

Opening Remarks – *Dan Leathers, AASC President* **2016 Annual Business Meeting Opens (Part 1) 8:18 am MDT June 29, 2016**

Introduction of New State Climatologists - 41<sup>st</sup> meeting. 1977 was the first meeting in Asheville. Glen Conner has been at every AASC meeting. New SCs: Pete Boulay MN (acting SC for MN until they hire); Laura Edwards – acting SC in SD (taking over from Dennis Todey); Bryan Mark - Ohio (taking over for Jeff Rogers); Martha Shulski (Nebraska – taking over from Al Dutcher). Departing SCs: Dennis Todey SD – to USDA hub, Ryan Boyles NC to USGS Climate Science Center; Greg Spoden MN, Al Dutcher NE, Jeff Rogers OH.

Introduction of AASC Executive Director, Glenn Kerr: – Located in Asheville in the new Climate Collider space. Retired from Air Force after 30 years. Was in meteorology and climate most of that time. Wants to build partnerships with our federal and other partners. Working on getting SCs in TN, PR and MA. Have been working with committees to broaden and define some ideas and plans for the association.

Approve Minutes of 2015 Meeting – *Nancy Selover (AZ)* – Motion to approve – John Nielsen-Gammon, second Dave Robinson. Approved unanimously.

Treasurer's Report – *David Zierden (FL)* – Income \$3600 individual dues (60 members), Meeting registrations \$18,700, extra banquet tickets \$468, Institutional Membership Leader \$30,000, Institutional Membership Associate Level \$12,500, interest income \$177.24, Fed Highways Project \$2700, Honorarium \$500, AASC List-serv subscription \$1000. Total income = \$69,645.24. Expenditures \$16,057.77 Cape May mtg; \$1835.54 travel for ED interviews; ED travel to AMS \$1892.36; Dissertation award winner \$1144.40; Legal fees for ED search and constitution/by-law review \$1715.00; \$400 accounting; Collider office rent \$1738.71; payroll and benefits for ED (available on request); Federal Highway Program payouts to SCOs so far \$500; PayPal 713.92, Total = -\$79,221.67. Funds on hand: Regular Savings \$7.43; Royal Money Market \$121,272.76; Share Draft Checking \$13,800.66; PayPal \$26,053.92; outstanding deposits \$11,890.00. Total = \$173,024.77. IMs – Leader NC, AL, KY, FL, DE, CO, NJ; Assoc MN, WA, MO, PA, TX, SC. Kansas and MRCC will become IMs Assoc level. Meeting registration had some confusion, so we extended the early registration an extra month. Some paid the higher fee, and Dave will give them a refund.

8:45 am – 10:15 am **Committee Reports and Discussion** (*Moderated by Glenn Kerr*)

8:45 am – 9:15 am Membership Committee – *Adnan Akyuz (ND)* – Melissa Griffin, Stephanie McAfee, Monica Deming, Laura Edwards, Mike Timlin, Ryan Boyles, Adnan Akyuz. Three Documents AASC Charter, Track changes to the latest Constitution and By-Laws, and the new membership categories document. AASC-Changes.docx. AASC Proposed Membership.docx. AASC Membership Charter.docx. Membership Grievance – handle issues on case-by-case basis – for the most part due to failure to pay dues. Elected officers President, plus either Past-President or President-Elect, Treasurer, and Secretary – adding an At-Large associate member. Add the Institutional Membership Levels (Leadership and Associate level) to the constitution. Add an Institutional Affiliate Membership –four levels Diamond, Gold, Silver, Bronze with dues defined in the Membership Charter document at \$50K up to 100 affiliates, \$25K up to 50 affiliates, \$10K up to 10 affiliates, and \$2K up to 2 affiliate members, respectively. Benefits include no voting rights, but access to the



