

**MINUTES**  
**PWV BOARD OF DIRECTORS' MEETING**  
**December 17, 2020 – 6:30-8:00 p.m.**  
**Conference Call due to Covid-19 concerns**

**ATTENDANCE**

**Board Members:** Jim Branch, Mike Corbin, Jeanne Corbin, Elaine Green, Bob Hansen, Janis Brady, Katina Mallon, Sean Orner, Pete Ramirez, Mike Shearer, Mark Snyder, Sandy Sticken, Bruce Williams, and Kristy Wumkes (USFS Liaison).

**Board Members absent:** Karen Roth

**Advisory Board Members:** Tom Adams, Fred Allen, Kevin Cannon, Jerry Hanley, Bob Manuel, Alan Meyer, Jack Morgan, Janet Caille, Linda Reiter, Karl Ritters, Celia Walker

**PWV Members, Other:** Tom Collins, Jeff Randa

**Guests:** Jared Smith, USFS (Acting) North Zone Recreation Staff Officer.

**ESTABLISHING QUORUM AND MEETING GROUND RULES.**

Mike Corbin welcomed everyone to the meeting and confirmed with Sean Orner that enough members were present for a quorum.

**AGENDA.**

The meeting agenda was adopted with no changes.

**MINUTES.**

The November 2020 minutes and Annual meeting minutes were adopted with no changes

**REPORTS OF OFFICERS**

**(A) CHAIR REPORT.**

- Mike Corbin explained that the Executive committee met with Katie Donahue today to discuss the transition. Katie said during the meeting that there will be two new USFS employees on board about the first of February, so there will be a bit of a gap there temporarily. He also noted that Jared Smith will be out of his position mid-January.
  - Contact with Forest Service will be challenging for a while. Mike can assist with any communication challenges in the meantime.
  - Jared Smith confirmed that his position will change mid-January but explained that he will continue to be available to assist us if needed to help facilitate communication with the Forest Service.
- Mike is working with a special group to focus on training a small number of new recruits for 2021. Volunteers include Celia Walker, Alan Meyer, Jeanne Corbin, and Bruce Williams. Additional volunteers will be brought in as needed. Mike noted that he will likely offer status updates monthly.
- Mike shared that CO Gives Tuesday raised over \$10,000 this month. He commended Tom for doing a great job with the fundraising effort. Mike noted this is a fair amount above what we have received in past years.

**(B) CHAIR ELECT REPORT.**

- Bruce Williams explained that the ad hoc “PWV Umbrella” group has been discussing the possibility of hosting some responsibilities for the Nordic Rangers. Bruce said the group, which includes Karen Roth & Mark Snyder, had met and made a little progress. Additionally, Kristy Wumkes and Jared Smith had a meeting with the Nordic Rangers which has created a new Leadership Team, and their goal is to maintain an independent identity if they can build some structure and organization to make that work.
  - The ad hoc group is prepared should they get a request for assistance/support from the Nordic Rangers so they can respond quickly. They are in stand-by mode for now, as there is nothing immediate to do at this time.

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

- Elaine Green mentioned that she recently shared a copy of the research paper from Dr. Neimiec with the Board and others and has received positive feedback from members who have read it. Elaine noted that the paper highlights some strengths of ours, including how we’ve run Spring Training in the past, which is obviously a void right now due to Covid.
  - Bruce added that the report was very interesting and informative to read, and Mike agreed.

