



**National VOAD Board of Directors
Member Survey Consolidated Results Report
April 2, 2021**

Executive Summary

The interview process performed by the board was conducted with most all 130 members of National VOAD in early 2021. The cumulative results of the data on whether giving voting privileges would “enhance the 4 C’s” and “is aligned with the Strategic Plan” roughly produced the following results: Yes—60%; No—30%; No Response (non-definitive)—10%.

It should be recognized that we did not directly ask “should Associate and State / Territory Members be given voting privileges.” The aim of these discussions was to have a conversation around these topics, rather than to simply conduct a straw-poll. Critical to this process is that all organizations continue to grow in their understanding of these topics. That is the intent beyond providing this report. It is difficult to clearly ascertain yes and no from discussion notes. Some respondents had reasons both yes and no. Keeping this in mind, the Representation and Dues Committee came to the following tabulation:

Q5. Do you think the 4 C’s would be enhanced if Associate and State/Territory Members had voting privileges? Yes? No? Why?

Response by:	Yes	No	Not Definitive
Member	21	12	2
S/T	27	12	8
Associate	12	2	1

Q6. One of our four Strategic Initiatives of the 2019-2023 Strategic Plan, “Strengthening our Collective Identity and Relationships” seeks to have institutional equity throughout the movement. Do you see giving Associate and State/Territory Members voting privileges aligning with the Strategic Plan? Yes? No? Why?

Response by:	Yes	No	Not Definitive
Member	24	11	1
S/T	24	9	6
Associate	10	3	2

The cumulative results of the data interpretation was: Q5: 60 (62%), 26 (27%), 11 (11%) and Q6: 58 (64%), 23 (26%), 9 (10%). These figures are provided but may not indicate how organizations will vote on potential bylaw proposals. We also expect opinion on these topics to evolve over time. We have enclosed a summary that represents the diversity of opinions expressed.

Condensed Summary of Data Received

National Member Responses (conversations December 2020 – February 2021)

Do you think the 4 C's would be enhanced if Associate and State/Territory Members had voting privileges? Yes? No? Why?

Yes

- And we should all work on the 4C's.
- No downside.
- The current hierarchical structure of membership 'levels' isn't the most effective way to continuously expand and strengthen the 'four C's' of the VOAD movement.
- *My organization first joined VOAD as an Associate Member, with dues of approx. \$3,500/year. When our dues were re-assessed in late 2018, they were increased to \$7,500/year because of the size of the agency and our overall operating budget, yet our membership status didn't change at the time. However, upon my initiative, I did use this increase as an opportunity to pro-actively apply to change our member status from 'Associate' to 'Full' member (which was approved Fall 2020). I do wonder, though, for organizations that have a regional/national focus but perhaps don't fit the typical VOAD member organization structure/size/scope (e.g., the AARP), or that do have much smaller operating budgets that currently limit their membership to 'Associate', are we still excluding the voices/votes of people and the orgs they represent that may be very valuable to the movement? Would these people/orgs add unique perspectives, help diversify the movement and committee leadership each election cycle, overall expand our reach across the country in terms of our collective abilities to engage in the '4 C's' that membership privileges are meant to support? I think 'yes' to all of these questions, and that by either eliminating the 'Associate' member category (all organizations would still apply for membership & have dues assessed based on operating budget) plus creating full-voting member categories for S/T members, it would only strengthen the VOAD movement and help us continue to put disaster-impacted communities, survivors, responders, etc., front-and-center in our overall mission.*
- Associates: We may consider to become an Associate Member and it doesn't feel very fair that we'd lose a vote simply to going to a different membership category.
- States/Territories have a handle on local organizations that are responding to disasters that go beyond just the National Members. Many of these may be minority groups unique to specific locations. Speaking on behalf of a National Member the response and recovery is enhanced when working directly with a

State/Territory VOAD. Enhancing the engagement of State/Territory VOADs through vote will better the movement.

- We need to ensure others are included outside the National Members. Broadens perspective. I think it would provide for more intentional inclusion for State VOADs to feel their voice matters and is heard.
- Many in our organization did not realize that States & Territories realize did not have vote already.
- Associate members – yes, they are an extension of NVOAD.
- Associate members are underrepresented and bring so much to the table in disaster in regard to being able to understand the needs of vulnerable populations and those that are historically underserved.
- These organizations need to have a voice at NVOAD.

NO

- The issue has been discussed for a long time. At the last vote, it didn't pass. It doesn't demonstrate 4 C's to keep forcing the same proposal without changes in response to concerns raised.
- NVOAD is an association of national organizations, not state and territory associations. They are not the same.
- NVOAD is a national organization with national membership and creates national goals. Having S/T with voting privileges would have states/territories weighing in on national goals. They already have a voice through the S/T Board Reps.
- Too many voices makes it difficult to get things done.
- If State VOADs were given voting privileges it creates more confusion actually. States VOADs and National Members are different. They are not the same thing. State VOADs are more administration and coordination as opposed to the National Members that are operational. Giving the State VOADs voting rights dilutes this defining characteristic.
- I believe there is a distinct difference between National Members (which the organization was founded upon) and the State VOADs. States should not vote on National Member issues and vice versa. Voting as a whole needs to be re-examined within National VOAD.
- Executing the 4 C's is not necessarily dependent on full or partial voting privileges to Associate and State VOADs. Extension of full or partial voting privileges could well provide greater platform, voice, and incentive for State and Associate Members to engage with NVOAD at greater levels. If State VOADs don't feel supported and have ownership in the movement then the 4 C's will suffer.
- The perspective of voting on issues from National organizations relative to states that are local to their geographical area and associate members are not the same in organizational consideration.
- State VOADs do have freedom to collect their own dues and organizational set-up any way they want. They also have the ability to say they want equity and anyone in

the State can be equal. Some states set up their State VOAD just like National VOAD (state-wide presence, regional presence, etc.). This is a good thing. However State VOADs having full membership is the same thing as saying each conference should have full voting rights, which isn't tenable. There's a way to promote engagement and inclusion without full voting rights.

- State and Territory VOAD's provide information to their members within their state/territory, but again are not within themselves "operational" disaster responders. It is the members of the state/territory VOADs who are the responders.
- State VOADs: No. I think it would do more harm than good. It would be organizationally confusing to have State VOADs function in the same way as National/Associate Members. All these outside organizations come together that formed NVOAD (National & Associates) and then have affiliates or chapters/franchises of the same organization have the same role and privileges as its affiliates/chapters of the national group. The work of NVOAD at a national level is not the same as the needs at the State level.

ADDITIONAL

- Stipulation that voting organizational understand with voting rights comes accountability.
- One question is if States/Territories have a vote what the benefit to National Members is to have a vote. It seems for smaller organizations this might incentivize National Members to just be active with a state or states.
- One organization did not know Associates are "operational" disaster responders, not partners.
- It matters how it gets rolled out. Do all State VOADs have fair election processes and consistent capabilities? Great opportunity to have more capacity building with more dues.
- With State & Territory VOADs, I'd prefer to see a weighted system as National Members have a broader view ACROSS states. I'm also not convinced the VOTING issue, in of itself by default leads to an increase in the 4 C's. It doesn't work in other direction--as a National Member, I'm not voting in (_x_) VOAD. The vote may not be the most effective way to ensure States have to ensure their voice can be heard. However as more grassroots organizations participate in State VOADs, some may feel their voice isn't heard by a National Member representative (like Feeding America, Salvation Army, etc.)
- S/T VOADs are important to the movement and need input and be part of movement but to put them together in the same way is not helpful from a Governance perspective – 2 different entities voting in the same way not helpful. Voting the same as a member? If voting in other ways. Can there be two house system to work to work on consensus? Voting Governance is different than how we work together. Committees could offer more representatives; they should be able to vote on POCs and Guidance documents as they have to live by them too

but issues with governance are different.