listserv, discount on registration for up to 3 people, and free posting on AASC website. Also proposed increasing the individual membership fees for associate to \$80 from the current \$40, and add a student dues of \$25 to continue up to 2 years after graduation. In terms of Affiliate members – we are looking to get buy in from organizations. Can we look into to the \$100/year for the full SC individual member? OK if paying out of their own pocket, but if their institution is paying we should be able to increase it. How many voting members do we have? Right now we have only SCs plus RCC directors voting and now 53 or 54. If we add the associate members to vote, that adds perhaps twice that many. Now the associates pay \$40 and can't do anything except have list-serv. So if we give them voting rights and committee membership they can pay more. But they won't have constitution and by-law voting rights, but can vote on other business. NOAA cannot pay for memberships, so we may not be able to call the Institutional Affiliates membership, but rather subscription or some other wording. Mark Shafer said his associate members had two views. Some want to be associates and involved, and others only wanted the list-serv. So can there be a consideration of a list-serv subscription only for those people, not necessarily affiliated with an institution. There is no change to the proxy voting. The SC can delegate the voting right. Will the affiliate member's organizations be able to influence our positions on issues or whatever since they provide money? They have no voting rights. Affiliates have to be nominated just as associates do. Maybe need to discuss removing affiliate members. Need to be sure the Exec Comm officers are clearly defined to be SCs with the exception of the At-large Associate member to ensure the EC cannot become populated by Associate members rather than SCs. Will have more discussion and voting on these things tomorrow with wording changes as needed.

9:15 am - 9:45 am Value Proposition Committee - *Mark Shafer* (OK) – Ryan Boyles, Kathie Dello, Nolan Doesken, Dev Niyogi, Mary Stampone, Kevin Brinson. What's our purpose as a professional organization in 21<sup>st</sup> century, what is our value proposition as an association, where do we go from here? What value does the AASC bring to its membership, partners and those we serve? What would we miss if AASC did not exist? What more can AASC provide? There is no counterpart professional association dedicated to climate services – so we are still unique. There's a rich environment that supports personal relationships, sharing advice and ideas, and collaboration. Recommendations –

Collaboration: more aggressively insert AASC into the national climate services dialog; improve communication of opportunities to AASC membership (grants, participation in meetings); create focal points/working groups around various topics (Mesonets, climate literacy and other issues) where we can increase our visibility; create AASC named awards to recognize outstanding achievements. (like AMS awards).

Communication: – Methods – listserv, discussions at meetings, social media. Website – resource for the membership and points of access to the public. Scientific Research – Journal of Service Climatology – change to a newsletter, since Elsevier has a new Journal of Climate Service. Recommendations: Push meeting summaries and discussions out to the membership (written up by an attendee). Send notifications of new publications to the membership and to the ED to post. Increase AASC presence on social media. Implement website features to make it more useful externally (lookup feature to identify expertise). Transform the Journal of Service Climatology to an association bulletin like EOS or AMS bulletin to increase our visibility.



Building capacity – Uneven capacity among state climate offices inhibits overall growth of AASC. Recommendations: Build regional coalitions of state offices to align with regional grant opportunities (regional CSCs and Climate Hubs). Host regional meetings with funding partners. Pool funding sources to reduce overhead for small offices (AASC clearinghouse). Small grants have lots of reporting requirements and administrative BS that takes a huge amount of time relative to the amount of funding.

External Partnerships - Be more visible and be a front door for all climate eservices. We have a very large breadth of expertise, ag, ecosystem, natural resources, water, we should have a coordinating role. SCOs have a personal touch as we know our constituents and stakeholders that the regional centers don't necessarily have. Few outside AASC even know we exist or that we have a broader organization beyond our own office in our state. Have some materials we can all tap into about the larger organization. Recommendations: Connect service provision aspects of AASC members to other climate service providers – (more social science groups – non-profits and NGOs). Promote AASC in local talks. Develop a set of common talking points.

