

**MINUTES**  
**PWV BOARD OF DIRECTORS' MEETING**  
**November 18, 2021 – 6:30-8:30 p.m.**  
**Conference Call due to Covid-19 concerns**

**ATTENDANCE**

**Board Members:** Jim Branch, Rich Cappello, Jeanne Corbin, Mike Corbin, Joe Cox, Jim Medlock, Steve Musial, Sean Orner, Jeff Randa, Mark Snyder, Bruce Williams, Matt Cowan (USFS Liaison)

**Board Members absent:** Janis Brady, Pete Ramirez, Karen Roth

**Advisory Board Members:** Fred Allen, Chuck Bell, Kevin Cannon, Elaine Green, Jerry Hanley, Bob Manuel, Alan Meyer, Jack Morgan, Karl Ritters, Celia Walker

**PWV Members, Other:**

**Guests:**

**ESTABLISHING QUORUM AND MEETING GROUND RULES.**

Bruce Williams welcomed everyone in attendance.

**AGENDA.**

The November 2021 agenda was approved after adding Steve Musial's question to New Business.

**MINUTES.**

The October 2021 meeting minutes were adopted with no changes. Bruce Williams thanked Sean Orner for her thorough and detailed minutes.

**REPORTS OF OFFICERS**

**(A) CHAIR REPORT.**

- Bruce Williams shared that the Strategic Planning Ad Hoc Committee met earlier this week with Matt Cowan to share their thoughts and get his input on the USFS priorities and activities over the coming few years. Bruce believes that he will be able to present to the Board in December or January to provide an overall plan of how the process will go and where the committee is currently at.

**(B) CHAIR ELECT.**

- Mark Snyder had nothing to report.

**(C) IMMEDIATE PAST CHAIR REPORT.**

- Mike Corbin had nothing to report.

**(D) USFS STAFF REPORT.**

- Matt Cowan explained that he doesn't really have any information on the Kreuger Rock fire beyond what's already been shared, saying that crews seem to have a good handle on things and that no major activity was predicted. He'll be going out tomorrow to evaluate the trail system to see if there has been any damage, though nothing significant is expected to be found.

- Matt referenced the new closure order that was released, which didn't have any major impacts on the trails, affecting mostly roads. He explained that at this point only a small subset of roads remain closed beyond the regular seasonal closures. Crown Point was reopened.
- Elaine Green asked if there's a plan for Christmas tree sales this season. Matt explained that his counterpart Geoffrey Godfrey is running the program this year, which will be done differently than years prior. Tree cutting will be permitted district-wide rather than limited to just the Swamp Creek area. The public will be encouraged to go to a few specific areas and there will be some new talking points regarding where, when, and how folks should get their trees. Matt explained that Geoffrey has already been in contact with Mike Corbin to round up volunteers and will also be contacting the Cameron Pass Nordic Rangers and the Diamond Peak Ski Patrol as well to help guide the public. Matt acknowledged that there could be some growing pains with the change in procedure, but it should be beneficial for everyone overall. Matt encouraged anyone in PWV who wants to help with the program to contact Mike Corbin to volunteer. Mike Corbin explained that he requested information from Geoffrey 10 days ago and still has not received a response, so he does not plan to coordinate volunteers. Matt said he would pass that information along to Geoffrey.
- Elaine Green followed up to ask if the permits are being sold exclusively on Recreation.gov this year, whether the majority of proceeds will be going to the Forest Service. Matt said he wasn't sure of the specific percentage but that there would be some loss in funds by having to use the site rather than direct in-person permit sales.
- Bob Manuel asked Matt if the reopening of Crown Point also reopened North and South Zimmerman trails, which he confirmed while noting that the regular seasonal closure December 1<sup>st</sup> was upcoming.

**(E) SECRETARY REPORT.**

- Sean Orner had nothing to report.

**(F) TREASURER.**

- Jim Medlock had nothing to report.

