

**DATE:** February 19, 2004

**TO:** Board of Direction Members  
District Council Chairs  
Section Presidents  
Council on Younger Members

**FROM:** Blaine Leonard  
Chair, Governance Restructuring Implementation Committee (GRIC)

**SUBJECT: Potential Regional Maps/Boundaries**

---

As most of you are aware, the Board of Direction at its November 2003 meeting voted to recommend to the membership a revision to the current governance structure of ASCE. The members are being asked to vote on this change this summer, in the form of a Constitutional Amendment. The proposed model will require a change in the geographic organization of the Society as zones and districts will be eliminated and nine geographic regions will be formed to encompass those sections currently assigned to districts. We need your review and input on the boundaries of these new regions.

The criteria the Board of Direction has established for the definition of region boundaries are 1) mutuality of interest, 2) facilities for travel, 3) member population, and 4) number of geographic units. Note that population is no longer the primary or driving consideration in establishing boundaries.

Attached are two colored maps: the first shows the current breakdown of zones and districts. The second map, labeled Option 1, is the preferred scenario developed by GRIC. It was prepared by joining adjacent Districts to form Regions. This map purposely does not separate any Sections from other Sections they have developed relationships with in their current Districts. Long experience indicates that we all dislike boundary changes, so this simple option preserves existing relationships. The numeric table that has been provided shows the details of the proposed Regions by population, number of geographic units and current District designation.

There are many other potential combinations and subdivisions which could be considered to create additional options. Many of you have seen some of these alternative maps over the past 18 months. Rather than provide you with some of these potential variations, we want to hear your thoughts on any adjustments to the Option 1 map.

Please review the Option 1 map and provide us with your insight on the mutualities of interest your group has. Mutuality of interest could be described as the political, economic and working relationships contained within a geographic area. Feel free to propose alternatives in the proposed boundaries which would better serve your group. Since we expect to receive conflicting recommendations, we ask that you provide justification for your recommendations so we can make judgments between them. We ask that your justification follow the Board-

established criteria listed above. Those criteria are listed in priority order.

I want to be very clear that the Constitutional amendment being presented to the membership for approval this summer does not include any details on the geographic boundaries. The Constitutional amendment simply defines the size and composition of the Board of Direction and Executive Committee and enables a regional governance structure. The details of region boundaries will be considered by the Board of Direction at their May meeting, along with the input you provide, and approved by them in October if the Constitutional amendment passes.

I would like to point out that the Board is required by the Society's current Bylaws to address zone and district population balances every ten (10) years. Should the governance proposal fail to obtain the required percentage this summer and be defeated, a re-zoning is still likely to occur as zone population balances must not exceed a ten percent (10%) variance. That level of variance currently exists and if it remains, the Board will be required to redraw zone boundaries. This new model will avoid the requirement to balance population every ten years. It is always possible to adjust boundaries, however, to meet needs of the members.

To allow time for your input to be consolidated into one proposed regional map, please provide your comments as soon as possible after the conclusion of your upcoming council and section meetings but not later than May 1<sup>st</sup>, 2004. If the proposed map is acceptable to you, no response is required. Please provide your comments via e-mail to Wendy Cowan at [wcowan@asce.org](mailto:wcowan@asce.org).

Thanks for your attention to this matter, and for your insight.

Cc GRIC members  
Pat Natale, Secretary/Executive Director  
Wendy Cowan, GRIC staff contact

Attachments