongst stakeholder communities and the general public. Mission "advancing the discovery, development and delivery"
Vision – national scales, "are informed by" rather than "guided by" and change "information" to some other word.
Mission "climate services" may be too vague. Is this a document for us or for others outside? If for us, we know, but for others, there is a wide variety of definitions.
Mission statement is useful for NWS Climate Services as it defines for them what we do, and what to refer to us. Vision – "climate sensitive decisions". Consistency of local to national or regional scales. As an organization we support our SC offices and we also include regional groups and together we are national. Vision is what we see, and mission is the action we take to get there. Is it our plan to put this up on our website where people can find it? If so, then maybe more clear definition of the terms. What are our expectations for this organization in 5 to 10 years? If we walk down this road, where are we going to end up? If the states choose to invest in this, what can they expect to get from it? What should we be in 5 years, with an Executive Director? Are we a large enough force that we tell our federal partners what we need from them, and have them change some things: USDA, Game and Fish, Forest Service? Can we supply a national perspective? That other agencies will respect our opinion. What agencies would look to us to say? Can they leverage our activities to deliver things they are required to provide? We recognize the need, and next step is to decide what we want to be. This is a two way street where we come to be an equal partner to NOAA. Take the lead. Goal #2. Vision and mission are generally good, but the goals may need to be concrete. What are the specific actions and objectives we need to do to achieve these goals? What does California need from the organization to invest in it? AASC to be a hub between states to promote what all states are doing to all other

states. Can AASC leverage NCDC or USDA or DOI CSCs? We want to be the hub where we all come together. First vision and mission frame it, but the goals are the roadmap, and they will change a little with course corrections. Bringing providers and stakeholders together. Our first goal should be to help our stakeholders across the nation. How far do we want to move down the road in 5 years. We are each doing this, but not making a dent in congress or large businesses. We need to decide if we want to make a dent in how climate services are used in this country. Identify that in the goals. What is going to be expected of the members to achieve these goals? One goal is to help state climate offices – not a goal. We are talking about an organization of climate service professionals. Insert “lead”: “lead” interactions, “lead” promotion of research. Do we have the resources to do this – well that’s a goal? Feds have never figured out how to coordinate within or across agencies. We have a unique opportunity to coordinate across the country, and avoid duplication, and help lead the federal sector in climate services and producing tools. All fed agencies duplicate effort. We can be a model for cooperation and leadership. Recognizing that all the offices are in different circumstances and they can continue as an individual SC or become an institutional member if you can lead the way at \$5000, or at a lower level \$2500. Opportunity, and we can’t hire an Exec Dir until we have brought in enough funding to support that position. We have to be serious. There is a large opportunity, but it will take a leap. A statement of faith that we want to do this and we are committed. Think about it tonight, and we’ll discuss it more tomorrow.

Motion to accept budget, Dennis Today, Seconded John Young Approved. **Adjourned 1703 CDT.**

Thursday, July 11, 2013 - Annual Business Meeting (Part 2) Called to order at 10:15 am CDT