**REPORTS OF COMMITTEES**

**(A) SUPPLIES AND STORAGE.**

- Elaine Green explained that she had sent out spreadsheets to committees to collect inventory information, which hasn't been done for a few years so there's some catch up to do. She added that she's also trying to account for items that traditionally have been overlooked or otherwise not included, such as supplies kept at the Forest Service office including the Smoky Bear costume. She asked that anyone who knows of items such as these to let her know, and that she's trying to put together a comprehensive list to present at the December Board meeting. Mike Corbin explained that the Smoky Bear costume does not belong to PWV and that's why it was not included on the list. Elaine said Jeanne Corbin had explained that to her, but she knew that we had funded a new costume and that's what led to her inquiry. Mike replied that the new costume has not yet been purchased due to supply issues relating to Covid-19. Kevin Cannon noted that the Trimble, iPad, and projector are all at the Forest Service office. Elaine commented that items like those had never been included on the supply list.

**NEW BUSINESS**

## **(A) REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF 2022 BUDGET SUBMITTALS.**

- Bruce Williams thanked Jim Medlock for his efforts over the last month. They have been in discussion about how to best present budget and financial information effectively to the Board that offers better context. Bruce noted that during last year's budget discussion, Alan Meyer asked questions about fund reserves, revenue streams, etc. so Jim will attempt to answer some of those kinds of questions today.
- Jim Medlock began by first thanking Sandy Sticken for spending quite a bit of time with him over the past month helping him prepare the 2022 budget. He also thanked Bob Meyer for outlining the responsibilities between the Treasurer and Bookkeeper. Jim shared that as he's begun to familiarize himself with PWV's data, he's been impressed with the financial strength and integrity of the organization. Jim then thanked the committee chairs for their timely submissions. He noted that the budget submissions all appeared to be well thought out and practical for the organization. Jim explained that in his experience with other non-profits, there's often a rush to spend unused budget funds, whereas PWV's committees instead roll their unused funds forward to the next budget year as appropriate. PWV is \$35k under budget for expenses in 2021 (over \$20k being delayed restoration costs).
- Jim shared a slide comparing PWV's revenue sources from 2018 through 2021. PWV's revenue is primarily comprised of Unrestricted Donations. In an average year, PWV has around \$50k in revenue, but the ratio of Unrestricted vs. Restricted Donations varies year to year. In 2021, over \$60k in Restricted Funds were received in support of Trail Restoration. Most of PWV's regular fundraising occurs in November and December, so we don't yet know what that final number will look like, but in 2019 and 2020 about \$30k each year was raised in this timeframe. With this in mind, it's conceivable that PWV could gross \$100k in revenue by year-end.
- Jim presented a second slide showing PWV's expenses by committee/program from 2018 through 2021, which varies greatly from year to year. Restoration has historically been the largest budget item.
- Review of 2022 Budget Worksheet:
  - Jim Branch asked if there was a projected estimated final 2021 budget that could be used to help evaluate the proposed 2022 budget, since the actual figures only go through October. Jim Medlock explained that he was not yet familiar enough with PWV's financials and that 2021 was not a budget year that could be realistically used as a guide to prepare projections. He suggested he could possibly have a projection completed in the next few weeks. Jim Branch asked if the committees had been asked to include projected expenses with their proposals. Bruce Williams explained that it's not something we've done historically, but that it is a fair question. Bruce followed up to ask if any committee members on the call could share if they were aware of any large upcoming expenses that would materially change the year-end budget. Jerry Hanley noted that usually the year-end Colorado Gives fundraising campaign brings in something around \$10-\$15k, but we don't yet know what the impacts of the GoFundMe campaign would be on contributions, so revenue cannot be confidently predicted. Jim Branch explained that he was more interested in projected expenses, not revenue. Fred Allan said typically, most committees do not spend much in funds October through December, with the Year End Event being the last major activity. His committee, which has one of the larger budgets, has just a few hundred dollars in expenses they are expecting by year-end.
  - Jim Medlock explained that there were a few final updates made to the worksheet from the version that was distributed prior to the meeting.