One of our four Strategic Initiatives of the 2019-2023 Strategic Plan, “Strengthening our Collective Identity and Relationships” seeks to have institutional equity throughout the movement. Do you see giving Associate and State/Territory Members voting privileges aligning with the Strategic Plan? Yes? No? Why?

YES

- Equity is rightly gaining more recognition in the disaster preparedness and response world. Granting voting privileges would affirm the importance of equity. State/Territory VOADs would be more encouraged and engaged if they also have a vote. We want buy in and should be seeking for them to contribute. Providing voting privileges enhances collaborations.
- It is unfair that S/T are invited to the meeting and then are not allowed to vote on critical matters for the org.
- It takes everybody to be involved.

NO

- They have different roles and responsibilities to fulfill. They are not the same thing and should not be considered as such. This is an association of organizations of national members, but listens to the voices of Associate members and State/Territory members
- Most of the state/Territories’ members are connected with a national member, (but they serve on a state level yet they talk with their organization’s national office giving input from their state within their organization) which it think brings balance. And NVOAD is more diverse now than ever.
- This will automatically solves the issue related to Strengthening our Collective Identity and Relationships. I believe we should consider other expanded opportunities for State VOADs. For example, maybe an additional seat on the Board or added State VOAD capacity from 2 to 4 per ad-hoc committee. More representation and voice where they can vote. State should have the availability to swing a majority vote around organizational structure and substantive changes to the corporation.
- National VOAD needs to have an identity that is National in scope.
- It should be based upon the perspective of organizational capability or their serve offerings allows for their affiliation with the National VOAD. National members organization have defined expectations for consideration of mission for more broader services / or community engagement offerings as a privilege of the voting members.
- Not unless these groups are prepared to pay equal dues, it does not align in my view.

ADDITIONAL

- Even in the absence of an opinion on how this relates to voting privileges, it is important to strengthen identity and relationships. Being more inclusive does seem to be supportive of this ideal and something we should strive for.
- Organizations within NVOAD are presently very diverse across different faiths, gender, religion, etc. Continuing to seek out other organizations with a diverse background should be a focus and would align with the strategic plan.
- The goal of strengthening our collective identity and relationships can be achieved in many ways and that voting privileges isn't required to do that. However, since a number of S/T Members see voting privileges as an important part of strengthening collective identity and relationships I am not opposed to that step as long as the dues structure and Member responsibilities are acceptable to S/L and Associate Members. I would not want dues or other requirements to be a barrier for States or Associates to be at the table.
- It's not about voting privileges. It's about culture and how we treat each other with intentionality and respect. We're all partners to each other.
- Goal is important as is institutional equity. Equity does not mean the same for everyone though. National Members are the "owning members" of the movement not S/T. Need to consider how to run the nonprofit NVOAD vs how to think about the movement. Important to nuance that. Can support S/T capacity but they can't run the organization.
- Associate Member bucket includes a lot of different types of organizations - Airlink, FedEx vs FEMA.

Do you have any concerns with a change? Yes? No? Why? What do you see as positives that would come from a change?

YES

- This would give one membership level a near majority of votes.
- Concern about any one organization getting too much representation across multiple S/T VOADs Concern about voter engagement and achieving a quorum S/T members need more resources and mentoring. Can members afford higher dues. Turnover of leadership.
- No value in making this change.
- States need capacity building to understand their own work/environment/organization, much less to understand the national level. Original intent was that National VOAD would support the states not the other way around. Different issues and roles and governance on different levels. Some things that involve their help need buy in though.
- Some states are reluctant to assume the responsibility of holding full member status
- If S/T dues are increased will all S/Ts be able to pay the increased amount and will some S/Ts not be able to vote due to their inability to pay?
- S/T full membership simply should be optional, that if S/T chapters are interested in

applying for full member status they can, but if they don't, they don't have to (I don't think full voting privileges should be automatic for each S/T chapter, without their applying for full membership, first). S/T VOAD chapters that don't wish to assume the responsibility of full membership would of course still be invited and encouraged to attend meetings, etc., but just wouldn't have a voice/vote (just as other non-member organizations can do) since they opted not to.

- State VOADs are organized in several different ways. Mr. ___ was actually State VOAD Chair once for 4 days. Some have close to no funding. Others have deep pockets. The proposed change could actually increase inequity. On a positive side, many State VOADs have depth of experience that would be a valuable resource.
- States: They are subsets of NVOAD. Why does it make sense for a National member with National scope to influence national votes and then get to vote as their leadership on State VOADs as well? Opportunities already exist for States to engage with National VOAD via their national organizations and committees and board reps. Points of Consensus for example is an agreement amongst national organizations and members that guide national organizations that comprise NVOAD. A State VOAD shouldn't be bound to the Points of Consensus.
- Associate members should be a separate discussion and should be explored, but not S/T.
- The categories of membership would get blurred. You could also get role confusion as a National Member also being the one who votes for a State VOAD as well.
- By giving State VOADs voting rights it encourages competition with the National Members. This is not good. Do not see positives at this point.
- It would bring so many more to the Board and be more difficult to do business with 50 plus more voices in the decisions and many organizations would have multiple votes with states voting too.
- I don't know how this could be a positive change except for us to say we allowed State VOADs a right to vote. This is not National politics as if someone were not being treated fair, this is about organization structure and integrity of the institution of National VOAD.
- We will need to give sufficient time to S/T to socialize the issues before a vote is called.
- National VOAD is an association of national members that have their own identity and appreciate the State/Territory VOADs in an advisory, not controlling, capacity. We do not see positives from the change.
- National membership and voting should represent national organizations. States and territories have the privilege to have their voices heard. We do not see a positive in this change.

NO

- We get more points of view.
- More buy-in is good, more collaboration during and before disasters. This will help.

- It would require more care and attention to the needs of State VOAD balanced against the needs and priorities of national members. As long as a 2/3 majority of membership is still required for by-law changes, this should encourage greater understand of the needs of different membership types.
- The concern when you add more voting members you add more opinions to the discussion which could open door for more controversy, but for the benefit of survivors they should be consideration of voting members, there would be some growing pains involved.
- Associates: These are organizations just like National members, fully formed with capacity. It doesn't make sense for an Associate member to have essentially the same capacity as a National Member, but not be able to vote. It's unfairly restrictive to a high-capacity organization with a regional footprint.
- More voices at the table and more perspectives are a good thing. Don't mind change but needs to be change with a purpose.
- I think that it would provide for more unity among the various types of members.
- Positive - gets rid of hierarchy. I was glad to see we did away with tiers.
- I am OK with allowing voting privileges as long as the corresponding dues and other requirements did not create a barrier to participation.
- More voices at the table is good.

ADDITIONAL

- Ensure VOADs (National / States / Territories are not surrogates for FEMA and State / Territory government). Allow member organizations to do their work, and do not get in the way, but facilitate and support member organizations.

If it were proposed that the dues were assessed based on aggregate data from Member Organizations (including Associate and State/Territory Members) and a review of the approved budget with board-adopted min/max dues levels, are you in favor of assessed dues based on each member's immediate past three-year average domestic disaster expenditures? Yes? No?

YES

- Current mechanism may be keeping small startup Associates from joining.
- It would bring so many more to the Board and be more difficult to do business with 50 plus more voices in the decisions and many organizations would have multiple votes with states voting too.
- Dues need to be realistic based on what it costs NVOAD to support its members.
- The dues structure needs to change. Not a fan of making it based on disaster expenditures for many reasons. A basic escalating flat fee/tier system either based on number of staff or other steady-state indicators (admin budget, number of members, etc.) needs to be considered.

- Some years are feast and some are famine, so a three year average works.
- As long as there are min/max thresholds.
- Minus restricted federal and state programs.
- Pass through is an issue. Min / max makes sense. Would need more information about how this works.

