

**ORIENT LAND TRUST (OLT) BOARD OF DIRECTORS ANNUAL MEETING**  
**SEITZ RESIDENCE ADJACENT TO THE OLT WELCOME CENTER**  
**SATURDAY, OCTOBER 16, 2010**  
**MINUTES**

- I. Record Attendance – **Those present - Board:** Doug Bishop, Mike Blevins, Dan Jones, Harold Pratt, Paul Zoric. **Absent, with notice:** John Eiseman, Marilyn Sherbring. **Staff:** Suzanne Ewy, Barbara Tidd, Terry Seitz, Neil Seitz, Mark J., Aurielle A. John L. joined the meeting at 9:20 AM. **Guests:** Doug R. (CDOW), Deb H., Keno M., Don and Kathy G.
- II. Meeting Call to Order – Dan called the meeting to order at 9:12 AM.
- III. Changes to Agenda – There were no changes to the Agenda.
- IV. Guest Questions/Comments – Dan asked guests to introduce themselves. Keno asked about the public speaking during the meeting. Mike suggested the Board entertain comments as they come up. Harold disagreed saying that this sets a precedent, possibly getting into a debate, unless you want to set a limit of say two minutes per comment. Paul mentioned eliciting comments as requested. Suzanne said she has heard from members that they feel that procedurally people can speak at the beginning of the meeting, but then as more information comes up, the public is not able to comment until after the board votes. Perhaps limit comment about certain issues to a certain time period. Harold indicated that as long as the Board has a rule about public comments, that rule can be followed. Suzanne suggests that a person could comment in a short succinct respectful manner prior to any vote. Doug said procedurally he thinks that the board should be able to do its business without public comment during the Board’s discussion since the packet is sent out before the meeting and folks can review and comment on issues before the meeting. Suzanne stated that issues sometimes come up that are not within the agenda. Suzanne said details may not be in the agenda or the packet. Doug suggested the Board make the process more clear going forward. We should do business transparently. He thinks the Board should try to keep its discussions public and keep the public informed ahead of time; then, he doesn’t think the Board needs to stop for the public’s comments.

Deb said the public comment issue will probably come up in the afternoon under unfinished or new business and suggested the Board allow a moment or two for people to bring in new information or ask questions. Try it.

Doug offered that historically the Board has been pretty open to allowing discussion from the public.

Dan said the Board had asked that comments not be allowed because it was breaking down the board’s proceedings.

Harold said that it is common in public proceedings to have distinct comment periods.

Dan suggested that the public try to make comments during the two periods provided. If something very important comes up, then make comments succinct and respectful.

Harold pointed out that there are breaks and lunch which offer times to approach the board with comments.

Suzanne suggested that comments outside the comment period be the exception.
- V. Executive Director’s Report – Suzanne is honored to be here. The board met a couple of weeks ago informally via teleconference because John Eiseman could not be at the meeting today. Suzanne is

pleased to present Mark J. who has been with OLT for about one month. Suzanne thinks we're off to a really good start with coalescing staff. The old reservoir is almost empty. Fish will be stocked on Monday. The hydro-plant bypass is completed thanks to a member welder. This is exemplary of the kind of projects that we can get done thanks to hard work and collaboration. Disease outbreak of the Rio Grande suckers was at the hatchery. The new reservoir does not have a lot of food in it. Rio Grande suckers are vegetarian, while Chubs are carnivores. Suzanne introduced Doug Robinson who helped OLT with its DOW conservation and access easements. Doug R. said that he has been doing conservation work for over 20 years. This was one of the more significant easements that DOW has done because it's species specific. One of the DOW staff outside the real estate section was insistent that this project go forward and found Watchable Wildlife funds for the project. Doug R. thanked OLT for all we do and Neil and Terry for making it happen.

Fundraising efforts – With Deb Hoffman we'll keep working with present donors and are also making a push with outside fundraising efforts to see where we can go with the vast potential that OLT has including conservation, preservation, historical, and agricultural uses.

Airforce overflights – The US Air Force out of Cannon Air Force Base in northern New Mexico wants to fly through the San Luis Valley down to 200 ft. above ground at sunset. This could affect the bats. Mark J., Neil and Terry worked on the overflight issue about 10 or more years ago. Comments are due on Nov. 15, 2010. Suzanne will send to the Board OLT's comments for the Board's review if she has not already.

Pivot irrigation estimate is \$53,000 for a new system. NRCS will pay one-half of that. A used system would be somewhat cheaper, but NRCS would not contribute to that. We need to look at what we want to do with our water. There is a lot of grant/foundation money for organizations that are doing agricultural work. Our ranch is set up for this kind of work. We need to look at whether spending money on pivot irrigation is the best use for these funds.

Construction estimates are based on Mark J., Jamie, Neil, and Terry's knowledge, not on hard bids. Land Conservation items are there because NRCS helps OLT with them. General operating costs for the Ranch fall under Visitor Services. Ranch improvements are under Visitor Services rather than Land Conservation. Terry thinks that the ranch lease income goes into the Land Conservation account. It was suggested to perhaps change the name of the Visitor Services budget to more accurately reflect what it includes.