#### **(D) USFS REPORT.**

- Jared Smith said that Kristy Wumkes and Kevin Cannon had reached out to some winter trail folks, and that assessments will be starting up in the Cameron Pass area in hopes that some of the trails can be opened by next weekend.
  - Alan Meyer asked if Jared could confirm which trails could be opening sooner.
  - Jared listed several including:
    - Cameron Pass trailhead and restroom (Cameron connection & Montgomery)
    - Zimmerman Lake trailhead and restroom (Zimmerman Lake and Loop trails)
    - Joe Wright trailhead (though not the trail yet)
    - Long Draw Meadows down to Long Draw down to snow park
      - Kevin Cannon explained that the loop connecting Zimmerman Lake through to the Meadows would be open, but not Long Draw itself at this time.
  - Alan thanked them and followed up to ask if the Diamond Peak Ski Patrol would be active and if that area would be accessible as well.
    - Kevin said yes and also mentioned that Blue Lake and Big South are expected to stay closed all winter. He said Saw Mill and Joe Wright are dependent on whether they can get access for an assessment to determine if they can open, and the same is true for the upper Long Draw Road area.
  - Janet Caille asked how Trap Park fared.
    - Kevin said it’s not accessible right now, but that the fire only hit the trailhead. He noted that the fire did not take down the old kiosk there, and Janet commented that it was a good thing they hadn’t yet put up the new one.
  - Celia Walker said she had been up the canyon last weekend and was up near Big South and noted that there was a lot of foot traffic at the closed trail.

#### **REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.**

##### **(A) WEB TEAM.**

- Karl Riters requested for the committee report to be pushed to last, to allow for Cathy Morgan to possibly join the meeting later, so she could be recognized for all of the work she did designing the website and leading the project.

#### **(B) SUPPLEMENTAL TRAINING.**

- Linda Reiter explained that Alan has been helping out, and they're looking to possibly post mini-trainings on the website. They may have something added on winter patrols (basically Gerry Cashman's power point from his classes). Additional ideas from other presenters are birdwatching and wildflowers. Linda said that it would be best for SpotX/InReach for anytime access as well.
  - Alan explained that the communications training is on his to-do but at the back burner for now and he'll be getting to it after the holidays. He noted that he would be reaching out to Jared to coordinate what may need to be followed up with Search and Rescue about.
  - Alan reiterated that he and Linda are working to find better ways for members to access presentations on training material. He explained that there's already an existing location on PWV.org for supplemental training as a way to make it available to members (just look for a Supplement Training entry under Members > Member Downloads).
  - Linda explained that they want to make sure that what's created has a long shelf-life so that it stays relevant and useful long term. Linda said that anyone who has ideas for content can contact her or Karen Roth.

#### **(C) TRAIL PATROLLING COMMITTEE.**

- A Trail Patrolling committee report was sent for members to review.

#### **(D) FUND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE.**

- Tom Collins explained that Jerry Hanley is heading up a task group that is working on a Go Fund Me effort that will kick off in the spring directed at raising funds for trail restoration.
- The committee is also working on a planned giving effort mailing effort that will go out late spring/early summer and will be presented to the Board either January or February.
- CO Gives Day was a record success with a record amount of funds raised.
  - In 2016 there were 22 donors and just over \$2200 were raised.
  - This year we had 63 donors and raised over \$10,000. Tom believes a primary reason for this increase is due to the Cameron Peak fire, but also because we are doing a better job reaching our target audience. Tom noted that they sent out over 60 thank you letters.
- Janet Caille explained that she sent to Randy Welsh the final report template for the NWSA/WSP 2020 award for \$1200 that was originally planned for photo/video equipment but was redirected towards the purchase of Chromebooks due to the Cameron Peak fire, at the suggestion of Mike Shearer. 8 Chromebooks and covers were purchased. Janet thanked Mike Corbin and Sandy Sticken for their help with the purchase of the equipment, and also thanked Celia Walker for assisting with the final report template.
- Celia asked what proportion of funds raised on CO Gives were designated vs. general use.
  - Tom said he did have that answer but did not have details with him. He guessed that about ¼ were designated for trail restoration, and added that there were a couple of memorials, but that most was for general operating purposes.
- Jerry Hanley noted that the crowdfunding was originally suggested by Fred Allen while they were coming up with the Operating Plan for 2021. It is planned for kickoff March

30<sup>th</sup>, and the goal is to raise \$25,000. Jerry explained that he and Mike had discussed the possibility that if raised, those funds may not actually be used next year if what's needed is already in the budget.

