

Partnership Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes
HQ- Washington D.C.
August 21-22, 2007

Attending

Debra Stokes, HQ	Cori Brown, NAB
Jeff Boutwell, SWF	Mark Wilmes, LRL
Greg Miller, NWK	Chris Gallagher, SPN
Mike Hosey, SAW	

Guests - Russ Hinckley – OMBIL Contractor
Mary Coulombe – Chief of Natural Resources
Ken Powers – Office of Counsel
John Piltzecker – National Park Service

1. OMBIL Changes. A package of recommendations was presented for various suggestions to screens as it relates to partnerships. The great deal of time was spent discussing what kind of information we really wanted to capture and what was realistic for the field to input. It was decided the easier we make it for the field the better the chance of capturing the information the team would like to see. Several suggestions were made of how to make this easier:

- a) Include Partnerships on the Common Pick List
- b) Have a drop down screen to be able to tie to business lines
- c) Challenge Partnership Screen – have box to check if it is a Handshake Agreement. Also have boxes to enter the partner's share of funds in addition to HQ's.
- d) Entering district-wide agreements –Use "District all Other"
- e) MOU/MOA does not capture value and expenditures - but they need to
- f) Capture Corps share of costs on reports and forms

Russ was very helpful in walking us through what might and what might not work from a user perspective. Based on the information he received, he offered to come up with some sample screens that the team can use to make recommendations to the REC, ES and OMBIL user group so they understand the changes we want to make.

2. Performance Measures – New Recreation Data Summary being developed by ERDC was presented. Two performance measures were listed: partnership percentage of the total recreation budget and value of services per total recreation expenditures. The team recognized that this data will need to be retrieved from OMBIL but was uncertain of what data fields in OMBIL would be used to calculate.
3. Foundation MOU – There was concern regarding the delay in having the MOU signed. Mary Coulombe and the ethics attorney came to discuss what needed to happen to move this along. It seemed there were some misconceptions in OC that this had been tried before and Congress had told the Corps no. There is no evidence to this however. There were several questions that need clarification from OC's perspective. OC rep. Ken Powers informed the group that even with these delays he expected to have MOU signed shortly. The team urged

Mary agreed to send a message to General Riley letting him know how important this MOU is and time is of the essence. Ken Powers instructed the team to let the Foundation proceed even though there was not a formal written agreement as he felt it would be signed shortly. Greg was going to communicate with the Foundation and have them speak with Charlie Burger from SWF on a possible stakeholder event connected with the Lewisville recreation development project. Mary reported to the team the next day that General Riley had responded to her email and asked her for some follow-up information. This is the first priority for the team members to complete.

There was also discussion about being able to release the Metroplex Partnership Study to the Foundation. There were some concerns with certain sections. HQ said they would remove those parts and forward it. Coordination will also take place with SWF to draft a disclaimer to place at the beginning of the study.

4. Legislative PMP/Authorities Update – Susan Greenwood from OC has been tasked with preparation of the legislative package. The ASA’s office asked the Corps to develop the legislative proposal as part of the FY09 budget package which is due in late September or early October. NWD – OC will do interviews to find out if the other agencies think their authorities are working as anticipated. Members of the team will support the effort by furnishing additional documentation and research as needed. Mary has been working steadily at the HQ level to raise the visibility of partnerships and the need for additional legislation.
5. Partnership Ethics Draft – The latest effort was distributed. The team was asked to concentrate on the italicized areas because of potential questions. Once all comments have been received the draft will be revised. In the meantime, various recognition examples of are being sought. Please provide that information to Debra and Greg with photos if available. The sections on fundraising agreements and corporate campaigns were discussed at length. It was the group consensus that concern about the Corps role in fundraising would be elevated if these sections were included. They are used primarily by the NPS to support multi-million dollar capital development projects and corporate campaigns and the Corp will need to take baby steps to achieve this level of partnership sophistication and policy support.
6. Fundraising Ethics/Recognition – John Piltzecker, Program Manager Partnership & Philanthropic Stewardship, National Park Service joined us and shared some of the challenges and opportunities NPS faces in dealing with cooperating associations and their friends group. He also shared with us their quick Guide to Donations and Fundraising. The NPS is preparing to celebrate their centennial in 2016 and currently individual parks are submitting request for proposals in hopes of obtaining matching funds from the monies Congress has set aside for their celebration. These are some elements of the NPS partnership program that the team may wish to investigate further for adoption into Corps partnership policy:
 - a) Recognition - No naming rights. Plaque used for recognition of effort with no corporate logos for permanent on-site. The legend usually says, “made possible through the generous support of...”

- b) Careful screening for acceptance of donations from companies with litigation or contractors doing business with NPS
- c) MOU and MOA are all signed at the park level
- d) Non-profits usually sign an agreement to work together with NPS. They do not scrutinize the overhead of friends groups
- e) Partners have undertaken construction on behalf of NPS, solicitor recently issued policy that allows partners to undertake construction on NPS land
- f) In most cases the NPS manages construction for large projects
- g) Cooperative agreement can be used to give partner a share of printing cost.
- h) NPS logo is often used with language that defines the responsibility of NPS when used with other logos

Comment [djs1]:

7. ENR Conference – Currently Mike Hosey is on the agenda the last day and the last session to speak about the Handshake Agreements. He is currently contacting past recipients to see if they would speak about their projects. Currently there is one display table dedicated to the PAC team to be shared with the Foundation.
8. APPL 2008 – Discussion ensued regarding what type of training the Corps wanted to host at the APPL conference in Denver next February. A new approach was discussed to tap existing expertise in the other agencies and APPL that would take the training to the next level. APPL will be contacted for ideas and maybe get someone from their training corps who could present something. Some members would also look at the USFWS training and Debra would speak to Rich Fedorchak from NPS regarding a recent report that was distributed on fundraising.

The Excellence in Interpretation Award will be given in 2008. Richard Otto volunteered to coordinate.

9. Review/Revision of Partnership Regulations – Debra shared there currently is a survey going out regarding the updating of the volunteer handbook and the regulation. The team cautioned not to send anything to OC until the Foundation MOU and the package from Misty was completed.

Debra also encouraged us to look at potential chances in the contributions, challenge partnerships and cooperating associations ERs and EPs. Many felt Dick had already done this, but will confirm.

10. Anything for the good of the order:

- a) Debra asked whether there was going to be any carry over money from the team and how much would it be. Jeff will collect that information for her.
- b) Jeff informed the team he would be leaving to deploy to Iraq by the beginning of November. The team will need to discuss how to handle future MIPR orders.

11. Next call – Sept. 12, 2007 7am PST