Expansion – partner with professional associations doing climate adaptation. Create a Certified Climate Services Professional process to assure expertise in those providing climate services, which would require developing an exam, and fee to take the exam, and re-certification. Maybe you could tie it into an institutional membership. Pattern it after AMS CCM. Cover Climate data and analyses, climate drivers, communication capabilities. Could expand to particular areas of expertise. Generate revenue through initial fees and annual renewal. Reduction or waiver of fees for IMs. Develop a Certified Mesonet Operator certification to assure expertise in standards and operation of a state-run network. Could be on an organizational level or an individual. Knowledge of standards, document methods for quality control, site locations and sensor deployment, climate data management and network maintenance. A committee would need to be created to develop the standards and the process. Are there legal requirements for certification? If someone make recommendations that are wrong – the issue of lawsuits. Yes, that is important and we can look at how other certification programs have addressed this issue. Do the people certified need to be members of the AASC – like AMS certified are AMS members. Think about at what level of membership. Jim Angel (as current editor) agrees that the Journal could be transformed to a more useful publication as we don't have the volume to be a peer-reviewed journal. Allows the work of the associate members be widely dispersed. Also could have monographs or occasional short papers that won't be in a refereed journal. A newsletter would be very useful to us to communicate information across the association as well as outside the association. There has also been a lot of discussion about the State Climatologist publication that is currently annual state ARSCO reports. Some things that might have been in there might be more appropriate in the newsletter. Have you considered certifying the Mesonet itself rather than the operator? Yes, this is more system specific than individual. This might help get some of the smaller networks into the national Mesonet if they can get some additional funding from the national Mesonet if they are certified. It could be a huge undertaking to set up a certification program (AMS spends a lot of resources on that). Maybe we could provide a journal or listing of climate services that people can advertise in if we certify them as qualified. The low hanging fruit is to lift the visibility of the AASC and our expertise. Much of this will require a committee to scope out



exactly how we can do some of these things, many of which are relatively easy to do, and others, like the certifications may be much more difficult.

9:45 am – 10:15 am ARSCO Committee – *David Robinson* (NJ) – We are in a state of flux so it will be important to consider the ARSCO status in this. We now have 48 SCOs, though not all have an SC. MA and TN have no SCO. Has been some work in both those states as well as PR and Virgin Islands. MA had advertised, then pulled it back. Maybe a state position, but at Univ of MA at Amherst. Jeff Rogers OH and Greg Spoden (MN) stepped down, Al Dutcher (NE) is transitioning to ASC, and Bryan Mark (OH) and Martha Shulski (NE) are new SCs. There are ARSCOs in 38 states, with no change since last meeting. PR is regrouping. 12 states have SCOs but are not ARSCO certified (AR, GA, ME, MD, MA, MT, NY, OH, RI, TN, WV, and WI). MA, MT, OH, PR/VI, and TN have SCO or ARSCO efforts in progress. 31 ARSCOs have submitted their ARSCO reports, 3 other states and MRCC and HPRCC have submitted reports. Need the reports from the 7 other ARSCO states and the other RCCs. Status of MOUs – 5 states have no MOU on file at NCEI; at least 15 states have a different SC than the one listed in the most recent MOU; only 5 states have a new MOU within the past 5 years. Glenn and Tami have initiated an effort to improve this situation – see one of them (or Dave) to see what is on file for your state. Purpose of MOU is that NCEI considers it important to know who is the official SC or SCO for a state. ARSCO Committee is Dennis Todey (chair), Mike Anderson, Stephanie McAfee, Tony Bergantino, Karin Bumbaco, Nolan Doesken, Tami Houston, Dave Robinson, and Mark Shafer.

So, where should we go from here with ARSCO? Has the program served its purpose long enough? Are there too many pieces to the puzzle with regard to SCOs, ARSCOs and institutional members at two levels? Is there a better “model” that would encourage and reward active/engaged state climate programs? What are the benefits of a reward program? Disadvantages? Given acting/interim role in SD, they are discussing the SCO and where it belongs within the University. For SD they are using the ARSCO as leverage to have their own website and be able to communicate better. In KS, ARSCO is used as leverage to get funding for the IM. Some states that are ARSCO are having to pick up the slack from neighboring states that aren’t ARSCO. Not being an ARSCO is a stamp that your office is somehow not good. Maybe we should be recognizing the very best offices, rather than requiring everyone to have a certification. The purpose was an incentive to get the office up to some standard. Maybe a different terminology. The MOU was supposed to indicate some level of support or base funding. Some active offices don’t have MOUs, so that requirement for MOU to be an ARSCO is not necessarily valid. The thing that sets the KY Climate Center apart from other centers on campus is the affiliation with a national organization. Re-certification is important in it prevents offices from slacking off. Some level of ongoing activity rather than capability. The MOU does not have NWS involvement, but the ARSCO does. ARSCO MOU is worded differently from the SCO MOU. ARSCO and MOU bring high value to the Florida Climate Center, and carries a lot of weight. Important to have the documentation as it can help get an administrator to approve of the things you have been doing. Maybe we can streamline the collection of the information in reporting on our ARSCO activities and we can then also share that information to our state partners and stakeholders. For some smaller offices the ARSCO provides cover and helps them get some leverage to grow or defend themselves against university efforts to cut them. If