- Jerry explained that the way that the crowdfunding effort works is we will ask ahead of time for PWV membership to donate, so that will be a 2<sup>nd</sup> fundraising ask of members in the year. The reason for this is due to the additional need of funds due to damage from the fire. PWV members will also be asked to use their network and social media to share the campaign and encourage the general public to contribute and ideally bring in the majority of the donations. Jerry wanted to make sure the Board wouldn't be surprised about the request that will be going out to members for March 30<sup>th</sup>. The emphasis is supposed to be the bulk of funds coming from the general public, but the seed money would be from PWV directly.
- He also mentioned that the video committee is working on producing a video for the event. Peter, Judd, David Fanning, and Celia are working on the script and video production.
  - Fred followed up to reiterate that the point isn't to ask a lot from the members but that Jerry's daughter, who is advising the committee, explained that for crowdfunding campaigns to work, the public has to see that there's an interest upfront in order to feel compelled to contribute.

#### **(E) STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE.**

- Jerry Hanley presented a proposal for dissolution of the Strategic Planning committee. He said he's never seen a proposal like this, but that there's a rationale for it. He explained that about a dozen members have been on the committee since it was founded 2018, including 5 past board chairs.
  - *Committee Accomplishments*
    - *Successfully developed and got BOD approval for a 2-3 year strategic plan in early 2019.*
    - *12 of 15 strategic initiatives have been completed.*
    - *Helped develop a template and process for committee operational plans, which was one of the major strategic initiatives. 20 of 21 committees asked to submit an operational plan did so.*
    - *The management of these operational plans was turned over to the BOD.*
    - *Although it was a struggle, this year we made a proposal that committee operational plans be integrated with the annual budgeting process, and that it be made part of the organization's policy document. Both were approved by the BOD.*
    - *Completed an overhaul of the committee operational plan template, supporting documentation, and examples.*
    - *Worked with the PWV Treasurer (Sandy Sticken) to coordinate the operational plan request with her annual committee budget request.*
    - *Committed to organizing the operational plan inputs into an Excel spreadsheet, and store said file in the appropriate Google Drive folder.*
    - *The BOD also approved a committee proposal that the Strategic Plan be updated every 3 years, rather than the standing desire to update every 2 years.*
    - *Although primarily being developed by Margaret Shaklee, the creation of a Committee Manual, describing the "behind the scenes" workings of the PWV organization, and resources available to committee chairs. The intent would be that this document serve as a resource, as well as be used to help in orientations for new committee chairs and new BOD members.*

- Jerry noted that the committee has observed that we do not have any kind of orientation for either new committee chairs or for new board members. This document that Margaret is developing is probably 90% complete could be used to build an orientation around it.
- *Thanks*
  - *I am pleased with what this committee has accomplished, and want to thank each and every one of them for their contributions to these accomplishments. Job well done!!*
- Jerry explained that he and Margaret Shaklee, as the longest-serving members on the committee, wanted to offer background in explanation of the proposal.
- *Reflections*
  - *Note: to reiterate some background, I was the original chair of the ad hoc committee in 2019 charged with developing the first strategic plan for PWV. Margaret was also part of that committee. I believe in about 2015, when Margaret was BOD Chair, she proposed that a permanent Strategic Planning Committee be established, and proposed that I be the chair. Both were approved by the BOD. Thus the reason that we tend to do a lot of reflection around this process.*
  - *The burden of the development of the Strategic Plan fell upon this committee. Although this was the original intent for establishing this permanent committee, it effectively left the management of the on-going process to this committee as well, rather than the BOD managing the process. There has been a feeling of “out of sight, out of mind” with the BOD.*
  - *There is strong opinion among several of us that the BOD has to be very engaged in not only the development of the plan, but also the management of the plan. They need to own the process and the plan.*
  - *The work we did this year on the operational plans is an anomaly. Consequently this type of work will not be repeated.*
  - *Some of these recent committee activities have raised concerns by some that this committee might be overstepping its objectives as a committee. Fair enough.*
  - *Given that a Strategic Plan will only be developed every 3 years, there is not much for this committee to do in the intervening years.*
  - *PWV has 30+ committees, which can sometimes feel almost unmanageable. Does it really make sense to have a standing committee that is only active every 3 years?*
  - *Given the unknowns surrounding the consequences of the Cameron Peak fire, the BOD and membership will probably be primarily focused on restoration activities, and might not have the bandwidth nor energy to wad through a strategic planning process next year (2021).*
- *Proposal*
  - *That the permanent Strategic Planning Committee be dissolved.*
- *Follow Up to Proposal:*
  - *The BOD/Executive Committee be responsible for initiating the Strategic Planning process every 3 years.*
  - *That the BOD be directly involved in the development of the plan, although an ad hoc committee could also be formed involving the BOD.*
  - *That select Advisory Board members also be invited to participate in the process, as many of them bring along a lot of “institutional knowledge”.*