- Web Team: \$680 requested. The committee is planning an enhancement to e-commerce portion of PWV's website to allow for better inventory tracking. Alan Meyer explained that the 2022 budget has increased over 2021 by a bit, primarily due to an increased cost in cloud storage for videos posted to the site. Jeff Randa asked if the cost to host the videos is something we need to worry about over the next few years. Alan explained that a different solution may be needed at some point, and committee member Kirk Sticken has taken the lead on managing this piece of things.
- Recruiting: \$425 requested, based on pre-Covid expenditures. Celia explained that they had been keeping costs especially low in previous years by providing their own supplies. About \$200 of the budget is planned for refreshments for 4 days of interviews. The other portion of their budget is for printing brochures, flyers, etc. for early recruiting.
- Public Outreach: \$500 requested. Sean Orner noted that some of 2021's budget was being pushed forward to 2022 to purchase display items for in-person events. The bulk of the committee's budget goes toward event registration fees.
- Photo/Video: \$2,143 requested, includes regular media and software subscriptions as well as some small equipment to purchase.
- Kick-Off Night: \$500 requested, based on pre-Covid expenditures. Celia Walker asked if this includes expected costs for boxed meals. Mike Corbin said he would have to confirm with his KON Chair.
- AGL Training: \$100 requested, based on pre-Covid expenditures.
- Spring Training: \$250 requested, based on pre-Covid expenditures.
- Leave No Trace: \$2,870 requested. Jim noted that the committee has an ambitious, detailed plan for 2022. Sean Orner added that she attended the committee's end of season meeting, and they are hoping to send some of their new members to the Master Educator training course.
- Mounted Patrol & Stock: \$1,140 requested. Fred Allan explained that they were pretty far under budget for 2021 because they ended up handling the delivery of materials themselves due to logistic challenges. The committee will be continuing to improve Stub Creek, which includes purchasing some additional panels to enlarge the corrals once they solve their storage issue. Fred added that nearly 100 people and 21 horses spent the night up there.
  - Elaine Green asked if the panels could be stored in PWV's storage unit. Fred explained that the panels are too large and bulky, so he's hoping to possibly chain and lock the panels to a tree out in the pasture. Steve Musial offered space at his property if needed. Fred thanked Steve and explained the panels are too large to be transported in a regular truck, so he needs someone with a horse trailer who can help move them.
- Supplemental Training: \$2,375 requested. Jim explained that the committee has a variety of educational programs planned for 2022.
- Mentor Training: \$44 requested. The committee requested just a small amount in case any expenses come up such as photocopies.
- Year End Event: \$1,500 requested. The 2021 event will be significantly under budget since it was held at the park pavilion with just snacks. 2022's event cost will really depend on the type of event that ends up being planned.
- Member Recognition/Relations: \$350 requested. Alan Meyer explained that the budget will go towards 2 things: 1) social events 2) hospitality. Celia Walker asked if the budget includes trinkets and other items to be handed out for member recognition. Alan explained that the committee still has a pretty good supply, and that ceramic mugs and other PWV swag made by Pam Vagge were purchased earlier in the year.

