

New England Society of American Foresters  
Annual Business Meeting  
March 16, 2005  
Sheridan Hotel, South Portland, ME

EC Members in attendance:

Tom Degnan	Connecticut State Rep
Paul Dolan	Rhode Island State Rep
George Frame	Vice Chair
J Peter Howland	New Hampshire State Rep
Laura Kenefic	Forest Science Coordinator
Anne-Marie Kittredge	Massachusetts State Rep
Leo Laferriere	Council Rep
Kenneth M Laustsen	Chair
Ronald C Lemin	Maine State Rep
Edward O'Leary	Vermont State Rep
Larry Rousseau	Treasurer
Raymond J Toolan	Secretary
Bradford Wyman	Editor NESAF News Quarterly

**1. Call to order:** Ken L calls the meeting to order at 1209 hours (12:09pm)

- Antitrust Statement: presented as required
- Introductions - NESAF Executive Committee: The various EC members stand and introduce themselves.
- Remembrance of NESAF Members
  - a) Samuel Hall
  - b) Edgar Pitkin (E.P.) Wyman
  - c) Darrel F Russ
  - d) Wayne Jackson
- Add/Adjust agenda: None offered
- Corrections/Additions and motion for the minutes of the March 24, 2004 Annual Business Meeting, Quebec City, Quebec (Toolan): None offered. Brad W makes a motion to accept them as written. Tony Filaro seconds. The motion is called and passes unanimously.

**2. NESAF Chair Report - K M Laustsen**

We are in good shape financially. NESAF has funded three grant requests: \$1000 to Connecticut for an information board; \$1000 to Rhode Island for its Champion Tree update and \$870 to Maine for its membership survey project. Ken L goes over some of the particulars of the Maine grant.

The VOS-TF has been discussed at chapters and divisions. A report and recommendations are important. Ken L asks the membership to access the report on the web site and to read it. Anyone can and should send comments by whatever avenue is most comfortable. Ken L is concerned about there being a breakdown in communication with the National Office. There seems to be an issue of how many Fellows may now be nominated in the future. Only one may be nominated per year from a multi-state or one each from each of the state chapters but not both. Any member can sign the nomination form to get to the required number of

signatures. The issue of the Forester Fund was also raised. The money "borrowed" from this fund to cover the operations account is still owed and we are advised that they are "working on it". It was mentioned that more than a few members felt the VOS-TF was being pushed way too fast which is why the deadline for comments has been delayed from June 1 to November 9.

### 3. SAF Council Report - Leo Laferriere

Comments on the VOS-TF can be sent by anyone via any method as long as it gets to Council. "Say whatever you want, however you want". "Tell it like it is". Moving the deadline for feedback to November 9 allows more multi-state and state chapters to have their winter meetings and gather comments. On the subject of SAF finances; we finished in the black in 2004, which is only the second time in seven (7) years that this has occurred. Leo L is confident in the current leadership and where they are going. Leo L reviewed many issues and items that have been deferred at National and which will need to be addressed during this year such as building maintenance and equipment needs to run the organization. Leo L is looking for some Presidential Field Forester Award nominations, which are due to him by May 3. The National Leadership Academy is in Nebraska this year: a great program. The National Convention is in Fort Worth, TX. Leo L reviewed some of the particulars such as forestry ad space exploration; global changes; ecology, biology and finances. There will also be Texas style entertainments such as rodeo etc. The question is asked if we need a motion concerning the proposed changes under VOS-TF. *[note: at this point the discussion moves us to item 5. Item 4, the budget, is covered after the discussion in item 5]*

### 4. Treasurer's Report and 2005/2006 Budget

- Discussions, Revisions, and Motion to Approve Budget: *[note this item was deferred for discussion until after item 5 was completed]*: Larry R presents a brief Power-Point presentation on the budget items. *Brad W moves that we accept as presented, Russ Reay makes a second. The motion is called and passes unanimously.*

**5. VOS-TF Report and comments:** Ken L explains that one change involves redistricting and a change from 11 districts to 7 regions. The regions were put together in such a way that no state or multi-state chapters/societies would be split. The new region that New England would be part of is region 5 which would include New England, New York, Allegheny and DC. We would become part of the region with the most members (approximately 2,600). The plan is for each region to have an equitable number of members to equalize the voting power of each region. George F feels it is too soon to have any sort of a vote on this issue as there is so much still to be addressed and discussed. Gibb Dodge is concerned that the decisions will be made at National before NESAF can get together again to go over it. Gibb D wants a motion at this meeting to address the position of NESAF to National on the redistricting issue. Ken L points out that some of the recommendations will require a change in the constitution, which will require a vote of the membership. Some changes, such as the redistricting, could be done without a change to the constitution and could well happen before the next NESAF meeting. Ken L points out that Council has already endorsed several of the recommendations. Ken L presents a Power Point demonstration, which addresses the entire VOS- TF list of recommendations and includes what has happened with them thus far. There is concern expressed about SAF losing more members as a result of the changes. There is also the concern that SAF will be less able to address the needs and concerns of the membership. The question was raised expressed concerns about how we could make the organization more accessible to the general membership. It is pointed out that items 2-5 relate exclusively to the student members who designed and recommended these items that address students' role in SAF comments and participation. Council has already endorsed items 8 to 13 at their Dec 2004 meeting. The question about how this will affect the structure and function of NESAF is raised. There