- *That either an internal or external facilitator be recruited to help with the approach/process and any associated workshops.*
  - *That the BOD actively manages and reviews the plan and all annual performance metrics during the 3-year planning cycle.*
  - *That the BOD needs to look at the Bylaws to see if “managing the Strategic Plan” should be mentioned as a responsibility of the BOD Executive Committee moving forward, i.e. to codify the issue.*
- Bruce Williams began the discussion by noting that there was a lot to digest. Alan interrupted to ask if someone should second Jerry’s motion prior to discussion. Janet Caille seconded the motion.
- Bruce Williams said that what he hears in the proposal is that the Board needs to take more responsibility and that it’s their job to manage. He said it’s a fair point, but commented that the Board would still need support in this effort. He asked how would the occasional ad hoc support to the Board be different than the existing committee being active every 3 years.
  - Jerry explained that when the formal committee was created back in 2018, that the committee essentially developed the entire Strategic Plan. They got input from the Board, Advisor Board, and committee chairs, but did not ask for input from the entire PWV membership as they had done previously in 2013. It was the committee itself that took all of the data and developed all initiatives and made a proposal to the Board.
    - Later, when Jerry recommended that the planning coincide with the budgeting plans, Mike pointed out that it had never come to a formal vote, meaning the Board had never formally approved the Strategic Plan, even though 12 of 15 initiatives were completed. These initiatives had only been completed because the committee members were pushing other committee chairs to ensure they were addressing the issues that were in the Strategic Plan.
    - Because of that structure, the management of the Strategic Plan fell onto the committee instead of the Board, which is where the responsibility really belongs. He reiterated that this really came to a head when he made the proposal for the operating plan and budget to coincide, and a number of people on the Board had no idea what was going on.
    - Jerry reiterated that it really is the responsibility of the Board to drive the Strategic Plan and be involved in creating it.
  - Bruce acknowledged that he understands there was a disconnect between the committee and the Board, and a lack of responsibility and shortcomings with the process. Despite that, he’s questioning whether this is the right solution to that problem. Bruce said that he’s concerned this is a punt of the issue rather than a solution.
    - Jerry agreed that Bruce made a fair analysis, but said that if the Board takes up the follow up recommendations within his proposal, that it would become the strategy and policy. This would require the Board to take the action.
      - He acknowledged the committee could continue, but there would have to be a restructure, as they could not maintain the responsibility of developing the Strategic Plan as a standalone, the Board would need to be fully engaged and participating in the workshops to develop the plan and follow up with action to implement the plan.

