

TWS Forestry & Wildlife Working Group

Meeting Notes

6/27/17 1pm EST

866.623.5937

1209142

Action items are in bold.

In attendance:

- Greg Corace (Chair; Applied Sciences Program, Seney NWR)
- Jenniffer Bakke (Secretary/Treasurer; Hancock Forest Management)
- Steven Castleberry (Board member; University of Georgia)
- Justin Vreeland (Board member; Pennsylvania Game Commission)
- Kelly Douglass (E-newsletter editor; NC Wildlife Resources Commission)
- Shelby Weiss (Student Liaison; Ohio State University)

1. Elections (Castleberry)

- a. Slate of nominees has been published to website
- b. Voting will open 19 July and will close 2 August, giving enough time for new Board to make travel plans for the Annual Meeting
- c. **Voting will be done via Survey Monkey and Castleberry will run the election**
- d. Members will be required to sign the ballot to ensure that no one votes twice
- e. Note for next time: make sure nominees are members? (future discussion item)
 - i. Charter doesn't say they have to be members, but information should be presented
 1. Corace and Bakke personally prefer nominees to be members so they have an idea of what has been going in the group, but Corace (for instance) likes the current policy that does not require membership
 - ii. Vreeland disagrees: he wasn't a member when he was elected and thinks it's good to have recruits come from outside the membership, it also encourages people to check the group out
 1. The nominees that Vreeland approached indicated that they would like to be more involved in TWS and the WG and saw this as a good opportunity for that

2. Membership Survey Roundtable Notes (Corace)

- a. Bakke: Appreciates the format, thinks that page 7 is important for the Board to note moving forward (tables with motivation for membership and ranking of FWWG priorities)
- b. Castleberry: Agrees with Bakke – has written comments to send along to Douglass/Weiss; Noticed that there was very low student membership so the Board should probably explore opportunities for

increased student involvement in the future; suggests that a reciprocal relationship with SAF moving forward could help promote more involvement from people from the forestry sector

- c. Vreeland: Noted there was little representation from state and federal agencies, and there were not a lot of forestry practitioners; there seems to be more interest in research than implementation; agrees page 7 provides good ideas/input; concerned that the #1 ranked item (facilitate information exchange) is very broad and also potentially very time consuming; suggests that the Board should be careful with “facilitate information exchange” means and what can be accomplished
- d. Shelby: Nothing to add
- e. Douglass: Was surprised by the large percentage of respondents from academia and fewer from state agencies/NGOs, thinks this is why there are fewer people interested or involved in implementation; for future survey, would also like to know how members think the WG is actually doing (e.g., do they agree the WG is already doing the things they think are important?)
- f. Corace: Also surprised by the high percentage of academics/PhDs; agrees with Vreeland and is troubled by the lower numbers of people involved in implementation; noted that 75% said they’d like to see “different approaches to forest management” and wonders what this means to members?; thinks that overall the survey did a good job of giving a snapshot of one-third of our membership; agrees he’d like to see more student involvement
 - 1. Vreeland thinks there may be a trend getting away from forestry with wildlife students/programs
 - 2. Castleberry also thinks schools are having to be more broad with what programs cover and are perhaps dropping the more traditional requirements (such as forestry)
- g. Corace would like to folks to provide edits/comments to Weiss by 28 June at 5pm CT; Weiss will finalize by COB CT Friday 30 June.**
 - 1. Weiss will post to Google drive and the website**
 - 2. Bakke will send it to the membership (email)**
 - 3. Douglass will provide a brief summary in the newsletter**

3. TWP article (Bakke)

- a. Bakke thinks the Board should submit the article as Nancy suggested (cut everything except Castleberry and Weiss’ sections- focus on academics), but then also pursue other opportunities to get it published in its entirety
- b. Corace disagrees and thinks the Board should withdraw the article from TWP

- c. Vreeland asks about other potential outlets
 - i. Corace suggests a publication through SAF; also perhaps the Forest Stewards Guild
- d. Castleberry agrees with Corace – withdraw from TWP and publish elsewhere; suggests that we can post the current version to website as an unpublished document
- e. Corace suggests each Board Member go to their state chapter and present the article
 - i. Bakke concerned about the article length for a state chapter outlet; suggests that the article could be sent to state chapters as something they link to/share (e.g., “here’s a recent article of interest)
- f. Bakke will email and withdraw the article from TWP. She will include some info from the survey (e.g., few student members) as justification**
- g. Corace will look for other potential outlets and reach out to people outside of TWS between now and the next call**
- h. Corace asks if the Board should finalize as an in-house document, post to website, publicize, and reach out to others.
 - i. All in attendance agree
 - ii. Bakke and Vreeland thinks it’s ready to go in its current form
 - 1. Corace will look over and finalize, Bakke will forward to Corace**

4. Annual Meeting (Corace/All)

- a. Corace reserved the room
- b. Attendance
 - i. Corace hopes to attend, but not sure yet
 - ii. Bakke will not attend
 - iii. Douglass hopes to attend, but not sure yet
 - iv. Castleberry will attend
 - v. Vreeland will not attend
 - vi. Weiss will not attend

5. Logo use/trinkets (Vreeland/Weiss)

- a. Little has been done at this point; Vreeland sees several issues:
 - i. Vreeland wonders if there is a genuine need or desire among members for trinkets? With the small size of the membership, there may not be interest; also may not be an effective marketing technique
 - ii. Vreeland has looked into a few outlets- there is a potentially high upfront cost (must pay to transfer the logo, then there are usually minimum orders)
 - iii. Another impediment is how to move the material around to be able to sell the items once they are produced

- a. **Newsletter will be sent to Corace for review and then going out on 19 July, published the same day as the election; it will include a summary from Board meeting minutes, newly published research, upcoming events, a link to website and slate of board nominees, the link to the survey, link to the survey report, student write-up from NCU student event, invitation to the annual meeting, and a link to the Facebook apparel and trinket poll**

10. Future meetings

- a. Schedule one for a couple of months from now, after the elections (after the first week of August)
- b. **Bakke suggests that the next conference call after elections include members of both the old and new board**
 - i. **Corace agreed and requested that the current Board should start noting their thoughts/advice for the next Board**

11. Meeting Minutes

- a. **Weiss will send to Corace and Bakke by 5pm CST on 28 June**
- b. **Bakke will send out to the membership on 29 June 5pm PST**