NO

- Dues for State/Territory Members should continue at a minimal flat rate. Associate members however, YES.
- Many national members pay significant dues and a potentially increase of dues with smaller voice would not benefit national members.
- Perhaps at some point in the future but not at this time. Many State/Territory VOADs are still struggling with financial sustainability.
- Base it on administrative budgets. It's not fair to base it on the goodwill of donors to organizations. Donors don't expect their funds to go to national membership dues. States are so different again and it seems problematic. Administrative budget is cleaner.
- A simple assessed amount would be better
- S/T have a limited budget. If they were assessed higher dues, it would be double dipping for us as a national org. Their budgets are rock bottom. They should be about operations, not fundraising.
- This doesn't define what the expenses are made of. For example, some groups count Gifts In Kind as part of their expenses, some do not. This would skew greatly those groups that utilize Gifts In Kind as part of their disaster expenses.
- Just because you rack up huge funds isn't a reflection of what you've accomplished.
- Dues should be evaluated at levels that are driven by operational expenses of National VOAD. Dues should not be determined by arbitrary numbers but rather should be determined by needs of National VOAD. What are the core functions of National VOAD that we are to be about the business of. Work to fund those things all of the time, from year to year. Also, some organizations do not determine disaster expenses the same way other organizations do. For example, some groups use GIK some do not. Dues solely determined by disaster expenses would not contribute to equity in the Membership but rather hinders it.
- Fixed dues are better. Not sure of the size and cost of disaster events during periods of time. It would be hard to quantify
- When funds come in vs when you are assessed could be problematic.
- Better suggestion for past three years but needs to be addressed. Associate needs to be revisited. Mistake to treat dues the same for Assoc and National. Definitely change dues structure but do they vote? If change to Assoc with vote that strips the value of being a member because anyone could hit those lower levels of requirements. National members run the organization. Plan was to bring in other new organizations

to grow to National Members.

- Three years is a big snapshot. A lot can change in that window. For the actual State VOAD---NO. They don't have much money. If it's an Associate Member, that seems to make sense. Maybe look at operational budget based on membership size? Maybe increase slightly to \$100 for State VOAD.
- Better on past dues not based on budget. Does it penalize orgs doing most work?
- I appreciate the logic of the approach. Honestly don't know what goes in to determining that. It feels like a lot of administrative work. I think it sounds hard. Tracking three years of disaster expenditures seems difficult.
- Too many variables of time periods, geographical issues with regards to disaster response activity and other unpredictable or controllable variables.
- Flat rate for National voting members, a flat rate for non-voting associate members and the current flat rate for non-voting state/territory members.

ADDITIONAL

- This formula should be applied for all organizational/institutional (NGO) members, but not S/T members. Regarding dues assessment for member orgs, however, the Board must understand that not all orgs have 'traditional' disaster models; some orgs. have non-disaster services (would those be included in the budget assessment?); some orgs. may have funder or other restrictions re. how they spend their disaster funds (e.g., if their disaster-related program expenditures are via grants or for some other specific purpose that doesn't allow for budget allocations for dues; etc.)
- There should be a dues assessment formula in place that can be based on an orgs.
- Immediate past three-year average domestic disaster expenditures, and that member orgs. should still be required to submit necessary documentation in order to assess for dues
- There should be an appeals process in place as well, as a part of member applications or dues invoices, for when orgs. are given an assessment that may not fully capture what their actual capacity is for payment.

If not, what suggestions do you have?

- \$100
- Yes, minus restricted federal and state programs.
- I think an assessment should be made on the size and capability of each state, as there are different State VOAD legal structures.
- To utilize the administrative budget, which is cleaner and simpler.
- Consider flat rates.
- Tiered dues based on annual budget, not expenditures.
- Some groups count Gifts In Kind as part of their expenses, some do not. This

would skew greatly those groups that utilize Gifts In Kind as part of their disaster expenses. Continue to use the Disaster Budget of organizations.

- Examine the National VOAD budget. Identify funded programs and staff positions that must be done at all times. Then work backwards to determine funding thresholds for membership. This would allow for sustainability of National VOAD regardless of severity of disasters per year or one off grants. Dues should fund regular day-to-day business of the organization.
- Maybe make a bigger window based on what organizations can afford.
- Level of engagement in disaster services helps determine dues level. For example, full disaster organization would be higher. Then organizations that offer immediate needs would be next and so on.
- Dues demonstrate capacity and commitment. Suggest a minimum and recommended levels that allow additional commitment. If there is a change, there needs to be a transition period to allow for budget changes. During COVID is a tough time to come out with a new dues structure. Hard to calibrate what is normal and how it is impacting organizational fundraising.
- We should look at the general function of the NVOAD organization and build a base line budget and expectation of the membership to help service their contribution to support the measures... hosting Annual Meeting, Fall Members meeting and some base line operational cost
- Suggest putting dues work in our policies so not changing bylaws all the time but can still get feedback.

What are your thoughts about State/Territory Members current dues assessment of a flat rate of \$35 per year?

- This is fair. States & Territories do not have large budgets; keep it low, to encourage inclusion.
- Several responses recommended slight increases: Recommend \$100, Dues should be increased to at least \$500, Standard dues increase of \$75 or \$100, Dues should increase for State/Territory Members, A flat rate is acceptable but at a higher rate.
- Unclear on what the rationale is for \$35.
- Seems low for the benefits they received, but recognize many do not have capacity to pay more.
- \$35 is low considering the benefits, leveraging organization's vast reach, collective info, and input to help in their response. Don't believe a \$35 membership dues amount is fair / equitable to National Members. Dues should equate to the value of contribution an organization makes.
- Perhaps the flat rate can be increase but not significantly. My experience is that most states have a small budget and fund raising for dues should not be an added burden. believe that this is too low, we should do an assessment of overall 50 State VOAD dues, propose an amount that would be reasonable also considering the other

meetings that we desire their participation (Annual Mtg and FMM).

- Open to exploring an application process for S/T members whereby those S/T chapters that are seeking full membership should still be asked to demonstrate that they meet certain criteria (do they hold regular meetings? Do they have bylaws in place? Etc.) and perhaps prospective S/T members could still be assessed for dues on a case-by-case basis depending on their budgets, however I understand why there was a flat-rate model, given the vast differences between say, American Samoa and Florida. With that said, I don't know how a flat rate of \$35/year is sustainable, particularly if S/T chapters are granted full member status. At the very least perhaps S/T member dues could be assessed based on their state/territory's population size OR their GDP (this would offer equity between say, Puerto Rico, and smaller but richer states) and again still assessed every 3 years. By increasing S/T dues (to what I don't know) this could also perhaps give chapters of all sizes more incentive to expand their own membership & collect more dues. (Which would be a win-win scenario.)
- Do they have budget and does that affect ability – Seems manageable, fine. Not enough - \$75-100 Hassle for low payment A variety of thoughts on the \$35/year dues: some thought \$35 was fine, some thought it was low, some thought there was little return on investment for S/T VOADs in the past.
- Small dues assessment seems appropriate, especially as they don't have same voting privileges.
- This makes a lot of sense.
- I think a study needs to be done to assess by the dues should be.
- Thought the dues were \$50 per year.
- I don't feel dues needs to be connected to voting rights. \$35 flat fee is fine.
- Currently, S/T VOAD dues are more expensive than their dues to National VOAD which seems backwards. If S/T get a vote, there should be more dues assessed.
- As a National Member our dues are higher than states yet all services provided the last four years have been directed solely to States. This includes the DART platform, State VOAD websites, and a dedicated Staff Person for States. National Members do not have access to those things even though we pay more in dues. I don't feel as though National Members are getting much in return for their dues.
- Some states may not charge dues and may not have revenue. If you don't charge dues, how can you pay National dues.
- Tie is to % of dues received.
- I have no idea how this number came from...but it does raise an equity issue of having National Members pay so much more and both getting the same voting rights. There needs to be a method to the madness and value for the dues.
- If they become voting member they would have accept reasonable amount of contributions to the organization therefore their dues should increase.
- State and territory VOADs generally have very small budgets and as such I think the

current flat rate is fine so that they may send representatives to NVOAD, however if voting rights are granted to these members, then I believe their dues must be in line with other voting members.