- An additional concern of Jerry's is that the committee would still largely be inactive for 2 ½ years between plans, making it difficult to maintain committee members.
  - He explained that the proposal is not intended to be a punt, but a call to action for the Board. He also noted that existing members could be available to assist in future ad hoc committees to support the Board.
- Bruce thanked Jerry for his response, and apologized for suggesting the proposal was a punt. He noted that he agreed with much of Jerry's analysis and wanted to hear other discussion.
- Pete Ramirez asked how long a Strategic Plan takes to develop from start to finish.
  - Jerry said the process takes a couple of months, in part because initially you have to determine what the process will actually be. A survey must be developed and sent to the agreed-upon population, and that information must be analyzed using something like a SWOT analysis (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats). One or two half-day workshops would then be needed to evaluate the data, determine action items, and identify performance measures to evaluate success, then the plan can go to the Board for approval. Jerry noted that the bulk of the effort is in the workshops.
    - Jerry noted that the creation of the first plan in 2013 took 9 months, largely because it had never been done before and they were having to create the process as they worked. Now there's a model to follow.
- Pete noted that he had participated in the development of Strategic Plans with other organizations, and asked Jerry if they submitted portions of the plan to the Board for review or if they only shared the finished product at the end.
  - Jerry said that both plans the committee has developed were not vetted during Board meetings, but several past presidents had participated on the committee.
  - Pete suggested that instead of having the full Board participate in lengthy workshops, it could be possible for the Board to offer input and the committee to develop and offer sections of the plan to the Board for review, possibly by email rather than during meetings.
  - Jerry acknowledged that this is one possible process, but that he believes the Board should be much more intimately involved in developing the plan. The Strategic Plan determines where the organization will go in the next 3-5 years, which is important, and shouldn't be a one-off.
  - Pete explained that his suggestion would have Board members periodically reviewing and discussing the plan in development.
  - Jerry clarified that his proposal is not to drive the process, only to question whether a permanent committee should exist to drive the process.
- Mike Corbin asked when another plan is due.
  - Jerry said based on the timing of the last plan, that the next should begin development in late 2021, about a year from now.

- Mike responded that he sees it as a two-part situation, first, abolish the existing committee, and second, determine what process to use going forward. Jerry agreed.
- Alan commented that prior to the first Strategic Plan in 2013, earlier Boards were not receptive to the idea of having a Strategic Plan because they wanted PWV to retain an informal, ad-hoc nature. The first plan was highly influenced by the people that were on the committee. Alan recalls that the committee considered large wide-reaching questions about the organization, like considering the use of paid staff or separating from the USFS, to small personal concerns of individual members. Alan said it was not very well managed from that standpoint and agrees that the Board should really be the entity asking the questions to determine the direction the organization should go in and directing those efforts.
  - He agreed with Pete that it's possible for there to be an effective process that doesn't require the full Board to participate in all of the development of the plan, but should at least identify the top 5 initiatives that would drive the planning process, so they would still be driving the plan rather than just reacting to whatever a separate committee created after the fact.
- Pete furthered that the Strategic Plan he helped develop was for a national organization, and he worked with only a small team to create the plan but frequently consulted and checked in with the leadership at large to ensure they were all on the same page.
  - Mike reiterated that right now the question is not what the future process should be, but to address whether or not the current committee should be eliminated. He agrees that at minimum an ad hoc committee would be required for the future planning process to do the legwork.
  - Pete asked for clarification as to what the distinction really was if it sounds like a committee will be needed either way.
    - Jerry explained that by abolishing the standing committee, it leaves open the question of what is the process to be used for future planning going forward.
    - Pete commented that he liked Mike's suggestion of using an ad hoc committee. Jerry replied that he agreed and that was part of his proposal, which would abolish the current committee but recommend the use of a future ad hoc committee that had much more direction and participation from the Board.
- Bruce followed up to ask if it would be possible for the current Strategic Planning committee to first draft a proposal process for the Board to agree on prior to disbanding. That way, we have a solution to the challenge and a plan forward.
  - Jerry acknowledged that Bruce's suggestion would be a reasonable way to move forward. The committee can regroup for a final task and develop an alternative process for the Board first.
  - Janet agreed that this seemed like a good strategy to ensure that the work and expertise of the current committee doesn't get lost over time between each 3 year cycle.
- Jeanne Corbin commented that as a committee chair, she did feel like in the past it seemed like it was the Strategic Planning committee telling her



committee what to do. She pointed out that whatever the procedure becomes going forward, it needs to involve the committee chairs much earlier in the process.

