

NNECAPA/State Associations Retreat

MINUTES

Present: Mark Kane (VPA President), Anna Breinich, Ben Frost, Yuseung Kim, Carol Eyerman (MAP President), Amanda Bunker (MAP Board Member), Sandrine Thibault, Sarah Marchants, Brandy Saxton, Donna Benton (NHPA PIO), Becky Hebert (NHPA ?), Carl Eppich

Bob Mitchell – Facilitator

GOALS FOR THIS RETREAT

- Reduce inefficiencies between the four associations.
- There is demand on the few with lack of volunteers as well as financial resources.
- Reduce redundancy between organizations to be more efficient.
- Developing a plan to move forward with the states and NNECAPA.
- Weigh the pros and cons of each option.
- Pulling resources to become more efficient.
- Maximizing the efficiency of all organizations for our members. Get an answer on the current structure and be able to put in to work.
- Better understand issues that are going on now.
- There is a flow of money issue that we need to figure out.
- Find efficiencies that can be reached with better coordination.
- Reduce the need for some members to pay two membership fees.
- Would like to see justifications for NNECAPA to continue as is or not.
- Understand the makeup of each association.
- Let's not lose sight of the potential power of coming together as a group. Could get a stronger regionalized organization that would give us more power.
- Develop a timeline schedule for next steps at the end of this weekend.
- Identify and help deal with capacity issues with volunteer boards that have limited time and financial resources.
- Identify what our members get for their money.
- Identified who is being served by which organization.
- Understand the financial implications/resources of a change in the current structure.

NOTE: At the APA national level, NNECAPA is an anomaly as a chapter with multiple states.

A BIT OF HISTORY

Chapter - what did it evolve?

- Before APA was created American Institute of Planners (AIP) was in existence.
- In 1948, the Chapter was created and associated with AIP (all six states of New England were included in the Chapter).
- 1970s – CT separated and created its own chapter of AIP.
- 1978 - APA got created.
- 1980 - Northern NE (VT, NH & ME) created their own chapter.
- 1994 – RI and MA separated.

MAP – Created in 1968 – MAP is starting to build recognition at the state level. Has been a mixed board as well and they are seeing more and more diversity. The board does more work for planning and not just for planners.

NHPA – Created in 1970

VPA – Created in 1987 – Became a 501c3 in 2002 – VPA was established to be multi-disciplinary, it's in the mission statement. There is a value in planning, which is not only done by planners. VPA has representatives on other boards at the state level, such as the Downtown Board.

OTHERS CHAPTERS ORGANIZATIONS

Grab from the info sheet...

SWOT ANALYSIS - VERMONT

STRENGTHS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Engrained in the VT planning world and state government - Breath of the experience of the members – being part of planning in the state - Solid membership of local planners – good geographically - Financially stable - Great professional development opportunities and offerings - Variety in the member services & opportunities for professional to engage together (social, courses, legislative work) - Awards process is well run and recognition at regional level - Public places award – ASLA and VPA together - High level of chatter and involvement from members – listserve conversation, attendance at events 	WEAKNESSES <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Internal transitions in the leadership are tough and create lack of continuity - Lack of capacity (admin support) - Finding ways to get new members and competing for their interest - Quality and depth of some of the prof. dev. offerings – hard to bring in national level speakers. - No resources to take advantage of being more effective – need \$ and staff - Cannot be definitive in the policy position when working on legislative issues - Aren't good to keep up on technology side of things AND financial tools (credit card)
OPPORTUNITIES <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enhance professional development offerings - Greater input/effect at the legislative level - More openness to what happens elsewhere in the country - What other services can our members benefit from? 	

SWOT ANALYSIS – NEW HAMPSHIRE

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
-----------	------------

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strong financial position - Exceptional Executive Committee - Our members know who we are and what we do for them - Legislative tracking, subcommittee - Newsletter, info going to members is excellent - Strong sponsorship of conferences - Excellent professional development and networking opportunities - Membership interest in small volunteer roles - Works well with other non-planning groups - Small enough to know everyone - Connection with higher education – University System and Antioch - Fun group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Volunteer burnout - Demand on the few - Aging planners - Poor member engagement; social media, Listserv/blog not utilized - Good reserve, but limited cash resources - Small enough to know everyone - Narrow focus of planning activities - Geographic splits – N/S, E/W - Ability to implement strategic plan - Sustainability focus is weak
OPPORTUNITIES <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase membership - OEP and Plan NH partnerships - Increased demand for planning services - Capacity to be an APA chapter - Increase member engagement and advocacy with Congressional delegation - Create RPC liaison position on NHPA Executive Committee 	THREATS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - OEP and Plan NH mission overlap - Entering a busy economic cycle – strain on planners - Political marginalization at the state and Federal levels - NHPA out of loop on Federal issues - Budgets - Lack of RPC coordination - Political backlash against planning – Libertarian and Free State movements