- Uniforms & Access: \$1,600 requested, based on pre-Covid expenditures. Jim and Sandy Sticken felt it would be best to base figures based on prior year budgets.
- Member Subsidies-SPOT/inReach: 2022 budget to be determined. Mike Corbin suggested the discussion may require time at another meeting, though his recommendation is to go with the same amount as 2021. Jim Branch said he agrees with the 2021 amount to be used as a placeholder. Alan Meyer said he had planned the materials used to plan and discuss the 2021 budget for the subsidies but wasn't sure who was responsible for it going forward. Bruce Williams asked if the Board would prefer to continue the program as-is and carry over the 2021 budget or if they would prefer time for more discussion.
  - Celia Walker said the forest fires offered us the opportunity to see the benefit of having members with the devices. She believes we should continue to support the program. Alan Meyer agrees, noting that no one is currently responsible for managing and updating PWV's resources and guidance on the various devices that members carry, so that is something we'll need to figure out at a later time. Rich Cappello shared that he believes all stock members should carry a device at all times, not just on required trails. Celia Walker added that could be expanded to all members, not just stock.
  - Chuck Bell said that PWV has the funds to be more generous with member reimbursement on uniforms and communication devices. Mike Corbin noted that the devices can be pretty expensive (his was around \$500). Chuck replied that there were funds in the endowment. Alan Meyer added that there were several PWV-owned devices that members could check out as well. Chuck suggested that the check out process may need to be simplified. Bob Manuel shared that when restoration crews are out, they are able to use walkie-talkies so that only one outside communication devices is needed for the group. Jerry Hanley responded to Chuck's comment, agreeing that funds should be spent from the endowment, but noted that we are limited to 4.5% of the principal each year.
  - Bruce Williams suggested that \$3,000 be added to the 2022 budget as a placeholder, then later a full discussion can be held as to how the topic of communication devices will be managed going forward. There was no disagreement to this.
- Storage: \$1,380 requested. The amount quoted for 2022 has not changed from what we paid in 2021.
- Kids in Nature: \$3,500 requested. Planned expenses based on pre-Covid budgets. The committee also plans to purchase the Smoky Bear costume that was delayed due to Covid. Jeanne Corbin explained that the company they had planned to order the costume from closed down due to Covid. If they are still not able to fulfil the order, she'll look for an alternative company to order from. Elaine Green asked if the costume should be included in the budget if the cost is coming out of the endowment. Jim Medlock explained that the funds would be offset once the distribution from the endowment occurred. Jeanne Corbin added that she see's it as being similar to designated funds. KIN is hoping to start back up next year if kids are getting vaccinated.
- Adopt-A-Highway: \$150 requested.
- Trail Crew: \$800 requested. This committee historically has not submitted a budget, but they're looking to purchase a cross-cut saw and some incentives for people who participate in their programs.
- Weed Crew: no budget requested, typically has minimal costs.

- Trail Patrol: \$525 requested. Jeanne Corbin explained that the committee will begin trailhead hosting. They regularly subscribe to CalTopo mapping for trail descriptions and there are some costs to the WILD program for celebrating the Wilderness Act.
- Restoration: \$33,300 requested (54% of the budget). The largest portion of this budget is for hired work crews. Jim Medlock explained that there is over \$63k in Restricted Funds allocated exclusively to trail restoration. Mike Corbin explained that he's trying to stretch the Restricted Funds across 2022 and 2023. He'll be collaborating with Matt Cowan to strategize on this. He's hoping to get about 5 weeks of hired crews next year which is what the \$30k in his budget is for. He has some saws to sharpen and has also allocated funds for volunteer refreshments for the public work days. It's unknown how much in supplies he'll need to spend on things like bridge repair, but he expects to be spending some of the \$2,100 he budgeted.
  - Bob Manuel asked if the crews are hired for a week at a time. Mike explained that it would be a college-aged crew. He added that the crews will need some guidance, since we're now moving past tree clearing and planning to work on construction and repair in the Rawah Wilderness, which may be beyond their training. Bob speculated that it would be more difficult to hold public work days when the work to be done is so remote. Mike noted that several participants at this year's work days indicated that they would be open to backpacking in to project sites, which is something Mike wants to try to coordinate, though there is still work to do lower down. Matt Cowan added that he's expecting to have 3 seasonal employees next year, so one could be posted up with the hired work crews to supervise them and ensure the work is done correctly.
  - Jeff Randa asked if Mike's pushing out the funds because of the challenge of finding workers or if he's actually wanting to spread it out across 2 years. Mike explained that he's wanting to spread it out, because you never know what will come up, and he's not actually sure he'd have enough work for the crews to do for 12 straight weeks. He'd rather go at a slower pace to see what can get done in 2022 then have a better plan for 2023. Jeff said this was good to know so Fund Development could have an idea of what funds to go after over the next few years.
  - Fred Allan asked if Matt Cowan expects to be able to have as many federally-funded crews next year as he did this year. Matt said no, but we'll see. There's a 10-person Rocky Mountain Conservancy crew already paid for planned for next season like we had last year. He doesn't have the BAER funding which allowed them to hire the Larimer County Youth Corp, which is more expensive, but he's going to be applying for some funding for a crew like that, but it's uncertain if it will be granted. He added that having the regular 10-man crew along with supplemental crews as available will help it be like last year, but a bit less. There's some opportunity to work in the backcountry areas that are harder to access by possibly using the stock committee to help get the crews out there.
  - Bruce Williams added to Jeff Randa's comment, noting that the Board is going to have to determine a goal for funding. We have to consider how much we can and want to spend, since more isn't always better. We want to make sure we don't over-request funding and don't overfund work. Bruce suggested that this is a conversation the Board should have in the next few months. Mike Corbin noted that he's applying for a grant, which if received, would push our own funding use even further out. Fred Allen