- Nominations and Election of Officers (President-elect, Secretary) – Nominating Committee - Jim Angel, Tim Brown, Lesley-Ann, Nolan Doesken. Dave Robinson has been ARSCO since 2006, and is ready to step down, and Dennis is proposed as new ARSCO coordinator. President-Elect had one candidate who has not been able to say yes yet. But another candidate will be able to respond in a few days. Any other nominations??? None. Nolan moved to nominate Nancy as Secretary – Jeff Andreson seconded. Nancy is elected as secretary for the next 2 years. ARSCO coordinator is an at-large person, and wasn’t added to constitution and has no term limit. Was voted on in Rapid City. **We should go back to the Constitution and add the position there.** Adnan moved to appoint Dennis Today to be ARSCO Coordinator, seconded by Kelly Redmond. We should find the ARSCO position in past minutes of meetings (Ryan). ARSCO coordinator may not need to be in constitution – though they are on the Exec Comm. **Will look into that this year.** Is in the constitution as elected by a majority of the Exec council. And serves a 2 year term.
 - Associate Members candidates listed. Moved to approve all candidates on the list by Nancy Selover, seconded by Renee, and approved. List with contact info is attached as Excel file. Wendy Ryan, Curtis Allan, Nicole Bart, BJ Baule, Aparna Bamzai, Guy Ash, Jeff Taylor, Joshua Roberti, Jake Crouch, Nina Oakley, Randy Cerveney, Cassandra Wilson, Ivetta Abramyan, Alek Krautmann, DeWayne Cecil, Mary Knapp, Laura Furgione.
 - Proposal to Restructure the Association (continued). We need to hear from more of our members as we all need to go into this together. The organization must represent and support each of our members. What do you need the AASC to do to help you in your situation? Where do you want to be in your SCO and what can we do to help you? We need to hear from more members. Agreement that the flavor of the vision and mission was good, with a little tweaking.
- Institutional Membership \$5,000 – see attached document. Need ~\$125k/yr to run an office with one full-time person. Can’t do this with part-time person working from their home. So we need to jump in or not. There should be many opportunities to bring in revenue down the road to expand and increase the level of services we can provide to our members, and increase our visibility and standing in the climate community. This was the charge given the President and EB last year, and we have been thinking about this for several years. Stu got feedback from WKU about institutional memberships. They pay thousands of dollars for ones that affect many groups on campus. At the dean’s level, anything less than \$10K is hardly reviewed, but at lower levels, department budgets scrutinize smaller amounts more closely. We will help you to negotiate with your institution, by helping you make the case for the support. Once you set that level, it’s hard to change it to increase it. We tend to underestimate how much funding we need, so if we start low, we will likely stay low. What are the benefits to the institution? Priority funding for SCEP partnership with NCDC; eligible for AASC seed grant to foster collaboration with other state offices (host meetings); premium marketing services under the AASC umbrella – premium level webpage on the AASC webpage, ads for faculty

