



Rio Grande Chapter

American Society for Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing

PO Box 20914

Albuquerque, NM 87154

<http://www.asprs-rmr.org/chapters/riogrande/>

Minutes: ASPRS – Rio Grande Chapter Meeting (Mar. 3, 2012)

Attendees: Joe Zebrowski, Michaela Buenemann, Nathan Kempf, Jake Darlington, Leandro Gonzalez, Mike Vessel, Rob Dzur, Brian Knehans, Clyde Hubbard, Dennis Szarka

1. The meeting was **called to order** by Joe at 12:10 pm.
2. **Roll call:** Roll call conducted with the above noted attendees present at the meeting.
3. **Quorum:** A quorum was established and the meeting proceeded.
4. **Agenda:** After brief review of the agenda, no changes were noted and the agenda was approved by unanimous consent.
5. **Approval of Past Meeting Minutes:** Joe solicited discussion of past minutes. Michaela indicated that the dates for the SWAG meeting in the February meeting minutes required a correction from August to **October 25-27, 2012**. Michaela also responded that no website for the SWAG conference was available as of yet. With no other comments, February board meeting minutes were approved pending the above noted modification of the SWAG conference dates.
6. **Treasurer's report:**
 - a. **Reimbursements.** The board reviewed the Treasurer's Report which Brian had circulated. A total of ten (10) student reimbursements in the amount of \$25 each were reported mailed out. A check for pizza at the NMSU Chapter meeting was also distributed along with disbursement of the annual PO Box fee. Discussion about the student reimbursement amount ensued and centered on the whether the amount should have been \$20 or \$25. Michaela commented that we could investigate the approved amount in the prior minutes. It was also noted that the stated goal from recollection of the minutes was to reimburse students and that the past discussion (MAY minutes outlined making a \$20 contribution) alluded to 5 dollars being a reasonable amount for students to contribute to their membership. Brian and others noted that since the checks had already been mailed, we should leave the current contribution to students at \$25. Brian also reported that we have an additional \$5 making the total balance at the time of the meeting \$1,123.00. Brian also stated that ASPRS-National is in the process of doing taxes. Discussion returned to the issue of student reimbursement and it was noted that any future reimbursements should be consistent with the form and based upon an expectation of budgeting for

such expenses. Joe also solicited input from the board especially younger members about their experience related to membership and student-related funding. Pending expenses were also discussed and included the question of expenses for mileage. Joe advanced the amount of 0.32 cents per mile for this expense and since the board had previously approved this expense, it was determined at this level and also accepted by Michaela. Joe wondered if we needed a standing amount for mileage reimbursement and to this point, Rob highlighted the fact that the ending balance was around \$1,000 and cautioned that rather than deciding on a standard reimbursement, we should set more general parameters for budgeting amounts that we are likely to spend.

- b. **Budget discussion.** Current income was reported to have mainly resulted from years of chapter inactivity. In the past year the total income received was about \$370 from ASPRS-National and over time we've been as low as \$250. Brian reported that there is a formula for determining this amount based upon rates of (associates and full members). This formula could be used for our budgeting purposes, but Brian mentioned that we should probably take care in budgeting beyond that \$350 amount. Joe thought that we should consider a future topic on fundraising. The chapter apparently doesn't really have historical information on expenses. Joe thought we could use a goal for fundraising and ideas on what we would want to spend Chapter funds on. Joe asked for volunteers including Brian to work on a budget. Mike voiced in the affirmative and contributed that the budget should be based on expected income and that we shouldn't have an expectation that the money will be there. Joe advised that he would be more comfortable in documenting other expenditures with a more formal budget. Joe thought that this could help us in a reality check and Brian mentioned that he had a little bit of history that he could work on, but a big part of the Rio Grande history was doing nothing. Brian and Mike expect to have a draft budget for the next month's meeting and if others have input please provide. Joe solicited more questions, comments and being none, we moved by unanimous consent to the next topic.
7. **Membership report:** Joe reported 66 members with 1 member on the lapsed member list. Joe mentioned that this would lead to a future discussion on recruiting. With no other comments and nothing to add the group moved to the next agenda item.
8. **Rocky Mountain Region Report:** Michaela reported that the region attempted to have a meeting but without a quorum this was postponed to 3/15. Despite the recent trouble in the past couple of months in holding a region meeting, Michaela reported that the Region had won the award for Region of the year for the Region's web site.
9. **Business:**