Do you have anything else to share from your perspective about this topic?

- Appreciation for the increased resources National VOAD has made available to member organizations to further their mission to help those impacted by disasters.
- Consideration that if States and Territories / Associates have a vote, it might make quorum more challenging. In anticipation of this, National VOAD could start implementing and enforcing committee and member meeting requirements. Regarding roll calls, National VOAD should move to a more automated roll-call / attendance-taking system for member and committee meetings, if possible, to save time.
- A National Member's dues payment should offset the dues payment of their affiliates in each respective State VOAD. Who needs National VOAD services the most? States or National members? Those with the greatest need should have a better way to influence the organization as a whole.
- Frustrated with loud and angry state members pressing the issue and not consistently representing what has happened on this issue. This vote came up and failed, why is it happening again. There's a process for this, why not vote State Reps to the Board who align with your viewpoint and whine when you don't.
- I believe we can work together on unity as we have a lot of challenges with disasters and the pandemic.
- Why should a National Org be required to report how many S/T VOADs we are active in?
- At the Annual Conference - make sure we all meet together in same room. the optics look bad if we are separated.
- I continue to pray for National VOAD
- We ARE getting a good ROI with our fees - the Lowes grant was amazing. The relationships we build in NVOAD are critical and valuable
- We do not feel State/Territory VOADs or Associate members should have a vote. They should take advantage of contributing to committee work.
- Appreciate that the board reached out about this topic.
- Wish there was a way to have more scholarships for Latinx groups to attend AVC. The Associate Member is an excellent level for new groups to enter. Coordination is happening on a vertical level of NVAOD with FEMA etc. but not much internal coordination is being fostered
- Dues and S/T voting rights should be separate issue
- Need to hear more what are the member benefits and communicate more
- NVOAD is an association of national organizations, not state/territory associations.
- In favor of three state / Territory's reps to have a voting option but not all states and

territories. That way the states VOAD organizations could have a voice in national decisions. But to have all 50 states having a vote would create chaos.

- I also feel that it is a strain on National Organizations to support dues to States and pay their dues. Most National groups are paying at the National level and then paying for their chapters at the state level. Perhaps some consideration for groups that are doing both.
- Most S/T don't have huge reserves - they are merely a convening body
- Have full confidence in the National VOAD Board and those organizations we have partnered with since becoming a National Member.
- We are proud of National VOAD and happy to get more involved in this discussion going forward.
- Could be an opportunity to engage large donors in support of DEI both to help bridge COVID gaps (Members doing well with fundraising and those impacted by increased need and less donations) and transition to a new dues structure. Generally, more inclusion is better so allowing more Members that are willing and able to participate at that level is important.
- Everyone needs a resounding commitment to NVOAD and the membership as a whole. Let's work through these things together. I appreciate the Board reaching out for open discussion. Glad that the Board is communicating and sharing the updates with the members.
- The NVOAD Board updates are good and being received positively for information sharing and keeping the members more up to date.
- National voting members pay thousands in annual dues, for very little in return. We still have to pay thousands each year to send representatives to the Spring and Fall meetings on top of the dues. If voting rights are granted to groups beyond National members, then the dues must fall in line as well.
- National members who have actual disaster programs and actually respond to disasters should be given voting rights. After all, it is "National Voluntary Organizations Active in Disaster". If state and territory VOADs essentially become national members, then the committee should be recommending a name change as well.
- Member orgs should be separate from Assoc and S/T as far as dues are done. Assoc membership is a way for small orgs to join as steppingstone. This is confusing membership roles and governance. S/T have governance in their S/T and reps to the Board. If S/T are members with same rights then difficult for governance.
- If there is an opportunity to facilitate dues payments electronically that would enhance business operations.

Associate Members Responses (conversations December 2020 – February 2021)

Do you think the 4 C's would be enhanced if Associate and State/Territory Members had voting privileges? Yes? No? Why?

YES

- Associate members contribute additional voice and including their vote broadens input.
- States and Territories will be more inclined to take leadership roles.
- It moves the organization from a hierarchy to a partnership.
- It increases diversity and decision making.
- Associates now contribute the same as National. Recommend: One year probation for Associates to gain voting rights.

One of our four Strategic Initiatives of the 2019-2023 Strategic Plan, “Strengthening our Collective Identity and Relationships” seeks to have institutional equity throughout the movement. Do you see giving State/Territory Members voting privileges aligning with the Strategic Plan? Yes? No? Why?

Overall, Yes

- S/T should have rights as this will bolster trust and buy-in.
- gives rights not privileges. Bolsters trust & fidelity within the movement
- strengthens relationships & ensures equity
- they represent VOAD in their communities and should have a voice and vote.
- local org. representation differs from national

Overall, No

- Equity doesn't necessarily ensure quality, if S/T will vote on behalf of their State or Member Agency.
- States and Territories with leadership from organizations that have National representation could lead to unequal representation. Unsure if S/T will cast a vote representative of their membership.
- Every S/T VOAD is different. Some contribute more than others. Equality with giving voting rights doesn't necessitate equity.
- Equity within an institution does not equal voting rights. Perhaps limited voting privileges, for points-of-consensus as an example. But not changing the by-Laws or voting on the dues for National Members.

Do you have any concerns with a change? Yes? No? Why? What do you see as positives that would come from a change?

- *There are a range of concerns raised, including: (1) State and Territory capacity and functionality across the 56 organizations, (2) holding a voting block across the movement, (3) whether voting rights equal higher dues, (4) unity over current*

divisiveness.

- A vote will be added value, favorable to have more voices at the table, a vote leads to ownership and empowerment.
 - more voices and a seat and voice at the table
 - Leads to ownership and empowers engagement & collaboration
 - A vote would recognize the value of Associates & S/T
 - Negatives:
-
- Not all State VOADs are equally functional or have much capacity. There are membership/capacity requirements for National and Associate members, however for State/Territory it seems to be a default membership as long as very minimal criteria is met. The way this issue has been worked has been problematic
 - Will voting rights equal higher dues & S/T Chairs should be beholden to State not Sponsoring Agency
 - States are not active enough to have informed opinion

What are your thoughts on the possibility of Associate Members having voting privileges?

Overall yes.

- Very good favorable thoughts!
- Yes, more voices is beneficial. Invested in the movement
- Unsure. Voice over voting.
- Advances diversity & inclusion. Knowing my voice matters.
- Feels like play to pay. We are able to have a significant voice on a committee but not vote.
- Associates invest time and SME without ability to vote or lead efforts.
- Associates are not high level like National Members.
- The more the better---but this org is not interested in seeking.

If it were proposed that the dues were assessed based on aggregate data from Member Organizations (including Associate and State/Territory Members) and a review of the approved budget with board-adopted min/max dues levels, are you in favor of assessed dues based on each member's immediate past three-year average domestic disaster expenditures? Yes? No?

Mixed. Emphasize dues should be determined based on domestic disaster budget not organizational budget. Gift in kinds should not be considered. Current structure is not equitable.

YES

- I don't have a problem with this, but outlier years makes this difficult.
- Need more info. on structure
- Should be a modest amount based on budget/what org. can afford.

- Disparity currently with National & Associate dues.
- Not equitable---differs from org to org.
- Yes, need a clear idea of calculation approach.

