

May 16, 2009

WPR Annual Meeting. - Minutes  
Marysville, WA

Attending:

Alaska	Dave Lanning*
Arizona:	Susanne Leckband*
California	Sam Grossman by proxy**
Hawaii	Florence Ching*
Idaho	Greg Brands*
Nevada	Dave James*
Oregon	Michael Hardy by proxy** Tamara Johnson
Washington	Doug Hendrickson (part time due to meeting conflicts)*
WPR	Frank Fong (CA), Chairman Alan Werner (WA), Regional Director*
*	HOD Delegate
**	NSPE Officer

Minutes: Accepted as distributed in 2008

Treasurer: Treasurer's Report accepted

Discussion of Current WPR Focal Areas:

1. Committees and task forces: Sam: Grossman, NSPE President 2009-2010, provide a background where the focus will be on benefits to the members with a reduction of half of the previous committees and task forces. A member can approach the chairman of a committee or task force to express interest and membership.  
Action: Use the Region to identify people with specific interests and promote individuals from the WPR to volunteer for NSPE committees and task forces using the Region as a promotional agency.
2. Issues of importance: Discussed different methods used to solicit issues. Point made: The telemeetings seem to be limited to HOD Delegates.  
Action: Increase the names on the list serve.  
Action: Memo to state presidents to solicit more participation.
3. Continuing Education: Discussed that four states have mandatory CPD requirements with varying degrees of audits (Idaho, Montana, Nevada, and Oregon). Question: 1.) Should this be one of the initiatives (Leckband)? 2.) What is the role of Region? The Region could publicize continuing education

opportunities to assist engineers needing to satisfy CPD requirements. Discussion ensued without action.

Discussion of Candidate Screening Committee: CSPE likely to take up the identification of an individual in an upcoming teleconference. Susanne Leckband, previous CSC members, expressed a desire to modify the rules of engagement of the CSC to solicit potential candidates if no or only one candidate comes forward. Question: Grossman – can the CSC do better? People are not stepping up. This could be accomplished in changes to the procedure. The word “Screening” appears to be limiting. Are there limitations from the bylaws and OP?. This could be an ExComm action.

State-National Agreement: The present State-National is the way NSPE actually operates (Grossman). Leckband: ASPE has not seen the Agreement. NSPE (NV), CSPE and ISPE have no issues with the distributed Agreement. WSPE has specific questions: HSPE also has questions. Get all states to agree or tender questions (Action: Werner) PEO is not likely to sign due to member issues (state-only members). ASPE (AK) did not discuss the Agreement. Noted: there is no “small state” version. States can make specific addendums. The BOD discussed this issue. If not signed by a state society, this lack of an agreement could lead to potential legal action should a situation arise. A straw vote taken (Likely, Yes, No, and Undecided): Likely: AK, HI, ID and WA; Yes: CA, NV; No: OR; Undecided: AZ. Not present: GU, MT, and UT

State-Only Membership : Sam Grossman will make a major agenda item at HOD; does NSPE hold the bylaws or allow ala carte membership rules? Larger states see three-tier membership as a strong status. A statement made that “Dues level is an issue.” (Werner) Question: Does NSPE market its benefits to members well enough to preclude local only points of view? Statement: One size does not fit all. (James) Nevada requires the three-tier membership. (Hardy) Oregon has 25% state-only without conversion; local engineers are not concerned with issues outside of the local area – where is the person’s interest level? (Grossman) Statement: Viability occurs at a population of 1 million or more? CSPE has a Virtual Chapter, and five traditional chapters, but 29 MathCounts affiliates.

HOD issue Discussion: There are two BOD voting positions being presented for approval: Background. Hardy noted that many HOD delegates were not joining the electronic discussion, therefore he had moved to table the bylaw amendment action. Statement: Noted the larger NSPE organization with an expanded scope, legally. (Leckband) Many issues were not brought up previously; these facts and information should be forwarded. Discussion followed.