someone comes to the AASC webpage to find their office, we want to have confidence they will be able to contact someone who can provide the information they are looking for – some basic standard. There seems to be a consensus that it matters, but maybe needs to be re-worked.

10:15 am – 10:45 am **Break**

10:45 am – 12:00 pm **Committee Reports & Discussion – Business Meeting (cont.)**

Introductions of who's here.

10:45 am – 11:10 am Policy Committee – *John Nielsen-Gammon (TX)* – Members include John Christy, Xiaomao Lin, Rezaul Mahmood, Hope Mizzell, and Dev Niyogi. Explore the need for and efficacy of AASC issuing policy statements on such topics as climate monitoring, Mesonet standards, climate services, climate change, etc. What are the benefits or not of issuing such statements? Look broadly at whether we should be in the “business” of issuing policy statements of any kind. The potential upside and downside of doing so. AMS has 3 types of statements and policy for issuing them, so we started there. Professional Guidance Statements – Alerting members to urgent or important matters; we have a list-serv for that. Information Statements – provide trustworthy, objective and scientifically up-to-date explanation of scientific issues of concern to the public at large; don't make recommendations or take positions. Policy statements are aimed at policy makers, local, state, Federal government, or international bodies and related policy professionals. Purposes are to advocate a position on science and technology issues; give perspective on issues pertinent to current public policy; raising awareness of scientific issue with potential future policy implications; or make policy recommendation. So committee recommended two type we could consider. Information statement to educate external individuals or organizations regarding factual matters in which AASC membership has special expertise on things we have expertise. Or policy statements to influence or support policy actions by external bodies, such as issues such as state or federal governments, on issues of relevance to AASC members. Our membership includes federal partners and our SCs have varying relationships with their state governments, so it's possible a statement the AASC issues could be problematic for a particular state office. For information statements, they should not be controversial and should have 2/3 approval of members (full members), but should be able to have all members vote. Policy statements should require unanimous approval, only full members should be allowed to vote on them, and there must be a quorum of full members. So the federal partners get some cover as they do not participate in the voting on the statement. Committee report includes the procedure to do these things. Would need to reconcile with the membership committee on voting recommendations. These things involve statements that could be external to the AASC, and the issue or where they are published or distributed is important. On the website and distributed to the target audience – published by AMS? News releases or op ed. We wouldn't issue a statement if we didn't want people to know what we're saying. Only want to issue statements that every member of the AASC could agree on, so there are areas of agreement, like Mesonet standards or what Climate Services should involve. Example – when NOAA cancelled USRCRN, we could have had a policy statement to condemn the elimination of the network. Associates could vote on information statements and help in drafting statements. The Exec Comm could solicit a policy statement or a



member of committee could propose a statement, then a committee would draft the statement. When AMS issues a policy statement – is there a place for a dissenting opinion? No – they do not want a dissenting opinion, so they don't do that. Members comment on a draft, but the AMS council votes on the policy.