commented that the GoFundMe campaign funds were contributed by people who want to see the work get done, and we'll probably receive even more contributions down the road, so we have to be cognizant of the public's expectation of the funds being used so the work is done timely. Bob Manuel noted that while we had an unusual increase in public support and volunteers for work days, that is expected to slow over time. Matt Cowan commented on the need for urgency when it comes to fire-damaged areas, which is why there was such a big push to get as much done as we did this past year and the reason we'll make another push this upcoming year—this is not something you want to create a 10-year work plan around. Just as we saw with the Black Hollow flood last summer, the more weather events that occur will be more and more problematic until we've finished restoring the damaged areas. Bob Manuel agreed with Matt, noting that many of the most concerning areas, such as up on Comanche Peak, haven't really even been surveyed yet due to accessibility. Celia Walker noted that this is a reason why Mike Corbin's plan to be conservative with the Restricted Funds is so practical, so there will be some reserve of funds available if we need to act quickly after another major event such as a flood or fire, without having to take the time to do another campaign first. Jim Medlock wrapped up by commenting on how enlightening the discussion was for him as a new Board member.

- Fund Development: \$1,100 requested based on prior years. Budget includes cost for DonorSnap fundraising management software. Jerry Hanley explained that the committee's budget is relatively conservative, with mainly just the cost of the software license and some postage.
- Administration: \$3,228 requested. Most line items are carried over from previous years. The Postage/Shipping line has been increased a bit to \$200 based on actual usage. The Office Crew is also requesting \$200 to allow for possible costs that may come up as they rework the check out processes.
- Final budgeted expenditures: \$61,660.00. Jim Medlock made a motion to approve the 2022 budget. Steve Musial seconded the motion. There was no discussion. Sean Orner called the roll and the motion was approved unanimously.
- Bruce Williams thanked everyone for submitting their budgets and supporting information, and thanked Jim Medlock for his preparation which allowed for a smooth budget review process.

## **(B) 2021 PWV FACT SHEET**

- Mike Corbin presented the 2021 Fact Sheet that was prepared. He explained that we've used the same format for several years, so it's mostly boiler plate but offers a lot of useful information. One modification Mike made was including an expanded write up on Restoration since so much more was completed this year. The other change he made was to include public volunteer hours (about 2000) in the total volunteer hours, which had not been included previously.
- Celia Walker asked if there could be something of a disclaimer explaining the difference in the way the total volunteer hours were calculated, so it's clear that they cannot be directly compared with previous years' totals. Mike said that could probably be done and added that he believes the number he's using for 2021 is the "right" way to do it—last year he simply did not realize that the total he had did not already include all hours.
- Chuck Bell noted that the format is something he created in 1995 or so and said the sheets should go that far back so the statistics provided could go back earlier than 2005. He pointed out a typo of down vs. downed trees.