NO

- Overall disaster expenses, gifts in kind doesn't make sense to consider. Maybe just domestic work.
- Unsure. Some orgs may be unable to provide this info.
- Should use expenditures not budget.
- Should be fair and low. Unfair currently.

If no, what suggestions do you have?

Last 3 years or few years, disaster budget, phased approach.

- Changes should be phased.
- Last few years should be evaluated.
- More consistent. A 3yr approach could be arbitrary and hard to predict.

What are your thoughts about State/Territory Members current dues assessment of a flat rate of \$35 per year?

Mixed. Too low, sliding scale, current activity of S/T should be considered, modest amount should be considered. Changes shouldn't be a barrier to participation.

- Need more info. to assess this. May not be fair for an active and less active state to pay the same.
- Adjustments should be equitable
- Should be a modest amount
- Sliding scale.
- Don't tax same people with an increase.
- Seems low. S/T may not have income.
- Very low.
- Would not want States unable to join because of lack of funding.
- Seems out of line for fairness & equity. Should pay a fair amount.
- Any changes may trickle down to what S/T require for dues from members.
- Fair amount. \$ shouldn't be a barrier. Should be a sense of value add.
- \$100
- May consider waiving the fee to reduce administrative burden.

Do you have anything else to share from your perspective about this topic?

- National Members should bolster capacity of S/T VOADs not overwhelm State.

- Former CEO Advocated for S/T—will next do the same?
- Excited to hear evaluation of dues and budgets to be considered are being discussed.
- S/T Members should have to meet basic criteria to qualify as a member.
- Consider an Associate member on the BOD.
- What is being done now is not working. S/T's contribute \$1860 and have reps. on the board.
- Many Associates pay high fees and don't have reps. on the BOD. Things are out of alignment and need to be examined.
- Maybe consider opt-in for those who are interested in voting---since many may not have bandwidth or interest.
- Consider adopting UN Cluster model principles.
- If they don't pay dues, they shouldn't vote. S/T should listen only if unable to pay.
- Since joining, this is what people like to talk about. We do not have interest in the topic.

State/Territory Survey Responses (conversations December 2020 – February 2021)

Do you think the 4 C's would be enhanced if Associate and State/Territory Members had voting privileges? Yes? No? Why?

YES

- Strengthen ethos and philosophy. No vote creates animosity. This would enhance level playing. Better representation. More participation the better.
- You are heard through your vote. There is no difference between voice and vote.
- Gives states more legitimacy, all responses are local.
- For Associates, yes. Associates still play key roles in membership and getting work done. Associates should have some input. It would enhance the 4 Cs.
- Our colleagues would take the Associate and State Members into more consideration if they saw us as equals in the organization.
- Should have vote on points of consensus and guidance documents.
- It is problematic overall for membership organization that does not engage all members as valuable as other matters. Growth in numbers in Associates and S&T. Most Associates regionally based and bring great assets but not looking to move up to national members, higher dues no Board seat. States do not feel as equal members. COAD's across my state are not affiliated with large national disaster orgs. but tied in to need and local response. They are everyday disaster responders.
- Brings more experience to the table.
- Structurally it helps the State/Territory, Associates members to see themselves as part of the movement and not just part of a hierarchy.
- States would be more engaged. We haven't many major disasters, they don't have

a lot of interaction with National VOAD that other states have. Consequently, they don't really know how/what NVOAD does during major events.

- Having a voice and vote ensures that one's voice is heard. Without State/Territories the movement is just an idea.
- However, have a concern that if we have a vote - we want the states to have strong capacity and not just "take up room"
- Yes. State and Territory VOADs serve as a primary conduit through which NVOAD engages locally during all phases of disaster. National Member's local affiliates actively serve as members of State and Territory VOADs, COADs and LTRGs – alongside state and local members that represent the majority or organizations across the VOAD movement. It is this State & Territory-based participation that is the day-to-day face of the VOAD movement. We believe S/T VOADs strengthens NVOAD's capacity to: 1) gain intimate operational knowledge and philanthropies of our States and Territories; 2) identify and leverage local resources to amplify and sustain operations; 3) build relationships with governmental officials; 4) advocate for legislative and policy decisions that benefit the movement, and so much more. As such, the efforts of State and Territory VOADs are inextricably linked to those of the NVOAD.
- Some fundamental issues are brewing with NVOAD, and it will be important that S/T Reps have a vote.
- Voice without vote often goes unheard. This provides States and Territories more pull and political power.
- But I'd like to see the structure of this before voting, the whys, the pros and cons and how it will all roll-out so it benefits everyone equally.
- NVOAD asks us to sign off on rules & regs. But we have we no vote in what we are signing off on.

NO

- States should have a voice and not necessarily a vote. States may want a vote related to items that directly affect them.
- Voting privileges isn't a huge issue for us.
- You should be following the 4 C's whether you have vote or not. A voice is more important than a vote (or a mini coup).
- The current behavior of several state VOAD's is discouraging hopes for that.
- We can have input and be heard without a vote. We are represented by our State/Territory Board representatives and can contribute through committees.
- Have not seen any evidence of that.
- 4 C's can all happen without voting.
- Would voting rights require consistency in how State VOAD Boards and leadership are constituted. We are a board of 15. Why do we NEED voting

membership? We couldn't define a clear articulation in response to this question.

- May be more work. comfortable with the representation to the board that we have.
- The system as it stands doesn't appear to be broken or need fixing. This subject gets examined fairly often and doesn't get the votes to pass.
- Not seeing the major benefit to us from this. Too many people at the same table could cause more problems.
- There are many less involved and less organized members, who don't pay significant dues that could make uninformed votes (which would be detrimental to the 4 C's). Also States already have members voted to the National Board and are able to represent their specific needs. Many in our State VOAD were pretty clueless about how NVOAD works and didn't have an opinion, including those affiliated with national members.
- There needs to be a way that State/Territories have a greater voice but not sure that voting privileges is the right way to do so. For what we're doing now, we do not need a vote.
- The national non-profits need to have the votes and be in control of National VOAD. State VOADs and Region VOADs should not have voting rights. Again, if we let each state VOAD or region VOAD vote this erases almost completely the voting influence the national non-profits have. Government organizations participating in VOAD having no vote. For profits participating in VOAD and have no vote and as you note the state and region VOADs presently have no votes. Again, giving the State/Territory/County VOADs a vote increases the votes by as many as 50-60 plus which dilutes the non-profit votes to a point, they will have no say in how the organization is run. As with national, leadership of State/Territory/County VOADs fluctuates every year or two years and it is a given that at any given point in time one non-profit has more influence than another. My wisdom is leave the voting the way it is with only the non-profits having the votes. So conclusion, my respectful advice is do not give the states and regions separate votes.
- State VOAD leaders are also responsible to work with their National leaders to be sure their views are heard and accounted at the National Level.
- We feel that we have representation in National VOAD through our National Organizations and don't necessarily need a vote as a State VOAD. As long as our national organizations are getting feedback from affiliates we feel that our voice is being heard. Need to make sure that the local/state affiliates have easier access to national organizations to get the sense of where we stand.

ADDITIONAL

- It remains to be defined with clarity what those voting privileges would be and their implications.

- If one agency had a majority of reps in State Chair positions. Gerrymandering. How would voting for States be regulated and monitored. Needs a lot of thought and input before States get a right to vote.
- My greater concern is the conflation of the lack of voting rights with other issues, which doesn't seem appropriate.
- Issues that have an affect on the state & territory VOAD's ability to operate with relation to our partnership to the NVOAD should be able to be voted on by every member of the NVOAD not just the national members. We as state & territory VOAD's offer voting privileges to all members of the VOAD. It would not be right to only offer voting rights to a select number of organizations who are members of the State VOAD that would then have an overall effect on every organization within the State VOAD.

