

Colorado Mountain Club
State Council Meeting
January 22, 2011

Attending: Voting -Paul Weber (Ftc) Chair, Janine Fugere (Bld), Bob Reimann (Dnvr), Lee Moosburger (Gore)
Non-Voting - Roger Drake (Bld), Sherry Richardson (Dnvr), Bill Markley (Dnvr), Ed Seely (Ftc), York (Ftc).

Paul called the meeting to order at 10:10AM. The start of the meeting was delayed as we worked to get the phone conference to work.

Minutes of the last meeting were read by Paul. Thank you to Bob R (Denver) for running the last meeting and bringing the minutes as Paul was ill and missed the last meeting.

Minutes were accepted as presented.

Paul found the minutes from the April 17, 2010 meeting. He printed a copy of the minutes for each member to be read and approve at the next meeting.

This special meeting was called to consider the future role of the state council. Currently the core role of the state council is to ratify the nominating committee in April. Then in the fall the Council selects the board director nominees from the slate presented by the nominating committee and from floor nominations from State Council members on the day of the election..

The committee started discussing the history of the State Council – Ed S. presented the history/rational for the state council as he was in on the meetings when the state council was developed. The goal, in 1997, was to develop a better process of selecting state board members as the previous method didn't work that well: each group had a director, there were 12 board members based on the proportion of members in each group, and then 9 members elected at large for a total of around 35 directors. More discussion was held about the reasoning and how the council concept was developed.

Article VI. Section 4 of the state constitution enumerates the duties of the state council. Janine said that the Boulder Group's feedback is that their group is ambivalent about the council as they don't see how it provides feedback to the board since there is not a mechanism providing an official communication channel from the council to the board. Bob R. said that the board members see themselves as representing the entire state instead of as a representative of their local group. Lee M. asked about council having one voice to the board instead of each of the council members presenting to the board. Discussion about the viability of the one voice, what it means, what it would look like, and how it would be perceived was had. What is effective way to provide the communication channel? Janine expressed concern that the state needs to provide communication about any issues on the table before the item is on the Board's agenda to

be approved. IE the change of the logo. Denver group likes to have feedback from the board/staff so they have someone attend the board meetings to get that information.

Consensus was that the board/staff push the information out to groups early to get feedback early in the process. Apparently there are staff and board liaisons for each group. But no one group knew that both liaisons were there. Everyone agreed that over communication is better.

Paul presented THE STATE COUNCIL EFFECTIVENESS PowerPoint. This is Paul's perspective on the comments that were made at that time in January of 2010.

* Lee and Janine said that their groups felt their feedback to the board was taken and then ignored.

* Also felt that feedback to the state council that was then passed to the state board was ignored and thus it diminished desire to participate in the state council.

The feedback so far has been informal and from the groups instead of through the state council as there has not been time, so far, to use the state council as a feedback channel.

- Communication – both directions – seems to be an issue.

The issue of “Parity of dues vs. proximity to Golden” was discussed. Lee addressed this perspective from the Gore Range Group. York commented on the \$51 state dues and what the average group member sees as the benefit of this fee: a magazine every now and then that might have some useful info and a website for trips that sometimes you can understand. Lee brought up that their group feels they are paying for salaries at the state office and that those salaries are going over board. The feeling is that the information provided on the web about the budget is not useful. Groups (individual members) at the present time really do not know what their dues support. A more detailed explanation of expenses would clarify any misconceptions. Janine mentioned that members say “I know people to go do the trips with, why do I need to spend the money to belong.” Lee brought up the competition of “Vail Club 50” with annual dues at \$35. Their 800 members support 5 activities a week along with social events. Paul brought up the need to support outlying groups because the ability to go on trips all over the state which is a good benefit. Paul summarized the next phase of discussion as getting the state council to provide communication between the groups all over the state. Ed S brought up the volunteer capacity at the group level so that you can meet the goals of that area. It was noted that Weld and Sneffels groups folded in 2010. Gore almost folded in 2009 per Lee.

Janine said that Rachel Scott has been doing lots as the marketing director for the state. Janine was particularly impressed with the posters Rachel provided. Lee said she'd like to get some posters for use in her group as well.

Next we moved to discuss these 5 questions from Wynne:

- 1) Does CMC need to have some form of a State Council? Yes: As Bob synthesized the state council represents the groups. Where the board directors

feel they represent the entire state instead of a particular group. Sherry said that in the back of board members minds they do keep their group thoughts in mind. She brought up that the board is supposed to represent at least 7 groups and thus the council needs to have a representative from each group to help provide communication. Whose job is it to make sure that the groups are represented on the state council?