- Bruce Williams thanked Mike for the thorough write up and encouraged everyone to read it thoroughly as it contains many talking points that can be shared with people outside of the organization. He highlighted the line stating “every dollar spent by PWV provided \$40.53 of value to the USFS” as an important data point that he found to be very helpful. The sheet is not only useful to share with people outside of the organization but also with members who are not as aware of PWV’s accomplishments. Chuck Bell agreed with Bruce, explaining that the document was originally created to help with fundraising but has a much broader scope of use. He also thanked Mike for a job well done on the sheet.
- Bruce Williams asked if the sheet was already on the website. Karl Ritters explained that the Web Team is in the process of publishing the new document on the website while also making the prior years’ documents available for download. He asked Mike if the 2020 sheet that Mike drafted should also be reviewed with the Board. Celia Walker asked for the 2021 formatting on page 2 to be adjusted to match the rest of the document before being published to the website, so it looks good when printed. Elaine Green suggested a paragraph should possibly start with an indent rather than a bullet point. Mike Corbin asked if people could send him their edits directly so they can be addressed offline. Karl reiterated his question regarding the 2020 Fact Sheet. Mike said he’d just like it to be posted. Karl explained that the copy he has is 3 pages and requested that Mike send him the 2-page version for him to publish.
- Fred Allen shared that he’s already forwarded the sheet to share with others and noted that each year it’s impressive to see what PWV has done. He asked why the tax-exempt number was removed from the sheet and the website. Jim Medlock explained that there is beginning to be business identity theft, so in some instances it is prudent to hide the federal tax ID and state tax exempt number. Fred pointed out that this information is publicly available online through the state registry. Jim replied that they are starting to partially mask the ID numbers to discourage improper use.
- Bob Manuel thanked Mike Corbin for an excellent job this year, especially considering the amount of coordination and work he had to put in.

### **(C) QUESTION REGARDING WILDERNESS REGULATIONS**

- Steve Musial explained that he had the assumption that different USFS and wilderness areas had the same regulations from one region to another. He’s noticed over time how various folks he meets out on the trails often must be corrected as to what the regulations are in our district. When visiting the Mount Zirkel area, it came to Steve’s attention that the USFS wilderness regulations there are different than those in CLRD. Steve would like to know why the regulations are not consistent.
- Matt Cowan explained that all wilderness areas are governed by the regulations set by congress and the Wilderness Act of 1964. Some rules are very consistent nationwide across all wilderness areas, such as no mechanized/motorized machinery. Over the years, different units at the Forest level have noticed different circumstances with regards to degradation of those areas. In some places with a high concentration of use, they may see it fit to have rules such as no camping within 200 ft. of water or dogs required to be on-leash. These decisions are made based on various factors, including the amount of use those places get and the amount of visitor contacts and resource impacts that specialists in those forest individually were seeing. Subsequently, they created forest orders to have special regulations on those higher use areas. He acknowledged that there is the potential for the public to expect that the regulations are the same from wilderness area to wilderness area, but that’s just not how things have developed over time.
- Kevin Cannon explained that about 15 or 16 years ago, on the national team, they were working to put together a corporate database for the different wilderness items—regulations was one item they thought could be streamlined. That plan fell apart



immediately. Different areas have different use and are managed by different directors with different standards, and as long as they are upholding the Wilderness Act, there's room for variation.