One of our four Strategic Initiatives of the 2019-2023 Strategic Plan, “Strengthening our Collective Identity and Relationships” seeks to have institutional equity throughout the movement. Do you see giving State/Territory Members voting privileges aligning with the Strategic Plan? Yes? No? Why?

YES

- All 56 State/Territory votes would have to be informed.
- It would allow the states to feel they are important to the mission and feel like we're "one."
- Any organization is strengthened when the partners are treated equally
- The States/Territories through having vote will enable them to offer direction to the strategic plan.
- Need equal parity and equal footing.
- Without S/T having a vote, there is a weak “institutional equity”.
- The vote not only gives State/Territories a voice but also initiates responsibility. It's very strange to sit at the National meeting of VOAD in the section with the states and simply be an onlooker rather than a full participant. This sends the message that we are simply a conduit rather than a member of the National VOAD.
- Local connections. Still predominately white, Christian and male in org. leadership. S&T local networks is where reaching diversity. Make sure connections at local level with most diverse population and way to connect them.
- If “a part of NVOAD” everyone should have the right to vote.

NO

- Voting rights does not seem to be a strong incentive to increase or maintain collaboration with National VOAD. Membership who do CARE at every membership level have opportunities to engage, for example like joining committees. In sum, the opportunity to engage already exists at every level. If anything, many State VOADs may lack the information and awareness to be more engaged with National VOAD

efforts.

- Everyone should be working cohesively, but not sure if a vote should be necessary to accomplish this at the national level.
- Don't see the S/T VOADs as an institution.
- The definition of equity and equality are different. It would be a different discussion if it were equality.
- We already have the opportunity to have our voice heard.
- Outside of operational calls, we don't feel all that connected to NVOAD.
- A vote is not needed to have a voice and equity.
- States can review Strategic Plan and offer information or suggestions.

ADDITIONAL

- State VOAD leaders are also responsible to work with their National organizations to be sure their views are heard and accounted at the National Level.
- There has to be a plan in place to ensure those voting have a true representation of the States and not the National Member Organization they might represent. If it did do this then I do think it would fit in.
- It would mean more work for us as a ST VOAD board to push out the question and then get a sense of direction how to vote. The National Board would have to give us ample time.
- State and Territories are essential to the Strategic Plan success – building relationships to help work better together.
- More research would be helpful. There needs to be a way that State/Territories have a greater voice but not sure that voting privileges is the right way to do so. For what we're doing now, we do not need a vote. It needs to be thought through more carefully.
- It has nothing to do with the strategic plan. It is a huge shift from our history of just having members vote. Now that states have become a driving force in disaster response the pros and cons need to be worked out not just with voting rights but membership and dues and participation etc.
- If we have a common definition of institutional equity throughout the movement. It might be nice to have an official steering committee.
- I do have deep issues about all States having voting rights. My concern is that voting blocs of Red Cross people, Food Bank people, etc. could emerge and create more problems than it solves. I can appreciate that everyone wants a voice. At the same time, (___x___) VOAD pays \$35 in dues. I also don't feel [this State VOAD] is deeply informed or deeply cares about many of these supposed "issues", I have concerns states could become "low-information" voters.

What you would hope to gain from having full voting privileges? What do you see as positives that would come from a change?

- More formal opportunity to take a closer look at the POCs. For example, how do we align National response with local jurisdiction.
- More engagement - it would require members to stay abreast of committees, changes in POC, by-laws, etc. They won't be able to get by with be a passive member. More accountability to the Strategic Plan.
- No gains. There are some who feel that having voting rights will make others "feel" more included, but it seems unnecessary. In a perfect world everyone's voice would be heard and counted. With a vote comes responsibility to be well informed and State VOADs have frequent turnover.
- More buy-in. Better communication. Improved morale. It is a vote of confidence from National members.
- Equal voice for S/T. Work is done in S/T so also allows for better conversation with where work occurs and national members. And another voice at COAD level. State wide orgs can be part of the State VOAD with small nonprofit. Interface with orgs.
- Small State VOADs hear from other state VOAD colleagues they feel like second class citizens, esp when you have lots of staff and lg programs.
- Having a vote will give the voice of States/Territories more influence and credibility. Because all States/Territories are unique and need to have a voice and vote to represent their specific regional concerns.
- Would eliminate idea of a two tiered system for State and Territorial VOAD ex: separate meetings for informational meeting.
- At the S/T level we have members who do not have national members and they may feel like they don't have a voice. We need to think through how this would work. Having voting privileges may change the opinion of how things work on a national level. The way in which VOAD is moving forward is a concern. VOAD being an operational organization during disaster response is concerning. There needs to be continued recognition and respect for organizations and their work.
- Whether through vote, committee work, or relationship building, we want to strengthen State/Territory VOADs and have regional concerns/expertise enhanced.
- We would like to have a voice in national initiatives. With more engagement, State/Territory leadership would be more known, visible, and respected.
- We do not see any gain. None.
- More access to decision making for the little guy, increase diversity.
- No evidence to show that S&T have more informed vote than national members.
- Not sure we need a vote. Not sure there would be a gain giving states and territories a vote.
- The behavior of some stat VOAD's has discouraged our positive feelings about state voting privileges.
- S&T have parity as national members. Feel there assets and opinion are valued. Would be able to vote on Points of Consensus which they are expected to adopt. Satisfied with 3 members or something proportional. State should have voice and

vote on bylaws. Same for Associates.

- More attention from National office.
- Having voting privileges could actually be confusing with so many voting.
- We should not have to defend our right to vote.

Do you have concerns with Associate or State/Territories having voting privileges?

- No full confidence in national board. States provide input in specific states. Focused on survival and efforts of State VOAD.
- No, increases inclusion
- The concern would be people voting without educating
- More people voting will take longer to get things done
- It is important we separate issues so state & territory voting rights are voted on as a topic of it's own.
- Anybody promoting voting rights should understand everything about this organization.
- No problem with giving organizations a choice. Legitimate concern about S&T not strong enough are developed to resist National organizations imposing their will. Answer is to strengthen state VOAD's. Trying to build capacity. Are we being intentional about making relationships at all levels.
- More work. we trust our current reps the way it is.
- Some misinformation is out there among voting members: (1) large national members stacking the vote' (2) States would use their vote to raise National member's dues, (3) Confused by the number of issues on the ballot during last by-law vote, (4) some thought that the S/T would be voting on National members on Board, (5) some members scared of implementing too much change all at the same time, (5) at last by-law vote, some did not support other proposals, so voted no on entire package.
- Concern is cost. S/T not paying the same in dues. Most could not afford to.
- VOAD State members now tired of hearing about National VOAD.
- Experience with Committees is that the larger they get the more inefficient they become. I prefer a smaller, well-informed group making decisions. "Also, is National VOAD a body of national disaster agencies or a federation of State VOADs comprised of those and other agencies?" There is an opportunity for one National VOAD member to stack State VOADs with those who care about their views. Things already take forever to be approved by the Board (take for example the Recovery Tools Workshop or COVID guidance document). Having POC's require validation by 50 additional bodies would be untenable.
- There is a bit of fear I hear out there that having voting rights means our dues fees will be raised.
- What obligations come with voting rights?
- Goes back to bylaws and founding of organizations. State and Territories do no

represent that. Do not know that it would be a good thing. No sense in it. Voting could affect the fabric of the organization. Yes. Could set up some interesting dynamics.