11:10 am – 11:35 am ED Responsibilities Committee – *Dave Robinson* (NJ) – Dave R, Dan Leathers, Marjorie McGuirk, Hope Mizzell, Nancy Selover. Most of this came from the Job Description we put out to hire the ED. Essential functions: Strategic direction and Operation, Communication, Support of SCOs and Budget and Finance. Building relationships, Asset Awareness, Being involved in AASC operations, Building financial bridges, and Explore opportunities to execute the AASC mission for advancing the development and delivery of science-based climate services on a local and state level. Building relationships: Engage SCs: learn about their offices, strengths, and weaknesses, what sort of grants and partnerships they are interested in, and what their funding model is like, and what they can contribute for the common good. Engage RCC directors: build relationships and become aware of potential partnership opportunities they know of within their regions. Initiate conversations with NOAA (NCEI and other units), CICs, USDA, USGS, EPA, BLM, CSCs Climate hubs, NRCS, etc. to explore partnerships/collaborations with the AASC and various SCOs. Asset Awareness: ensure that the constitution and by-laws are followed and that they are up-to-date. Compile a list of AASC assets. What products are SCOs currently producing and what data sources are they using for those products. Determine how they might be shared among SCOs. Compile a list of the areas of SCO expertise (e.g. ag, water resources, modeling at various scales, climate change, tropical weather, extreme weather (non-tropical), ENSO, etc.). Also assets such as communication, mesonets, education, etc. Being involved in AASC operations: participate in AASC Exec Comm meetings; promote and participate in AASC strategic planning, encourage and participate in committee activities, currently Membership, Value Proposition, Policy, ARSCO, and Executive Director Strategic Planning. Oversight of AASC website development and maintenance efforts. Building Financial Bridges: Explore and participate in fund raising for the AASC. Help identify opportunities and grants. Explore partnerships and grant opportunities in the federal sector (USDA, EPA, USGS, BLM, ISGS Climate Science Centers, USDA Climate Hubs, NRCS, US DOT, etc.) for projects that may match up with SCO interests and expertise. Explore opportunities to execute the AASC mission for advancing the development and delivery of science-based climate services on local and state levels. Explore opportunities with the private sector for ways the SCSOs can help them with climate information that may impact their sector. (E.g. insurance industry, energy sector-extreme weather events). Annual Goals/Performance Metrics. Develop in consultation with AASC Executive Committee. Best way to avoid becoming overwhelmed – trying to do too much in too many directions. Also a means of review and accountability. Many of us are involved on regional levels as well, not just local and state levels. Should we all be involved in a climate change research project not coming from NOAA. We have observations on what has happened in our state, and our opinions are important. We want our opinions to be sought out, and this will help to get our expertise sought for projects and we can make it known that we can do these types of projects that involve many states. Are there times in the last year that things came up where you would have liked to have the ability to jump in? No, but once we have more processes in place, there will be more



opportunities to leverage some opportunities to meet with various regions and increase the AASC exposure. Did get several opportunities to expose us at AMS and several regional meetings. Is in discussions with NCEI about SCEP and other funding opportunities.

11:35 am – 12:00 pm Nominating Committee – This year we need to elect a Treasurer & ARSCO Coordinator – Lesley-Ann (nominating committee) – said they will hold the discussion of ARSCO coordinator until we settle the ARSCO direction, and they have not yet decided on treasurer nominees. Will have that tomorrow at the next business meeting session. What do we have a nominating committee? Why don't we just nominate people as a group? Because it's in the constitution that we have a nominating committee. We can also entertain nominations from the floor. This is something we can also change in our constitution and expand nominations.

11:56 am MDT Adjourned Part 1 of Business Meeting

2:00 pm – 5:00 pm **Business Meeting Re-opens (Part 2) at 2:14 pm Thursday June 30, 2016.**

*(Moderated by Dan Leathers, Hope Mizzell & Glenn Kerr)*

Had 29 voting members present at the start of this session, which constitutes a quorum. Several others entered the meeting shortly after we convened the meeting. Constitution was written in 1977 before electronic communication. Changes to the constitution and by-laws could only be voted on at the annual meeting or by US Postal Service mail ballot. "Submission of a proposed amendment shall require a majority vote at a scheduled meeting or a petition to the Executive Board by at least 10 members. Adoption of an amendment shall require a two-thirds majority of Voting Members who cast a vote." The constitution can be amended at this meeting, but the By-Laws cannot as they require a 30-day notice of proposed changes.

2:00 pm – 3:00 pm Discussion of Proposed Constitution and By-Law Changes

Proposed: change to be able to take care of business by e-mail or electronic voting rather than waiting until once a year in person or by US Postal Service mail. Wording: "This constitution may be amended by email ballot of the Voting Membership of the Association, or by Voting members attending the annual open meeting."