Motion with Second: “WPR should support the motion to seat the NICET and Educational Foundation on the BOD.” Passed Unanimously.

Action: WPR Regional Director Werner to vote in favor of the bylaws revisions at the HOD Meeting.

2009 -2010 Initiatives

Issues of Importance – Consensus: Treat the Issues of Importance as a continuing effort for the WPR. Replace the listing of this initiative with two other initiatives

(James): Soft skills needs emphasizing in NV. If WPR take note of specific training sessions, this would elevate the issues, and as a promotion agent, the WPR could publish the opportunities before the event.

Promote legislative advocacy. (Leckband) The WPR needs to provide more emphasis in this area. McGowan to summarize local legislative results from WA experience.

Discussion ensued on the merits of several concepts followed by a selection.

Motion with second: Replace “Continuing Education” with “Soft Skills promotion” and “Legislative Advocacy”. Passed Unanimously.

Election of WPR Chair: Discussion. Nominated and elected Susanne Leckband as WPR Chair, 2009-2011.

Employment: What to do? (James) Nevada is having a workshop to survive hard economic times, and would be willing to share workshop and ideas. They encourage others to do likewise. What is happening with stimulus funding among those who are receiving contracts? (Hardy) The state of Oregon website has information on stimulus funded projects. Are there other contracting websites? Idea: Advertise on Region communications mechanisms. Posting and soliciting monthly (Leckband) – research by each state, make a standard portion of monthly telemeetings. Website on NSPE.

EPA Action: Werner related paper on EPA Climate Change action: Asked for WPR action. Grossman related Chevron action to encourage action. James: Brought up Cap and Trade, encourage a proactive approach. Lanning: clean up air and driving emissions and jobs overseas. (Brands) Advised strongly against NSPE taking a position, as it will be extremely divisive; unless the position can be one that all would support. Examples given were: A position to evaluate the credibility of the science that underlies the action; or a position that none could argue with; such as “that professional engineers are specially trained and uniquely qualified in the identification and description of the problems we are facing as a society, this one being no exception, and we need to strongly promote professional engineers as the best resource to address this action by EPA.” Grossman does not believe NSPE should take a position. He cited a case of EPA blocking improvements due to a EIR restriction. He believes a position on EPA actions would split the society due to personal sentiments. Instead, NSPE should work to facilitate improvements in the wording and actions. (James) This is a professional practice issue and NSPE needs to make it work for “the devil is in the details.” In the past, NSPE has actually prepared legislation, working with PAC. (Werner) Is this a case for a position statement? (James) NSPE Ethics has a phrase of “sustainable development) (Leckband) NSPE should make a presence in the wording – what is NSPE doing to identify people with suitable expertise? Proposed: Issue a query to find out people with expertise and contacts to lead the effort with serious interests in this area.

Proposed: Look at the action by EPA on an emergency basis. (Hardy) Does NSPE have the resources to make significant effect? (Johnson) NSPE should promote use good engineering practices in the implementation of agency regulation promulgation, and NSPE should use all necessary means with due consideration to achieve results.

Resolution: **“NSPE should revisit participation in development and promulgation of national legislation and regulation with emphasis on use of sound engineering practice and judgment.”** Moved, Seconded, and Passed

Action: Werner to place on HOD agenda

Budget:

(Brands): Could funds be allocated to initiatives. Response: these allocations are typically buried in communications. Add \$900 to agenda for officer travel. Totals \$3175 total, with a \$3160 overrun.

Budget approved

Dates & Times for monthly WPR telemeeting: 4<sup>th</sup> Friday at 11:00 PST. The HOD delegates, state President, and state President-Elect from all states are specifically encouraged to participate, along with any other interested members.

Action: Set up a task force to highlight issues of importance, with a Allocation for time for this purpose. Greg Brands to set up framework.

Request: Insure that a side meeting will occur in St. Louis.

2010 meeting: the decision to come in the June telemeeting.

Adjourn: 1510