- Need to draw the line somewhere. Associate should not have voting rights
- I've seen email traffic and find it very concerning and have an agenda of their own and influencing others without much perspective of their own opinion. My concerns are very much informed by this current context and it gives me great pause. I actually don't think this push [for voting rights] has ANYTHING to do with equity or fairness -- but rather a means to an end. I do NOT like what I'm seeing. It does not appear to be "pure" motivations. It strikes me as manipulative at many levels and very disturbing. UNIFORMLY APPALLED.
- The behavior of some members in each class show that they may not be ready to warrant voting privileges.
- Some may not be able to represent a national or even state perspective.
- VOADs seem to become more political from being more relevant – creates atmosphere of competition. People wanting membership in order to receive grants.
- It goes back to our strong governmental integration. Due to State Gov't influence/representation in our State VOAD, we'd be concerned we may have to reform how our VOAD is comprised to be allowed to receive the vote
- **Votes of a State should be the collective consensus vote.** We have 30+ members we want to listen to.
- States and Territories have opportunity to provide a voice through committees and do not necessarily need a vote. Voting privileges may result in more work for State/Territory VOADs that are volunteers.
- The administrative responsibilities that accompany such privileges will have commensurate high expectations and volume. This will be overwhelming for S/T leadership. It is already impossible to keep up - this is not a full-time position.
- State/Territory VOAD often have members who are local and not connected to a National Organization.
- Local organization members could sway a State vote so that it is not in compliance with Policies and Guidelines or POCs of the movement or national member
- Most State VOAD members are not well informed, nor do they care to be, on the inner workings of National VOAD, especially such matters as budget, staff and day to day operations.
- Many State VOADs and their members do not have the time, or the inclination, to delve into NVOAD operations. They see their role, and rightly so, as preparedness and response organizations.
- A handful of State VOADs, with very opinionated leadership, are very convincing in their arguments to State VOADs/Territories who have little to no NVOAD experience or information on which to base their own votes.
- The State/Territory VOADs do have a voice on the Board through those elected to those positions.

If it were proposed that the dues were assessed based on aggregate data from Member Organizations (including Associate Members and State/Territory Members) and a review of the approved budget with board-adopted min/max dues levels, are you in favor of assessed dues based on each State's/Territory's immediate past three-year average disaster expenditures? Yes? No?

YES

- We have no budget. Small operating budget.
- Assess dues per member.
- Yes, if you want equity than dues should be based on average disaster expenditures.
- The smaller rural states don't have large budget) some have dropped collecting dues at all because of the Covid 19
- State does not have disaster expenditures over the past three years. The State/Territory dues need to be a little as possible to encourage participation.
- Need to account for pass through money through a members.
- What is the impact on S&T Members potentially being shut out by inability to pay dues.
- If we had a large number of disasters in a short period of time and our dues were raised because of it, we might be priced out of being able to pay.
- Same for everyone without regard to disaster activity.
- Should not be the same for Assoc and [other] members.

NO

- How do you account for the significant impact of FEMA cost share changing to 95% or not. Also, many state VOAD's do not have funds, approved budgets or make disaster expenditures.
- Flat dues.
- Based on organization's budget instead.
- Annual dues should be fixed. If a VOAD has an unlucky year, with lots of disasters and expenditures, why should the dues paid to NVOAD go up?
- States don't have much and others have quite a bit. There's no GOOD way to do this. How do we even define Disaster Expenditures? We don't have staff, yet have a lot of disasters and do a lot work.
- Response and Recovery. Expenses are different for every organization. Volunteer Services, Gifts In Kind, Equipment Expenses. Its not the same for every

organization. If you do it based on averages for States would not equal for States that do not have disasters as often as other States. So from a Finance standpoint how would I budget for a three-year averages.

- We have a very small state budget of about \$700. Expenses are born by the individual members. we are trying to get enough funds to pay for Zoom upgrade.
- We pay about \$40 a year to NVOAD. That said, we don't have a revenue stream. We have a MOU with State VOAD not to charge our members a fee. This allows for more organizations to engage with our group. If we had to charge more to join our State VOAD, it would hurt our membership. We are quite comfortable with a low flat, fee that is \$40 or less. It is more equitable to base dues on expenditures than budget, but there needs to be more discussion around this issue. Perhaps a variance would work.
- We do raise funds in a disaster so we would need clarification as to whether we are looking at expenditures of each VOAD member collectively.

ADDITIONAL

- Without knowing what the min/max would be, can't really say. Rep doesn't see how this would work because in a lot of cases, many organizations don't have disaster budgets because they haven't had major events in years.
- My suggestion is that State/Territories not vote and have National Members bear the dues cost on their behalf and continue to help provide funding to get State members to National Conference.
- Unsureness about the term "Associate" Thoughts were that it was a mistake to do this – based on varying amounts of available funds in VOADs
- I think it would depend on the max/min levels set by the Board. Having a large variance in dues from year to year would make it difficult for our organization to budget for dues expenditures. Please see notes on #6 for further info. relevant to this question.
- Comes to what would our State VOAD be gaining for a larger membership fee that comes with voting rights?

If no, what suggestions do you have?

- Flat fee.
- Dues should be a minimal as possible.
- One man and one vote, not enough skin in the game for states to have the same equity of vote and dues.
- \$35 dues
- There have been no expenditures in the past three years for our state VOAD except related to attending the NVOAD conference. There are only funds for specific

response efforts as pass-through funds.

- Not all States/Territories collect dues. We believe a VOAD should come at no cost and the member organizations contribute support as necessary (personnel, meeting space, refreshments, skills, abilities, etc.).
- It would be better based on budget rather than expenditures.
- It would be too difficult for many States/Territories. If we want equal representation, this may be an undue burden on some states.
- The organization budget net of pass-throughs. Should not be penalized for pass through of donations but for what organization actually spent. Level the dues based on people's ability to pay. ARC protected by maximum. S&T seems low at a minimum, but based on operating budgets, everyone pays fair share.
- Maybe focus on membership roster size
- Building phase of VOAD and this is not the time. A lot of organizations are really in need of funding creating strain on local VOAD members to gain any funding.
- I really don't have a better way.

What is your state income exclusive of pass-through grants? Based on this what would your capacity be as a State/Territory VOAD to contribute dues in the amount of \$100? \$250? \$500? \$1000?

- No, dues should stay the same.
- \$0 Where we are currently.
- \$0. We do not collect dues and the NVOAD dues are paid by the Red Cross.
- No income. Whether \$35 or \$100 would still be cheap.
- No more than 10% of their operating budget so in the \$20-50 range
- Need to know what will be getting for increase.
- Hard to forecast as raising funds for other than disasters response is hard to do
- Dues are \$35 per year. We have close to no expenses except government filings and refreshments 4 times a year. So even \$100 could be too much.
- Seems that \$35 is a small amount for a free website, DART and other benefits.
- \$1,200-\$1,500 per year which pays for QuickBooks, website, and NVOAD conference. We could pay \$35.
- \$50. If it is more, state membership dues would have to be increased.
- \$75
- \$100
- Send reminders not consequences for not paying. LTRGs can't afford dues reassessing like that. Bring in \$5,000 dues a year. Expenses-communication services
- Dues could make - \$100 would be fair in past. \$250 currently, future could change to what could be paid
- Annual income for (__state__)VOAD from dues is \$1,500. I would like to keep the

NVOAD dues at \$100, so we keep as much as possible to support activities/response.