- Jerry noted that the committee had previously consulted with all committee chairs on the plan that was approved but acknowledged they may not have done a very good job communicating with all of the committees chairs once there was a final plan. He explained that he had expected the Board to be responsible for taking on that role and didn't really recognize that it hadn't happened.
- Jeanne explained that her intention wasn't to be critical to the past actions of the committee. She acknowledged that every organization has its own challenges with communication. Her focus is on ensuring that those who develop the procedure for future planning recognize the importance of closing that communication gap.
- Jerry then asked Mike if it would be best to table the proposal while he takes the time to follow up with the committee on developing a recommended plan. Janet suggested that Jerry could amend his existing proposal to say that the current committee will reconvene as an ad hoc committee, but Jerry declined and said he would prefer to instead come back in a few months with a recommended new process, so that the Board would feel more comfortable at that point with the proposal to abolish the standing committee.
  - Mike agreed that it sounded best to table the proposal for now.
  - Jack Morgan asked if the Board would have an advance opportunity to review the proposed plan prior to having it come up for a vote.
    - Jerry reassured Jack and said it would definitely be shared for review first and would take a few months for the committee to meet and develop the proposal. Jerry noted that there's still plenty of time for this to be done since the next planning session isn't expected to begin for another year.
  - There was no objection to tabling the proposal.

#### **(F) AGL COMMITTEE.**

- Mike Corbin explained that the committee is working on a plan to determine how to train new members in 2021. Mike is the chair of both the AGL and Training Manual committees. He explained that last year, there was a discussion on how the Kick Off Night committee is integrated with the AGL and Training Manual committees, as each committee is part of the process of training new recruits. Mike believes that they will be better coordinated if they function as a single committee. Due to the nature of next year's process, these 3 committees are working in an integrated way anyway, but Mike wants to introduce a motion to formally combine the 3 committees into a single committee for New Recruit Training. Mike explained that there was now a well-documented process on how to train recruits properly.
  - Mike moved to combine the AGL committee, the Training Manual committee, and the Kick Off Night committee into one committee that would be called something like New Recruit Training.

- Out of concern over the question of whether the Chair can initiate a motion, Elaine formally made the motion of Mike's behalf, and Jeanne seconded the motion. Mike asked for discussion.
- Jerry noted that it sounded reasonable, and Pete agreed.
- Bruce asked if all 3 chairs of the respective committees agree to the proposal.
  - Mike noted that he's currently the only acting chair for 2 of the 3 committees.
- Linda Reiter noted that for 2020 the AGL leaders had already been asking to handle KON themselves, which hadn't yet been coordinated, so this was a good progression of that.
  - Mike commented that help would be recruited for the actual planning of KON as well as the creation of the training manual, but that would be managed within the new committee.
- Bob Manuel commented that it can be difficult finding new members to chair committees, and that consolidating into one may make it a bigger challenge to find someone.
  - Mike noted that now that the training manual is largely developed and only requires minor updates and revision, it is not as time consuming of a task as it was in the first few years. He acknowledged that they would still need to find someone to manage organizing KON, but that likely wouldn't be any harder than finding 3 individual committee chairs rather than one for the single committee.
- Sean called roll, all 12 of the voting members present voted in favor of the proposal.

#### **(H) WEB TEAM.**

- Karl Ritters explained that the new PWV website went live this week, and that there were a few minor glitches identified, but the site was running quite well. Karl had hoped to acknowledge and recognize Cathy Morgan for her work on the site, but that she is currently en route to Illinois and evidently was not been able to attend tonight's meeting as she had intended.
  - Karl also thanked Alan Meyer and Kirk Sticken for their involvement with handling many of the technical issues that allowed for a smooth release of the new website.
- Karl wanted to explain in some detail how the Web Team operates and discuss some ways that they can best serve the organization:
  - PWV Mailing Lists: Karl explained that there are currently about 40 email lists, that allow for a specific group of members to be contacted for a particular purpose. The website shows who the list owner is, and that person is responsible for maintaining and updating the list contacts.
    - Members who are contacts on lists should know that their email address will not automatically update from other sources, and the change must be requested of the Web Team.
    - Karl noted that the PWV mailing lists are not viewable/accessible to the general public. Only members who are logged in can access the information.
      - Separately, there is a Contact Us page for the public to use to reach out.
    - Karl explained that if there's a need for a new list, the request just needs to be sent to the Web Team.
      - It's also up to the list owner to request that outdated lists be removed as they are no longer needed.