SWOT ANALYSIS – MAINE

STRENGTHS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MAP in name could be a section of NNECAPA - 75% of members consistently renew membership - Professional development opportunities; MAP alone w limited resources, AND w NNECAPA - Partnerships existing and growing i.e. MMA, GrowSmart, BuildMaine, Lift360, USM – only grad Planning program in NNE - Young planners on board vitality and new thinking (see weaknesses) - MAP bylaws recently updated - Mix of members demographically i.e. age, sex, experience, etc. 	WEAKNESSES <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Retirement of 25% members in the next 8-10 years - Legislative engagement (capacity issue) - Young planners on board (lower flexibility, young families' priority) - MAP bylaws not inline w NNECAPA's - Same members do most of work (board, prof dev, conference) - Representation of MAP members from northern Maine - Capacity to deal w big threats i.e. Governor w anti-planning agenda e.g. dissolving State planning office - e.g. Federal threats
OPPORTUNITIES <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - W NNECAPA 501c3 status, can use up to 10% of budget for lobbying; shared lobbyist who could 	THREATS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MAP losing treasurer with no replacement in sight

<p>“cross-pollinate” and share legislative issues happening across the 3 states *Challenge: capacity across states leg timelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Growing partnership with MMA in serving planning needs (no state planning office) - Organizational memberships? - NNECAPA capacity to do financials i.e. annual conference; like PDO - Unified membership recruitment, retention - Unified billing/financials - Shared IT capacity i.e. website; Wild Apricot; Constant Contact... - Unified record keeping - Being able to pull resources from national APA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Aging out of members; retirement - Lack of Volunteers and capacity - Lack of capacity with legislative issues / Augusta - Lack of capacity with financial dealings - Young planners lack of capacity - Perception of MAP as a section not being seen as a “Maine org”
--	--

SWOT ANALYSIS – NNECAPA

<p>STRENGTHS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Represents NH well – APA at Federal level matches with NH’s needs - NNECAPA Conference 	<p>WEAKNESSES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Poor member understanding of organizational differences between NHPA and NNECAPA - Similar to MA but no engagement - Info flow from NNECAPA to NHPA - State planning grants poorly structured and focused, low funding - NNECAPA Conference is a burden on the states - Lack of understanding what NNECAPA is about and what it does with VPA planners - Communication of what states association can count on from NNECAPA for help/financial assistance - Spending finances and lack of efficiency -
<p>OPPORTUNITIES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Do more with Region 1 - Recognize how similar we are to each other (ME, NH, VT), relative to the rest of the country - Service oriented travel grants to members (NNECAPA planners exchange) - 	<p>THREATS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - OEP and Plan NH mission overlap - Entering a busy economic cycle – strain on planners - Political marginalization at the state and Federal levels - NHPA out of loop on Federal issues - Budgets - Lack of RPC coordination

POSSIBLE OPTIONS FOR RE-ORGANIZATION

NO ACTION

Pros

- Membership stay the same
- Autonomy of the state associations

Cons

- Flow of information difficult between chapter and state associations
- Long-term sustainability of each organization
- Inability to recruit board volunteer – pool too small
- NNECAPA's inability to effectively spend money for the memberships
- Confusion about what NNECAPA and the state do and what their role is
- Advocate to be members of two organization for planners
- Subsidizing Non-NNECAPA members now
- Need to raise dues substantially for the ability to hire help

MODIFY HOW IT WORKS TODAY

Pros

- Easier to get buy-in
- Coordinated bylaws
- Might address NHPA issues
- Better coordination
- Reducing redundancy in administration
- Conference planning at NNECAPA level

Cons

- Just fixing flow of resources isn't enough
- Might "hallow out" NNECAPA
- Some underlying issues not addressed

ESTABLISH EACH STATE ASSOCIATION AS SECTIONS

Pros

- Coordinated bylaws
- Better coordination
- Streamlined administration
- Conference planning at NNECAPA level
- Potential increase membership
- Better connection to citizen planners
- Benefit to the region and to each state for national advocacy
- Regional approach increased
- Strengthen connection across states
- Easiest option to explain to membership

Cons

- Number of non-APA members would be associated with APA one-way or the other
- May not allow citizen planner into the organization
- Older members resistance
- EC for each state able to

ESTABLISH EACH STATE AS CHAPTERS – DISSOLVE NNECAPA

Pros

- Full autonomy
- Clear identity
- More direct connection to APA & its resources

Cons

- VPA and MAP don't have the capacity to become their own chapter
- Not realistic
- Not enough money
- Harder to convince state association members only
- Not sustainable for MAP and VPA

NEXT STEPS – 2 YEAR PROCESS

This group created a task force to continue exploration of the various options. The task force is made up of (4 organizations presidents and 4 organizations treasurer).

The task force will look into the following four topics to bring further analysis to the membership in the fall 2017.

FINANCIAL - Look into financial implications for each option

Who – Task Force members especially the 4 treasurers

When – Done by mid-August

MEMBERSHIP

Demographics, fees, recruitment

Getting the message that it's not sustainable the way we are operating now.

NNECAPA is subsidizing state-only members and we cannot keep doing that. It's a question of fairness.

There is a struggle with capacity at all levels.

Who – Task Force with help from NNECAPA VP

ADMINISTRATION

Shared resources & Efficiencies with other models

Who – Task Force