American Planning Association Idaho Chapter
Minutes for January 20, 2011
APA Idaho Executive Board

[ ] Daren Fluke, President [ ] Charles Hutchinson, Region 4
[ ] Renee Magee, Vice-President [ ] Melodie Halstead, Region 5
[ ] Brad Cramer, Secretary/Treasurer [ ] Kurt Hibbert, Region 6
[ ] Clare Marley, Region 1 [ ] Jon Norstog, L&PA
[ ] Joel Plaskon, Region 2 [ ] Anna Canning, E&O
[ ] Jon Cecil, Region 3 [ ] Diane Kushlan, PDO

The meeting was called to order at 12:00.

1. **Approval of Minutes for December 9, 2010:** Clare moved, Jon Cecil seconded to approve the December 9, 2010 minutes. Unanimous approval.

2. **Legislative Affairs Report:** Jon Norstog sent out written report. Jon summarized as follows: legislature now coming into session. One of the items under consideration will be urban renewal districts and any other special districts. This is something the board may want to look at. No bills coming up yet; Jon will track. Talked to Ms. Smith regarding social calendar of legislators. Agreed that breakfast was a good idea. She recommends February. Jon recommends Café du Paris and inviting local governance committee of House (11) and Senate (9). Would be good for as many board members to show up as possible. Joel mentioned the budget amount as being $600. Introduce ourselves—stand for the public interest. We will weigh in on issues. Reception with a few remarks at the outset. We have certain expertise and can be a valuable resource. Jon Cecil commented that he is uncomfortable with the amount of money vs. the outcome. He is also disappointed that we missed opportunity to partner with AIC on legislative luncheon as a good forum for us to make that introduction of the group. We can make a stronger statement by partnering with AIC and IAC. (Brad and Renee joined the meeting). Diane believes it takes a lot of work to establish credibility and we should be partnering with other organizations. We should expect only a few of the legislators actually invited to attend. She suggested members of the board personally contact legislators they know. Renee stated her experience has shown legislators want to meet with local elected officials. Charles believes we should partner with the strongest organization as we may not get very far on our own. Joel also feels partnerships are important but we have expertise in a specific area and may feel differently than other organizations on certain issues. We need to figure out where we are and how other groups feel on issues. There was discussion among the group regarding urban renewal as a current legislative issue. Daren expressed the need to define the objective of the breakfast and whether to do it rather than talk about specific issues. The point of the breakfast is to introduce ourselves. He asked if we are better off sending a letter instead of breakfast. Jon Norstog explained it is very common to hold a reception and Ms. Frank says breakfast is a good way to meet people and get a good turnout. We could wait one year but we need to make a decision. Joel is in favor of a breakfast and suggested maybe we could do both a letter and meal. We need the face-to-face meeting and should give it a try and learn from it. We need to sell our credibility and talk about our certification. Clare said we need to focus our efforts and meet those who will be most helpful. A letter is not enough. Diane moved the board contact members of the legislature and see if they think the breakfast is a good idea. Jon Cecil seconded. Daren asked the motion be rephrased to allow any action to move forward. He suggested one week to contact legislators.
Diane moved to table the item for one week while board members contact legislators. Jon Cecil seconded. Motion passed unanimously. Diane will send out a list of legislators.

3. **Idaho Land Use Analysis Update:** Anna met with Rachel Winer to discuss follow-up on submitting grant application to move the transportation education component forward. She will give further updates next month.

4. **CPC Grant Application:** Anna reported $500 is needed to have a booth at AIC conference and monitor any membership increases to see if the booth is worth the money. Daren is attending a meeting to see how the program works. Not everything is in place yet.

5. **2011 Conference Planning Update:** Charles recommended the following committees: transportation, registration, program development, audio visual, hotel, speakers, awards, sponsorship, and program selection. He spoke with Michelle Vachon. She recommends the Best Western University Inn. We are planning on 100 guests. University of Idaho has ties to the hotel for better rates. Michelle will work with Steve Drown and have him take the lead. Anna believes having the chair of a department get the work done may be difficult. Charles stated Michelle also suggested working with Joel. Joel said he spoke with Michelle and he is willing to take a supportive role. He agrees that Steve may not be able to get things done. There may be some other members of the department that could help. Daren suggested we focus on a date and venue. Clare said she spoke with Michelle and we need to avoid scheduling the conference during a football weekend. Charles said we are looking at the first or second weekend of October. Clare said the University of Idaho and Washington State University both have away games on October 1, but the 15th is to-be-announced for U of I and a home game for WSU. The 8th may work as well. Charles mentioned there may also be a conflict with mom and dad weekends. Coeur d’Alene or Idaho State University also have facilities. Charles will email other information. Date should be locked in for the next meeting. Anna reminded the board that the conference needs to stay in October because of travel budgets for most departments.

6. **Web Site Discussion:** Daren asked for a website we could update and maintain ourselves. There has been frustration that we have to go through a host. Clare wants to make sure we can update it ourselves. Anna believes the organization needs help on learning what would make the website better. The proposal from Thinkfast is a bit slim. Kurt said the board wanted a website plan. We started one but dropped it. We need to know what the board really wants from the website. We should focus on what content and goals we want. Anna believes a strategic plan is good but we need help knowing how to do it. Brad asked if there were any specific complaints from members regarding the website. Complaints generally come when a link is bad. Kurt said he has the analysis document. The board only told him to simplify it. The provider needs to know what we want. Posting our own content is an example of a problem that needs fixed. A provider can’t give what we want if we don’t express it. The board worked hard on a plan. He can bring it back to the next meeting. He will email the plan to the board. He asked members to call him with specific problems. Joel asked if a subcommittee would be helpful. Kurt does not believe it is necessary. He just needs the board to communicate with him. Joel believes structure and a subcommittee would be helpful. Anna recalled the plan was hard to understand but Kurt tried to simplify and no one did anything so a subcommittee may not be helpful. Daren suggested we decide on a subcommittee after everyone sees the document. Anna is uncertain the board has the resources to define a vision for the website.

7. **Open Discussion:** Joel asked, regarding the legislative action, who is taking the lead of the new urban renewal group. Jon Cecil said his organization and others are taking the lead. Joel suggested we need to stay in touch with them and follow up. Renee has an email from the contact
person for the group and will forward it to the board. His name is Gary Riedner. Anna said not all the urban renewal agencies agree with the strategy. Jon Cecil said the effort is new but gaining some momentum. Diane reported at least two and possibly six people plan to take the AICP test in May. She is forming a study group.

The meeting adjourned at 1:15.