- Alan Meyer shared that a few years ago, when he met a group that was camping right off the trail, he suggested that they should know the regulations since they are consistent nationwide. After learning that was not actually the case, he began emphasizing this as an AGL so new recruits understand that people could be visiting from other areas where there are different rules. He also shared that when he visited the Zirkel area how surprised he was at the number of dogs that were off-leash, and it wasn't until he studied their regulations that he understood how different their regulations are.
- Steve Musial shared that he often encounters people who know about the rule requiring 200 ft. from water, but not from the trail. He noted that there are so many places, especially up in the Rawah area, where there are established, durable campsites that are way too close to the trail and this is where he often finds people camping. Kevin Cannon explained that he and Matt have had discussions about this, especially regarding travel zones—these are only effective if you're limiting use, otherwise it's pointless to have limited designated campsites. Kevin said that this is something he never had the time to resolve. He shared that when he was working in Washington, they changed the rules so that people had to camp in an established site, rather than creating a new site, regardless of its proximity to the trail and water. This put the onus on the Forest Service to cover up any sites that they didn't want used, which was a huge project. Kevin admitted that our rules don't really work; while completing his campsite monitoring project last winter, he determined that about 95% of established campsites are within the 200 ft. margin, so it's almost impossible for campers to use an established site that meets the regulations. He acknowledged that this is something the district needs to address. Bob Manuel commented that we wouldn't want people camping right next to water. Kevin agreed, reiterating that the responsibility would be on the Forest Service to revegetate/rehab any sites that should not be used for camping with discreet signage. Steve Musial suggested that the signage could be very effective. Kevin said it would be one part of a larger project/plan.
  - Matt Cowan explained that it's a capacity issue, as the district does not have the workforce to tackle a project of this scope. We also wouldn't want to put up hundreds of signs in a wilderness area. He noted that the district's rules were put in place long before he or Kevin were there, and through their wilderness character monitoring efforts that will be done, they will have a better idea of what the capacity of the landscape is and the actions that should be taken in the future, which will be a long-term planning and implementation process. He said that we will need to be a patient when it comes to the resource impacts, as solutions are identified and put into place. Matt said there's a lot of work to be done, but Cameron Peak has taken a lot of the recent focus and attention, so it will take more time before things can really begin to take motion.
  - Kevin added that the flooding in 2013 took up a lot of his time and attention. He explained that he didn't intentionally exclude PWV from the wilderness management piece of things, but the state of the trails was in such bad condition that they needed to be the primary focus.
  - Steve Musial explained that he didn't mean for his question to be a critique against Matt or Kevin, but that he just wanted to share what he was experiencing while out patrolling. Matt Cowan said that it was a good point that Steve brought up, and it's an important thing for members to understand. At the end of the day, it's about preaching Leave No Trace ethics to reduce resource impacts, which everyone should be able to do while they're out on the trails.

- Rich Cappello shared that he didn't know what a travel zone was and had never heard of one until he came to our district. He finds that there are many people who also don't understand what they are. Like Steve, he also thought the wilderness rules were the same everywhere. He pointed out that each ranger district has its own rules and regulations that people, including us, generally don't know fully—the signs don't tell you everything.
- Jeanne Corbin said this is something we can better train new recruits on and can also share via the monthly emails so that people know when they are patrolling that the regulations are not consistent everywhere (which many visitors may not realize) and to emphasize LNT principles.
  - Kevin Cannon shared that the regulations for all regions can be found at wilderness.net. Matt Cowan reiterated that each area has different use and different rules. Kevin noted that some districts also have exemptions, for example the Bob Marshall Wilderness has landing strips.
  - Celia Walker liked Jeanne's idea of including the information in a monthly email or even a special email to members, so they understand the situation and are also encouraged to be instructors rather than enforcers. Steve Musial agreed that it should be something in new recruit training.

## CLOSING

Steve Musial made a motion to adjourn, which was seconded by Mike Corbin. There were no objections. The meeting adjourned at 8:20pm.

Sean Orner, Secretary

Next Board Meeting: **December 16, 2021, 6:30 p.m.**