- Requests: Karl noted that there are two requests that can be made of the Web Team, either to send a Broadcast Email or to add a Calendar Event.
  - A broadcast email can either be requested using the web form or by a direct email to the Web Team.
  - Currently the only event on the PWV calendar is the monthly board meetings, but as Covid lightens up and activities are planned, the request can be submitted for the Web Team to add to the calendar (again either by web form or direct email).
    - The calendar events have a lot of setting options, such as limiting the number of registrations.
- Alan explained that PWV currently has a paid Zoom account that can be used for members who want to host committee meetings.
  - The account currently uses Alan's personal email address, but should we decide to renew the license when it comes due in August 2021, a more generic email can be used such as [pwv.clrd@gmail.com](mailto:pwv.clrd@gmail.com).
  - Depending on how comfortable members are with using Zoom, Alan can share the login credentials for members to use, or Alan, Tom Collins, Jerry Hanley, and Karl Riters are available to offer assistance setting up and hosting the meetings.
  - Bruce asked if there are any usage fees associated with the account.
    - Alan explained that the account allows for unlimited meetings with no time limit. It limits participants to 100 people per meeting and does not allow for more than one meeting at a time.
  - Bruce followed up to ask if setting up the meeting was similar to using a free personal account.
    - Alan said it would be similar, although our account does have some features unavailable on the free account, such as using polls.
- Alan also mentioned that some members have been asking how the storage capacity works with shared files on Google Drive.
  - Alan noted that you can see when logged in to Drive how much storage is used. Free accounts have 15 GB of data.
    - The data used is a combination Gmail storage and what a member has uploaded to the Google Drive. The files that you upload, even if they are shared, go towards your storage use (something that was not initially understood by many).
      - The Web Team has discussed the possibility of using a single common account to host the shared files so that it does not go against individual members' storage quota.
    - Jerry commented that he uses his Google Drive for personal use, as well as committees and other uses, and clarified that all of those uploads would count against his account's capacity, to which Alan confirmed was the case.
      - Alan explained that overall, PWV's files are using about 5 ½ GB but that on an individual account level, some members may have run out of storage space with their uploads.
    - Janet asked Alan to explain what to do if their storage is already at capacity.
      - Alan showed how individuals can click on "Buy Storage" then view storage details to understand how their data is currently being used. Alan mentioned that his data was

used much more significantly by email than Drive storage. Members could look this up for their accounts to determine what plan of action to take.

- Janet asked what should be done if Drive storage is the issue.
  - Alan showed how the [pwv.clrd@gmail.com](mailto:pwv.clrd@gmail.com) user can be made owner of PWV files to release the file from the uploading member's data limit.
  - Alan said a shortcoming of this is that only Google-native file types can be reassigned ownership (such as a Google Sheet vs. Excel sheet).
    - Janet asked if files that cannot be reassigned could be removed then reuploaded under the [pwv.clrd@gmail.com](mailto:pwv.clrd@gmail.com) user.
    - Alan said this could be done, and may be an on-going project.
- Celia asked if a member could remove old emails to clear up storage space.
  - Alan said this was one solution, but he understands not all members are comfortable deleting old emails if they prefer to keep them saved.
- Elaine commented that for certain members such as the Secretary, who are responsible for uploading a high volume of files to Drive, a solution would need to be implemented.
  - Alan agreed and suggested that he could work with members on an individual basis if they needed assistance with this.
  - Alan also pointed out that for any members who are heavy users, a storage upgrade from 15 GB to 100 GB is less than \$24/year so that is an option for individuals as well.

## **REPORTS OF OFFICERS (follow up).**

### **(A) TREASURER REPORT.**

- Sandy Sticken explained that while Elaine was Chair, financials were only discussed on a quarterly basis. She can cover them more frequently than that if requested, otherwise she will review 4<sup>th</sup> quarter financials in January.
  - Alan requested that a per-committee report could be provided with the financials as well, and Sandy said she could provide a Budget vs. Actuals per committee.