- \$250. Max.
- \$250
- Max of \$250.
- Approximately \$2,200 membership dues each year. Based on this the capacity for FLVOAD would be \$250.
- \$250 dues would be fair consideration
- \$250 would be the max. Annual income does not typically exceed \$1500 allowing for dues and some support for attending Annual Conference.
- Could look at \$100. Maybe \$250. Their membership has grown in pandemic, redefining disaster.
- Our state income is roughly \$3,500 per year. I think we'd be willing to pay \$250-500?
- Based on current budget \$500 would be reasonable.
- \$500
- \$500 or \$1000
- Currently, our state VOAD has no income. In the past, they charged dues per member but the only members to pay were national members. It limited their participation with other organizations on a regular basis. Organizations rallied around response but didn't as members of the VOAD. Contributing any dues would be a hardship and probably come from members who are national members.
- \$425
- \$6-7,000, we could offer \$750
- Operating budget is \$250,000 per year. All paying same percentage of budget or equal share and feeling they are getting value for investment.
- What is your state VOAD income exclusive of pass-through grants? \$600
Based on this what would your capacity be as a State/Territory VOAD to contribute dues in the amount of \$100? \$250? \$500? \$1000? We are working on an increase to \$50 per organization and making it mandatory which would raise our income dramatically.
- Income is \$1,000 annually.
- Our State VOAD does not have dues. There is no fee to be a member. Organizations can make a donation based on what they are willing to make. Only budgeted item is for the State Chair to attend conference. Our State VOAD could not participate.
- Our State VOAD generates no revenue. Occasionally we get training grants from the State that will provide some revenue, but not often. We did get a grant for Quickbooks from NVOAD that has been great.
- Our VOAD is not a 501c3, as a lot of others are not. They do not receive grants. They have 34 members and dues are for \$75 and bring in about \$2500. So this would

be beyond the capacity of our membership. \$100 might be doable, but beyond that, it would be challenging. The dues cover administrative costs and small purchases.

Do you have anything else to share from your perspective about this topic?

- I am concerned that not all S/T have the same capacity.
- Real hot button issue. Needs to be resolved!
- There has been a good deal of conversation about professionalized the VOAD movement. In particular at the State/Territory level. For example, with the growth of local/regional VOADs/COADs the time commitment for the State/Territory chair is excessive
- On the issue of voting privileges, the representative has been on several calls with other S/T chairs and several mentioned that the State Reps on the National Board said that they did not represent the interests of the S/T members but rather the interest of National VOAD. If it's true that this is the perspective of the S/T Reps on the National Board, the S/T members have no voice. This is a major concern.
- Virtual education is needed for State VOADs as opposed to deferring to the small group of State VOADs: (1) we appreciate the materials coming out of NVOAD i.e. mold cleanup. we hand them out by the hundreds in our flooding situation, (2) we appreciated the LTRG training for new LTRGs, (3) frustrated with the turnover at our state level and at national board level. need more consistency.
- Need timely debate
- We appreciated staff support when we went to 501c3 status.
- We appreciated the conversation last week with April on capacity building.
- Thanks for April and Justin, and for the Board for reaching out.
- We are getting more assistance than \$35 worth!
- We haven't had a major disaster for years - we are getting rusty
- There's a lot of questions with regards to the equity vote. We do get meeting invites from 2 entities: The Board and "concerned partners." Why is that so impactful and there is a divide in membership?
- We wish we could have monthly S/T VOAD calls called by our three State reps - where are they? I appreciate that at our AVC we meet together - not in separate rooms
- Appreciates the opportunity talk directly with a National VOAD board member. Wish he had more time to review materials. It was challenging as the VOAD leadership changed in January.
- At the national level, our voice is more important than a vote.
- Dues should not be a barrier to States/Territories having a voice or vote. We would like some sort of mechanism to ensure diversity, especially geographically. If States/Territories do not have a vote, there should be a forum for us to engage with NVOAD, especially our Board representatives.

- We have opportunities already to have our voices heard and trust our State/Territory VOAD representatives on the Board to act on our behalf. If we act responsibly, having voting privileges would mean placing the additional task on our volunteer leadership to be informed on voting issues that may not even affect us.
- Having a vote is not a big issue for us. Most of our member organizations are represented at the national level already and therefore have a vote. More state and territory representatives should join committees and commit to participate. We could use more resources to develop future VOAD leadership.
- This is a difficult discussion since there are so many variables. Without standards, how can a myriad of different be compared to the National Members for these rights. Some even lack bylaws.
- Passionate about S&T and everyone. Rejects that some should have bigger say because pay more. \$35 is not indicative of a serious and committed organization. Send message that everyone is important and has a voice, tied to expectation and responsibility.
- Frustration that leadership change every 2 years. Want to hear from national members what the real problem is. If not full voting rights for the S&T, then what. Have not started serious conversation about Associates or Tribal. Frustrated that we are going into another annual meeting without this resolved. If the answer is no, the answer is no and the S&T will need to decide to stay involved or not.
- Could get their board to consider supporting this level of dues
- Our VOAD supports the following statement that was raised in previous meetings on the topic: 'We call ourselves the VOAD movement. Historically, movements in our country have often been based on the idea that to be fully included in a society, a nation, or an organization, requires opportunities for all members to fully participate. This requires that we recognize the importance of the gifts each our organizations bring to the movement, and that as we practice the 4Cs that we also apply our shared values of inclusion and integration of all members. This includes fully enabling all members participation, through value, voice, and vote.'
- Perhaps S/T dues could be structured at a percentage of their yearly membership income. For example, if (x)VOAD has 25 members @ \$100, they would pay \$250 in dues to NVOAD.
- Full confidence in National Board to do the right thing! Cannot have the unwinding of goodwill that has been occurring as a part of this.
- It takes time for voices to be heard. The two most important categories of relationship to a S/T VOAD are 1. The in-state members (nonprofit, government, private sector); and 2. The State Emergency Management. 3 is NVOAD. However, a significant amount of time, effort and commitment are expected of S/T leadership to fulfill the administrative expectations of NVOAD>
- Everyone should have a vote for their voice to be heard. Every S/T should have at least 1 vote. Vote should be determined not by ability to pay dues, but by the quantity or quality of response efforts.

- Who can help me? Who do I ask for help on the NVOAD staff?
- My sincerest condolences to the entire Board of Directors for dealing with this craziness. Can't even imagine. God bless you all.
- We're exhausted by the emotionally charged conversations some State VOADs have been leading on this topic. The more vocal components of this charge appear to be leading from a position of personal opinions and not their actual full VOADs. This is not the time to be intentionally divisive. This seems to go against the 4 C's. This isn't a good place to be nor is it good leadership.
- Frustrated that my preparedness committee meets infrequent Tribes should be a part of this conversation
- We feel that it is not a good thing for the question of dues and voting privileges and dues to be floating around. The current discussion that is going on with all the emails about recall elections does not reflect well on the VOAD movement. Our state VOAD members see this discussion happening and it just appears that some people are just trying to take over and want to be in charge.
- I am not a person that is against change, but it feels like these recent emails have not be a positive influence on what we are all trying to do.
- I would like to learn more background about the 3 Board members who “represent” the S/T VOADS: what was the intent of that? What is the charter of those 3 Board members? Some S/T members have expressed concern that those rep’s have “gone native”, and only align with the greater NVOAD (and Natl Member) plan/agenda, and no longer represent S/T interests.
- Board needs to realize that states are important and are paying dollars into being part of NVOAD. Word questions more clearly – we have not received good communications from National VOAD – Terms used that were only familiar and regularly used by National VOAD.
- Doesn't feel like one organization would have multiple people in leadership because hard to get people to run in the first place. Should not give away the right just because some don't want it.
- Big concern about comment that “Once I am on the Board I no longer represent the states” needs more explanation. I mention all this because I need to know more about simple question of "what does the national office give to the state VOADs and to the national Members?" There has been much organizational shifting and clamping down over the years - with all the committees and the orders from the national office to form up points of consensus and then more orders. It has never been carefully explained why and assumed that the states wanted these.
- One good thing was the Communications Committee which handled all the copyright/trademark/branding issues which was excellent and protects the NVOAD brand/VOAD brand.
- What does the national office give to the Members? I have never been clear on that. I mention all these things because all the states are so very very different. Some are operational, some are non operational. So are incredibly busy and others have very

little to do during the year due to no or very few disasters. And many state VOADs are totally volunteer run, no pay, and all the execs or the Chairs have other full time jobs and do the best they can to keep their VOAD alive at their state level - again due to the fact that there are few disasters in that area.

<ends>