York asked about why the committees are supposed to have a representative on the council. Ed gave back ground history on the committees and that they used to be volunteer members only. Today the committees are operational. Roger stated that it is tough to be a good council when only meeting twice a year for two hours. Bob discussed the nomination process for this last year and thought it worked well this time.

- 2) What are the tasks that the state council does that no one else in the club does? It provides any member a communication channel to the board. At each board meeting we need to have 15 minutes from the chair to present to the state board. Also need to reach out to the other groups that are not represented today. Janine said we need more human communication to the groups, not represented at the meeting today, to get them and/or their input here in some shape or form. Lee didn't know anyone who was running for the state board this year, where they were from (Group wise or geographically), or what their thought process were for running for the board. We need to know who they are and what they are about and how to get this information to members/groups. **Need to get the bios way in advance to not only nominating committee, but also the group chairs, state council and board.** Bob brought up that the Denver group has moved to running their elections via Survey Monkey. We discussed the need to have more candidates than there are board positions open. Nominees from the floor do sometimes work.
- 3) Based on the tasks decided in question #2, who is needed on state council – e.g., what is it's composition? Need to reach out to the groups more. The question was asked do we need committee membership on the Council? Sherry brought up that the committees are to be the voice of the members that are involved in that area of interest. The idea of conflict of interest could be an issue with the committee chair appointed by staff when the council selects the state board that is to review the staff person. The other issue is getting the committee chairs to attend the council meetings. Janine asked about getting more communication about the committees and what is happening so the council could share what is happening at each committee.
- 4) What is the leadership of the state council? Currently the board vice-president is the state council chair unless that responsibility is delegated (as is the present case). Who will take on the council chair position if the board vice-president does not? Currently we can go with the delegation process for right now and continue to monitor the situation. Ed suggested that we look at the past

group chairs, past council members, and past board members to be the chair of the state council as potential resources. Main consensus was that the chair needs to be from within the state council.

- 5) What is the action plan to enact these decisions? Roger's perspective – bylaws & constitution gives state council a whole lot of power if it chooses to take it. Based on the bylaws we have all the authority to take on whatever we want. The issue is whether we have the power and energy to take everything on. Janine thinks the biggest thing to work on is to reach out to the groups that are not represented today via personal effort to reach out to these people. Need to set up a process to get information to the council and then to the groups to get feedback in an appropriate timeframe. Bud brought up that you have to have more than two meetings a year. Ed brought up that you need to have continuity in membership for the historical knowledge. Groups can appoint a council representative that is not the group chair. Need to get comments as to why groups participate and why they don't in the state council. We realize that contacts have already been made and that was valuable. Having more contact by others will help and hopefully solicit feedback before the meetings even if those solicited don't participate this time.

To try to increase group representation at the next meeting the following people committed to contacting these groups:

York will contact Shinning Mountains (Estes Park)
Sherry will contact Colorado Wilderness Kids
Bob will contact Pikes Peak
Janine will contact Longs Peak (Longmont)
Lee will contact Aspen Group
Paul to contact San Juan

Paul presented Wynne's proposal for the state council role: "State Council/Membership committee description from 9/10/2009 DRAFT"

Janine suggested that we commit to reviewing this document individually and then discuss it at the April meeting. Sherry brought out that we don't want to be a state membership committee; we want to be the State Council. Some of this document is probably out-dated at this point based on other changes in the organization. So we need to review and see how much we really need to do.

Paul brought up that we need to determine when the next meetings will be held and that we need to decide what we want to accomplish at these meetings. Ed brought up that there are pros and cons to meeting at the same time as the state board or meeting a week prior to the State Board. Roger mentioned that we should not be limited to a 2 hour meeting since people take the time to travel to be at the meeting. Much discussion about the potential details and options of meetings, including phone conferencing possibilities, was had.

Paul asked if there is any item that we want to focus on at the April meeting besides ratifying the nominating committee. Getting the bio's early was the first issue to be brought up. Sherry said to focus on the communication issue : what is it exactly that we want from the state board and how. Roger brought up potentially having a strategic plan for the State Council.

At this point we had used up the two hours allocated for the meeting and adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

York, The Red Lion
Chair, Fort Collins Group, CMC
Acting Secretary