

MINUTES
ORIENT LAND TRUST (OLT) BOARD OF DIRECTORS SPECIAL MEETING
VIA TELECONFERENCE
Wednesday, October 28, 2009, 7:00 PM

I. Record Attendance – Amy T

Board members present: Dan J, Harold P, John E, Kai A, Doug B and Paul Z

II. Meeting Call to Order – Dan

Dan called the meeting to order at 7:04 pm

III. Changes to Agenda – Dan

There were no changes to the agenda.

Business

IV. Unfinished Business

a. Reservoir Construction Bids – Amy (DISC/DEC – 15 min.)

Amy summarized the memorandum that she submitted to the Board on Monday, October 26th which outlined the three bids that she solicited for the excavation of the reservoir. She reiterated the amount of bentonite clay that the reservoir engineer calculated it would take to seal the pond. She also mentioned her proposal that we could reduce the size of the reservoir by 25% to 1.5 acres of surface area rather than 2.0 acres of surface area. Harold and Doug asked why the reservoir was designed for 2.0 acres of surface area, and Harold said he was in favor of reducing the size to 1.5 acres in surface area. Amy explained that the larger design was to address the additional fish species that the Division of Wildlife will soon stock in the reservoir, as well as to take advantage of the increased water right per OLT's January 2009 Amended Water Right Application for the Everson Ranch Reservoir. Discussion ensued. The board members asked whether the 25% reduction in size would equate to a 25% reduction in cost, and Amy said that generally speaking, yes it would. John said that we should be sure to get a lien waiver from the contractor. Harold asked if reclamation of Lee Ridgely's property was part of the contract and Amy said that it was. Amy then gave the board a general timeline for the reclamation of the current reservoir. Paul made a motion: that OLT contract with Valley Excavating of Villa Grove to perform excavation for a 1.5 acre reservoir per Amy's direction, the approximate cost of which will be \$35,000. Harold seconded the motion. Discussion ensued. Kai asked whether we should include the bentonite contract in this motion or separately, and it was decided to address it separately. The motion carried unanimously.