## **NEW BUSINESS.**

### **(A) PWV BOARD PROCESS**

- Mike Corbin explained that he had documented what he believed the current process for the Board, since every Board operates slightly differently. He wanted to hear members' thoughts on what he currently had documented so he could bring a final draft next month for approval.
  - Elaine Green commented that Mike had quoted the Bylaws to say that any PWV member can bring a motion to the Board, but that she found that when she was Chair that there was a perceived practice that the Chair could bring a motion.

- Mike responded to say that he did not believe that was true in past years, and that currently he is also chair of multiple committees, and this policy change would require him to have to ask someone else to bring a committee motion on his behalf.
- Karl Ritters noted that Robert's Rules of Order (which PWV does not fully follow) does not allow for the presiding Chair to bring a motion to prevent the Chair from dominating a meeting for their personal agenda. Karl stated he did not feel that it was a problem for the Chair to ask another member to raise a motion on their behalf, and his recommendation is to follow this practice.
  - Mike replied that he felt this requirement was silly and unnecessary.
  - Karl said he did not feel it was silly to have protections against a Chair dominating a meeting with as many motions as they want.
  - Mike pointed out that any PWV member may make as many motions as they wish.
  - Karl acknowledged that this was true, but those other members are not running the meeting.
- Celia Walker asked if it was possible for the Chair to temporarily relinquish control over running the meeting to act only as a committee chair, and if so, who would manage the meeting.
  - Karl commented that this introduced unnecessary complexity and it seemed simpler for another member to raise the motion on behalf of the chair.
  - Sandy stated that it seemed like it would be the Chair Elect who would temporarily take over.
- Mike noted that it was not his intention to make PWV unnecessarily bureaucratic and add rules that don't add value. He said that there is no real concern over any Chair dominating during our meetings.
  - Jerry agreed with Mike and said that since we're not a privately held corporation where this may be an issue, and as a small group that knows one another we would simply call out the Chair if something like this were to happen. He said he agrees that this would be overly burdensome.
  - Alan said he also agreed, and while he understands why the Robert's Rules policy would be needed in some formal groups, that this hasn't been an issue for our group. He also noted that whether it's Mike making the motions or someone doing it on his behalf, the policy wouldn't actually limit the number of motions being made.
- Celia shared that the Chair should make it clear in what capacity they are bringing a motion, as the chair of a committee or something else.
  - Elaine commented to say that when the issue was raised while she was Chair, she was making the motion as an individual member, not a committee chair, and that she just sees this as a question that needs to be resolved so it won't come up every time the Chair makes a motion. She also noted that the Bylaws explicitly say "any PWV member".
    - Jeanne commented to say that she thinks it should continue to be that way, as it's been written for 25 years.
    - Elaine pointed out that in her experience it hadn't been a clear policy, as she experienced as Chair.
    - Jeanne replied that this is part of the purpose of documenting the procedures to eliminate any further question.
    - Elaine reiterated that it had always been written that way in the Bylaws.

- Mike said he would allow for some further consideration of the procedure document and could be contacted if anyone had any additional questions or issues. He plans to bring the final document next month for approval to then add to the Operational Handbook to be documented.

## **UNFINISHED BUSINESS.**

### **(A) KRISTY'S FAREWELL**

- Janet Caille noted that this was Kristy Wumkes' last Board meeting, and Mike shared that Kristy is always welcome at our meetings.
- Kristy thanked the Board for sharing this interesting year with her and said she has always enjoyed working with the Board and many members across a variety of projects, including training. She mentioned that she is not leaving town, and will be around, and encouraged everyone to attend her virtual goodbye party in January. She asked that everyone keep up the good work, and said that we do amazing things and that it has been a privilege to know everyone.
  - Mike said we had enjoyed working with Kristy and appreciated all of her support. Janet echoed a thanks and Pete wished her a good retirement.

Mike asked for a motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded and passed. The meeting adjourned at 8:18 p.m.

Sean Orner, Secretary

Next Board Meeting: **January 21, 2021, 6:30 p.m.**