are different possibilities available. We could continue with NESAF and the state chapters or we could disband NESAF and have just the state chapters. Russ Rea expresses a bit of concern over the issue of equal representation. Has there been any sort of a poll of multi-state chapters to see if any might want to be split? There is more discussion around the distribution of membership between the various districts/regions. Jane Difley suggests: "if we don't change we will become irrelevant". How do we change to remain relevant? Ken L explains that this is the fourth Task Force since the early 1970s. This is the first one to fully engage the full membership. The recommendations of the Task Force were reached by consensus. Leo L indicates that everyone really needs to read the report. He wants comments. It is important to read the forward and the beginning of the report. Hans Bergy is concerned that within the larger Region we might never see a representative from New England. Max McCormack points out that there are members who do not have and/or do not want Internet access nor computer skills adequate to the task of downloading and responding. Ken L tells everyone that he will copy and send copies of the report to anyone who requests one. Gibb Dodge asks about the time frame. He is told that some of the changes have already occurred, some may happen as early as December and the rest will happen after a vote of the membership. November 9 is the deadline for comments from those who wish to influence the final decisions and results. More general discussion takes place. More concern expressed about whom will represent New England. Council seems to feel that the membership will like the change because they will have better access to Regions than to the National. It is pointed out that none of this is likely to alter the structure of things from NESAF on down. Ken L expresses a concern that there is no fiscal accounting of what these changes would incur. It is pointed out that if the Regions alternate with National for larger meetings, then National will lose income it desperately needs. There is more concern expressed about the redistricting plan. Going bigger may not be better. The issue of the one member, one vote is raised. Bob Edmonds points out that representation is not so much the issue as is the need to maintain diversity on the Council to best represent all the membership. It is noted that Canada is not shown on the new region plan. It is pointed out that Canada has no voting members. Jane Difley is concerned we are getting old and really need to engage the younger members. The report is on the SAF website and should be on the NESAF site. One member points out that Ken L is very credible and we really need to trust his judgment. Another suggests we need to grow leaders. Another member addresses the idea of diversity moving us to a different level. How does this make us more attractive to non-members? Ken L points out that we need to keep and take care of the members we have while at the same time, work to bring in new members. Russ Reay indicates the issue of losing members to other organizations, which may appear more relevant. The question of which organizations we are competing with was raised. Ken L listed several competing organizations. The point is made that there are fewer jobs for foresters while there seem to be more jobs available for other types of environmental professionals. This all affects how employers choose new employees. Gibb Dodge indicates that we need to do a better job of PR. Gibb D makes a motion: **That we, NESAF, object to the plan to change the current configuration of SAF through redistricting. Walter Gooley provides a second.** There is active discussion. Russ Reay feels it is too early for this motion and the motion should be voted down. There is obvious support for this feeling. It is mentioned that the redistricting plan does not require a constitutional change. We still have until the Nov 9 deadline to comment. Gibb is concerned that we be heard in a timely manner. Jane Difley is more in favor of a motion to ask National to hold off making a decision until NESAF can have another meeting. Someone asks what the response rate has been on referendums? Ron L indicates it is around 1/3 of the membership. **The motion is finally called: 17 in favor, 46 against. The motion fails.** Jane Difley offers a motion: **We, NESAF, shall form a committee to inform the members and to hold a referendum so as to get the results to National by the November 9 deadline so our concerns may be recorded.** Mike Fleming makes a second. A friendly amendment is offered by Gibb Dodge in that in the referendum question that each item still to be decided from the VOS-TF be dealt with individually. [Note: there are 7 outstanding items]. A second is made by Tony Filaro. The amendment is called and passes without dissent. The motion, as amended is called and passes unanimously. [Note: at this point the agenda goes back to the Budget, Item 4]

6. Working Groups and Forest Science - Laura Kenefic: Omitted due to lack of time.

7. NESAF News Quarterly - Brad Wyman: omitted due to lack of time.

8. 2006 NESAF Winter Meeting (New Hampshire) Status: Peter H reviews some of the details.  
Theme: "Race for the Resources"

9. 2007 NESAF Winter Meeting (Vermont) Status - Bill Samal: Omitted due to lack of time.

10. State Reports: Omitted due to lack of time.

- Connecticut
- Maine
- Massachusetts
- New Hampshire
- Rhode Island
- Vermont

11. Adjourn: Motion to adjourn made by Bob Edmonds and seconded by Russ Reay. Motion is called and passes unanimously. The meeting ends at 1409. (2:09pm)

Respectfully submitted by Raymond J Toolan, Secretary