positions, discount on annual meeting registration for 5 (2) affiliated staff or students; free posting ads for grad assistantships in climatology, free access to the AASC list-serv. Institutional Associate \$2,500, with a few benefits scaled back. If we can't vote on this today, we would like to come to a consensus that we need to do this and need to work out some details. ? If you are an institutional member, is that in lieu of an individual membership? Yes, but we can tweak the numbers of how many free associate members you can get. Some of the institutions (Nolan and Nick) won't think it's worth it to them, but if it is worth it to the SC, he can find the budget to join it. John Young – not an ARSCO due to budget problems, but this should be an aspiration for us, looking at the bigger picture. One office, commented that if they could get \$5000 from their University for this, they would put it into their own office to use. One of the major benefits of this association is technology transfer – leveraging the talent of the members of this association. Each office can use the products developed by other offices. So when an office develops a product that is used by other offices, that's an accomplishment. We can avoid duplicating services or products because we exchange our products and ideas. That should be put into the list of benefits. In our current structure we have created a library of applications (WA) using some SCEP money, and we wanted someone else to continue that effort, but we didn't have an infrastructure to carry that on. ED can help us develop our strategy for increasing our funding streams. That is a benefit for institutions. The institutional benefit is that all the member institutions get some leadership to help strategize to increase funding streams. Offices that don't have institutional memberships aren't losing any benefits, but first priority for funding grant opportunities would go to the institutional members. But the organization is only as strong as the weakest link, so we will work to help every office. Someone mentioned we are an Association of Climate Service Professionals. Perhaps we might consider joining forces with another group like an energy association who may already be well-funded, and has similar goals. We're a pretty small group, without a large growth potential. Maybe bring some of our users in to broaden our base. Changing ourselves into a more professional, leadership group might threaten our small friendly, comraderie type group. We need to approach expansion from a position of strength. Dave - we need to get a better list of benefits that show that the organization down the road can help bring money into our office. Jim – those offices that are part of a state agency are not likely to be able to get their agency to become an institutional member. Don't know. Harry (IA) 6 years ago would have said no way, as they didn't value the State Climate Office at all. More recently they are now valued with a new administration. Tony (WY), housed in University, but state funded, and they are 10% cut and now 0 based budgeting - would likely be first cut in next budget crisis. NH – not likely to get that kind of support. What would it take to change the administration's view? Not all states have to participate at that level, as individual memberships would still be available. South Carolina – supports institutional memberships for organizations with more staff in that group, like biologists, as there are lots of them, but there are only 3 climatologists, so no way \$5000 or \$2500 to support membership for 3 people. Ryan is in a position to be able to get that institutional membership. In a year, we won't be bringing in that much money for our member offices, but in 5 years, yes, we could be doing that. Don't promise that you can give back to the states 3 times their membership fee, but there is an expectation that that will happen down the road. We have some offices that can't swing this, but some that can. Do we really want to do this – to take this opportunity, or do we see it as a burden? We need some leaders in this. A close look in the mirror. Nolan – are we in a position to start collecting now if we decide to do it? Who is in a position to do that? 8 hands raised. Who would consider that? 9 hands raised. That's 40% of the offices. Renee – question – can the ED go to the hill to lobby for us, or because the Feds contribute money is that not allowed? If our state legislators have someone to go to quickly to provide answers, that would be a great benefit to educate legislators. The Ed would be a voice for the SCOs, and be actively seeking opportunities, working on behalf of our members. Can we consider foundation support or research coordinator support to support part of this position, like national phenology program? It appears to allow legally lobbying, so no SCEP money is involved. Gregg Shuler – if organization does self-promotion, that's one thing, but if they are doing advocacy, that's a different story. The membership tells ED what level of activity is appropriate. Be able to discuss climate and climate issues with federal and state agencies, advocating on our behalf, but not lobbying for legislation. Vote on the spirit of the proposal. That we do think this is a good way to go and we want to continue to move down this road. If we are supportive, we can appoint a committee to re-word, and strengthen the vision, mission, goals and benefits of institutional membership. Are we supportive of the spirit of the proposal to hire an ED and secure a revenue stream? Show of hands 26 in favor. Opposed – would prefer not to go down the road. 0 opposed. So we will form a committee and get to work immediately and prepare a proposal we can distribute through the list serve – by October 1.

Committee: Renee McPherson, Nick Bond, Nancy Selover, Hope Mizzell, Greg Spoden, Stu Foster, Pat Guinan,

Kevin Law. Suggest all members in the next month ask their administration and take a straw poll and give some detailed feedback to Stu. Ask what benefits the administration would need to make that happen? Also want to hear from every member where they are in the spectrum. May also work with the Exec Comm.

- Other Business –Webmaster – Lou Vasquez – will embed the new logo in a graphically pleasing way on the website. We can use the new logo freely on our websites. Will get the high resolution version of the logo available on the website. Latest news on the website is from 2012 – need to update that. Nolan moved to adjourn business mtg, Stu seconded. Approved 11:56 am CDT.

12:00-12:30 pm Final Discussions and Adjournment

- Comments by Dennis Today, outgoing Past-President – Thanks for the last 4 years leading the organization. Hoped we would be further along by now as an organization, but it's a slow process. Encourage you to step out of your comfort zone or we don't go anywhere as an organization. People know what offices they can get something from and many offices people can't find what they want from them. They will go look elsewhere to get what they need. We have to be across the board as a strong organization and strong individual offices, or we will be marginalized.

- Preview of 2014 Meeting – Will maybe have another panel on MesoNets. Karin Bumbaco – July 8-11 (Tuesday-Friday). Easiest to fly into Portland (45 minutes away).

Thank you to Pat Guinan, Jim Angel, and Jennifer and the student helpers.

Dave Robinson moved to adjourn, Tony Bergantino seconded and approved. **Adjourned at 12:03 pm CDT**