Proposed: "Submission of a proposed amendment of the Association shall require a majority vote via email or at a scheduled annual meeting, or a petition to the Executive Board signed by at least ten Voting members."

Proposed: "Adoption of an amendment to the Constitution or By-Laws shall require a two-thirds majority of Voting Members who cast a vote via email or at a scheduled annual meeting."

Question about 501c3 – needing 2/3 of voting members not members casting a vote. Is this the requirement in North Carolina? Our lawyer looked over our constitution and by-laws and had no problem with the wording of "2/3 of the members who cast a vote." **Need to double check this with John Hunter (our attorney) about the 2/3 of voting members or 2/3 of voting members who a cast a vote.**

Dan Leathers moved we adopt these three constitution changes, and Karin seconded. All in favor 30. All opposed 0. Motion passed.



Need to change the “Institutional Affiliate Membership” to “Institutional Affiliate Subscription” as the federal agencies can’t pay for “memberships”.

Membership dues (are covered in the Constitution): currently \$100 SC or RCC Director, \$40 for Associate, and Student membership proposed for \$25/year through first two years after graduating.

Also IMs Leadership Level \$5000/year and Associate Level \$2500. Also change word “Associate Level” to “Foundational Level” to avoid confusion with Associates.

Institutional Affiliate Subscriptions: \$35/person – NWS and NCEI are paying for those subscriptions. Many of those people would not otherwise pay for a membership.

Membership Committee eliminated the dues structure from the Constitution and put it in the Member Charter as a separate document so changing dues would not be a “Constitutional” change.

Thoughts about these numbers? Though they may not be in the Constitution they would be in the Charter. Suggestion that the SC dues be raised to \$1000 or maybe \$500. Some states won’t pick up memberships, and members have to pay out of their own pocket. It seems unbalanced for a state to only pay \$100 while other states pay \$1000 – particularly if the state is paying the dues, that seems unreasonable. If we need to change the term from “dues” so that the state or agency will pay it, then maybe we need to do that. The membership is in the individual’s name. If it is an organizational fee for the State Climate Office, not for the individual, then maybe it could be paid by the institution. So how much would be appropriate? AMS is \$140. Full member for states that are not IMs. Or do we come up with another level of Institutional Membership? We originally did not do that because we didn’t want institutions to opt for that level. We are the American Association of State Climatologists – individuals SCs, not the association of SCOs.

Suggestion on terminology: Institutional Level and Institutional Leadership Level, just drop the word “Associate” on the lower one.

Raising benefits and involvement level was the impetus to raise the dues level. There are a lot of members on the list who have not paid dues in a long time. Some will drop to the subscription as NCEI or NWS employees, and others will stay as members if they want to be involved. But maybe two levels of associates, some who only want the list-serv for \$35 or 40. Add another slightly higher level for associates and others who want to be involved at some rate above \$40, but not so high as \$80. That matches up with the federal subscription rate.

Affiliate member low rate and associate member at the higher rate - quite a few thought that was a good direction.

Move toward three or four levels of Institutional membership? We currently have 7 states at the Institutional Leadership Level, 5-7 at Institutional Level. Some may not be able to pay at \$500 or \$1000. Keep at full member or add an institutional level? The membership was split on changing the full member price. A few offices are paying the vast majority of dues. The real challenge is increasing the benefits to all members so more can move up, get



them more funding opportunities. For some offices two consecutive years at the \$5000 level will be all they can do until there is a larger benefit coming their way.

The membership committee charge was how can we bring more value to associate members. That's what we can work on in the next few weeks to craft and not worry about these numbers right now today.