 - a. **Licensure in New Mexico (Nathan).** Licensure was discussed by the board in the context of the question: "What does this mean for our organization?" Brian

contributed that he felt this was an important issue. Mike mentioned that there are a few other states doing a variety of actions on the licensure front. Dennis Szarka recalled from prior discussions on the topic that we would have to make a case to professional surveyors and professional engineers. Accordingly, he mentioned that the previous Sunset review was last year. After discussion, group consensus was that this topic should monitor, but not specific action at this time was warranted.

- b. **Scholarship Status.** Joe mentioned that given his workload we may need to continue the discussion, although he did welcome discussion during the meeting. Mike contributed and asked what kind of scale we were talking about with regard to scholarship and the fact that we should talk about who might be our target audience(s) for fundraising. He further commented that even if it's a cause that you're committed to contributing has to be made easy. Joe summed up that we have two issues before us: what are we committing to and what's the fundraising effort going to look like. Joe thought it would be good to make a call to ASPRS foundation to obtain their views on the scholarship topic. Mike thought it was important to have, at a minimum, an undergraduate scholarship. Leandro agreed with the idea about the usefulness of supporting undergrads and that if we were to have to choose between undergraduate vs. graduate, the undergraduate may be the more productive direction for our scholarship. Michaela voiced her opinion that the graduate level was also important. Joe mentioned that we might be able to fundraise a bit more easily at the undergraduate level. Bottom-line for the group was that we would need to continue to address and plan more on the scope of the potential scholarship efforts.
- c. **Technical Tour.** Joe reported that despite a few cancellations and a lower turnout than anticipated, Mike Inglis of EDAC was comfortable with the number and Joe noted that there could be some lesson's learned in putting the tour together logistically. He further suggested that we need to keep this in mind for future presentations/technical tours. For the next tour, Joe mentioned that Blue Skies would like to host a technical tour and Joe is thinking around June time frame but the group will have to stand by on scheduling. Joe mentioned that other ideas for tours are welcome.
- d. **Planning for Spring Meeting.** Michaela indicated that while the request for submission of abstracts has been out, only one abstract had been submitted so far. She noted that she would send out another email and reiterated that the abstracts don't have to be just from students. Joe mentioned that he'd bring out at least one and Brian mentioned that he'd do one to help fill out the agenda. No other items were discussed related to the Spring Meeting.
- e. **Website.** Nathan reported no new changes related to the website. Nathan has updated the old site in the meantime continues to coordinate with the Region.

10. Conferences

- a. **SWUG** – Dennis reported that Colorado, Texas, and Utah groups had been notified and abstracts are due by Mar. 31st and these can be posted to the SWUG website. Dennis also mentioned that an events planner had been hired to assist with the conference and that the planner from past experience has connections to sponsors.
- b. **NMPS** – Jake reported regarding the NMPS conference and said that he’s looking for volunteers to be another ASPRS booth buddy. He mentioned that knowing ahead of time would be useful to get name tags. Jake said we would put a call out for members in general to see who we might recruit. Jake also reported that the “trove” had been found for the upcoming conference(s). Joe mentioned we should update the website with the conference lists.

11. Next meeting

- a. April is set for the Annual Meeting and the next meeting beyond that date is May; following week after the 3rd and 4th (which is scheduled dates for NMGIC meetings). The board then set May 11th and hoped to have minor call-in number issues resolved.

12. Last call items and Adjournment. Mike asked who may be going to Las Cruces. Joe, Brian, and Jake all mentioned that they were planning on traveling to the meeting in April. Joe will send out a report on the field trip to EDAC later. Motion to **adjourn** per dial tone concluded the meeting at 1:06 pm.