3:00 pm – 3:30 pm **Break**

3:30 pm – 3:50 pm Constitution & By-Laws Discussion Continued – Associate member serving on the Executive Committee as member-at-large. Proposal was that there be an associate member position on the Executive Board – but it wasn't clear that President, Secretary, Treasurer or ARSCO could not be an associate member. President must be an SC. If we have a strong nominating committee then the Secretary or Treasurer could be an Associate member. But could associate members be on the nominating committee? We have Associate members who used to be full SCs, so they could be on the Executive Board. We have a lot of Associate members who are very active in the organization and would not have associates volunteering to be officers if they were not involved. A number of associates are effectively the SC in their state. President definitely needs to be a State Climatologist. Nominations from the floor are allowed. So the Constitution definitely needs to state that the President must be a State Climatologist. Would like to hear feedback from the membership about the value proposition committee report about their priorities so we can move forward with some of those things. They do not require Constitution or By-Law changes for the most part. Suggestion yesterday was that we not elect an ARSCO coordinator yet until we discuss what direction we want ARSCO to go. Want ED responsibilities committee to meet one or two more times and come back with a couple specific things we need included in the Constitution and By-Laws.

4:00 pm – 4:15 pm Nomination and Election of Associate Members. Excel list of 14 people nominated this year. Tina Callahan (DE), Chris Hughes (DE), Megan Schargorodski (KY), Trevor Timberlake (AR), Song Feng (AR), Lauren Lindsey (GA), Jordan MacLeod (SERCC), Bill Sorenson (HPRCC), Esther Mullens (OK), Bryan Peake (MRCC), Margret Boone (OK), Violeta King (WA), Jennifer Simmons (SC), Jennie Atkins (IL). Called for vote. Unanimously approved all.

Nomination for treasurer. Asked David Zierden if he would be willing to stay on another term. No nominations from the floor. Treasurers job is difficult and more so now with payroll and our ED and the taxes, etc. Dave Zierden accepted the nomination. Unanimously approved.

4:15 pm – 4:30 pm 2017 Annual Meeting Information - *Tami Houston/Glenn Kerr* – Last year we determined the 2017 annual meeting would be held in Asheville as no other proposals were made. Ryan Boyles will no longer be NC SC, but that should not affect the planning. There is lots of climate activity in Asheville, breweries, many hotels and tourist attractions. The hosts will make the best selection for costs and the spaces and proximity



to other venues. There is meeting space in the Callen Center (Collider). Can hold up to 150, and that's where our ED office is. Several options for dinners. Many nearby attractions, Biltmore, North Carolina Arboretum, hiking, mountain biking, bowling, kayaking, golfing, many activities, waterfalls. Asheville Regional Airport or Greenville-Spartanburg 1-hour drive away. Charlotte is 2 hours away. AMS Applied Climatology is interested in a joint meeting with us. AMS wants last half of June or early July. We are thinking about 3<sup>rd</sup> week of June (week of 19th). Fiscal year changeover at end of June, early July can be a problem for some, so we don't want to span the FY changeover. Idea is to start Applied Climate at the beginning of week and changeover to us mid-week. Is NCEI providing any support for the meeting? Yes they are. Applied Climate Committee has discussed registration with AMS, and they may be open to the option of people signing up for one or both and they will work with us on that to be as smooth as possible.

4:30 pm – 5:00 pm      Proposals for 2018 Meeting - Martha Shulski, Nebraska. Lied Lodge in Nebraska City, NE. It is a small town with a really nice location. 45 minutes from both Omaha and Lincoln, south along the Missouri River. \$30 shuttle from Omaha. Has hosted regional meetings and can handle our size group. Free parking and plenty of hotel rooms. Would be an all-inclusive resort type experience. Newly renovated. Good food. Wine tasting and hayrides, full service spa, golf, swimming pool. Federal per diem rate of \$89/night. Meeting package for 3 days at 100 people is about \$6400. \$2000 for 3 private dinners, and hosted bar for 3 nights \$900. Probably registration would be about \$200 if we have 100 attendees. There are places for kids to explore, State Park with trails, a Lewis and Clark Interpretive center. They can accommodate any food issues. Not really that far from Omaha, which is 30-45 minutes north and there are lots of things to do in Omaha for kids and adults. No cut-off dates for the summer season as they honor the federal rate year around. College World Series mid-late June. Two hours to Kansas City. The proposal was voted on and unanimously approved for NE 2018.

Adnan Akyuz (ND) moved to adjourn business meeting. Seconded by Nancy Selover (AZ) and approved unanimously. Business Meeting adjourned 4:47 pm MDT