Dan and Rebecca G. are here. Dan G. is helping to stabilize and maximize the power system. Dan G. is putting together a project system so that when we go through a project, we will go through the same steps. Rebecca G. is helping with the database. Camille R., a rangeland specialist from Lake City, is interested in being on the Board.

- VI. Board Chair's Report – Dan added that as far as the location for the Board meeting, it should be up to Neil and Terry and Suzanne. Mike said that the Board predicated Suzanne's rent on the Board meeting at the Ranch. Dan will have minimal email capability the third week of January to the third week of March. Dan brought up that the board could be thinking about a Board chair for the upcoming term.
- VII. Facilities Manager's Report – Mark said he is grateful for the Board and staff's confidence in him. Those items on the report Mark either made progress on or he will be getting to them. Mark updated the board on his report in the packet. Mike asked about the pad for the generator. Mark

said that a roof can go over the generator at any time. The reservoir has consumed most of the maintenance staff's time. They'll put garage doors at both ends and have the generator on a trailer to be able to pull it up to the Village if necessary. \$10,000 was budgeted for this per Suzanne, which has already been used up, so that is a limitation. Massage deck – putting this up now doesn't make sense. Mark would like a canopy over it. It's a fast project slated for early spring. Neil said we'll use the rough cut lumber for something else that was going to be used for the massage deck. Composite lumber that will be used for the massage deck is easy to maintain. Mark hasn't looked into the cost of an auto-start for the existing backup generator. Doug said he heard it was \$300. The new generator has auto-start. The old generator had auto-start, but it rattled apart. Mark said they determined it was an errant relay that caused problems with the hydro. Mark and Doug discussed possible causes. Mark will note this.

VIII. Secretary's Report/Correspondence – Barb reported that the Board had received correspondence from a guest, which is in the packet at p. 21. Staff and Dan responded to the guest. Dan spoke to the head of the group (whose members were the visitors of whom the guest complained) who spoke to each member of the group. Suzanne will provide Barb staff's response for the permanent record.

IX. Treasurer's Report – Terry/Suzanne

a. Annual Review of Operating Checking Balance – Terry reported that this is set at \$40,000 by the Board. Terry thinks this is still a reasonable amount. The only investment getting interest now is the CD at the credit union. Terry said it's frequently over that. Terry said she thinks we're good for the winter reserve.

b. Review 2010 budget – Terry reported that the increase in Visitor Services is because of the price increase. Contributions are definitely down compared to last year. Terry thinks it's the economy. There was a spike in donations when the spring newsletter went out. A fall paper newsletter will go out. We use Vertical Response now for the e-newsletter because Constant Contact was very expensive. Terry doesn't notice a donation response from e-newsletters; she does from paper newsletters. Terry would have to look to see if individuals' donations are rising from year to year. Dan suggested looking at whether the number of guests that hit the maximum number of days a person can stay has gone down. John Lorenz said it was slightly less than prior years and involves less than 10 people.

Neil said that being down on donations is an indication that we need to do work on donations. He suggested more face-to-face contact; do popular things and ask for donations. For example, Neil said hydro tours have gone through the roof; we do them almost every day. Put more time and effort into face-to-face contact rather than spending time selling the hot springs when people arrive. Suzanne said that this is on the plate for this winter – education of staff re: the land trust aspect of OLT. Doug suggested it be targeted to people who have been here before and not so much to people who arrive for the first time. Mike thinks we over explain the hot springs to folks. Suzanne said staff will be discussing this more. Ranch improvements expenses are for the reservoir. About \$40,000 was unbudgeted. The jump in grants and allocations was \$5,000 paid to TNC for the conservation easement.

- c. Silent Auction wrap-up – Terry reported the following: Gross on silent auction: \$10670 + \$1100 sponsor fees. There was very little outlay other than expenses associated with freebies from OLT-one week in Sunset and one year admission. There were no cash prizes like with the raffle. We came close to making the same amount as we did with the raffle in the past. We received about 52% on bids. That is better than the average for Bidding for Good, which is 25-40%. Mike has since talked with people who saw the auction and who have since said they would donate for an online auction in the future.
- d. Income Statements, Balance Sheet, Cash Flow Statement – There was little discussion. Paul said that he thought that John E. would say that we're a healthy organization. We are a \$4 million organization. Paul moved to approve the financial (Treasurer's) reports. Doug seconded, and the motion carried: all in favor, none opposed, no abstentions.
- e. Stats Charts –Barb summarized that total income is up from 2009. June, July, Aug., and Sept. all saw an increase of around \$10,000/month in total income over 2009. Total income through Sept. is about \$60,000 more than 2009. Donation income excluding government is down about \$14,600 from 2009. Individual donations are down about \$10,600 from 2009. Barb brought the Board's attention to p. 34 - four new charts on unique donors thanks to Chris Miller and said that it's good to keep a pulse on our member numbers.

Suzanne said that we're putting together a survey. Personal contact is key and we're doing that more. Harold suggested we do a campaign and explain what we're doing at the ranch. Suzanne said that is being addressed later in the meeting and at Sunday's workshop. John L. said that the reservation window affects our donations. Mike is suggesting the last chart include a percent change from one year to the next. John L. said we lowered the quota in 2010 by 5 from 105 to 100. Mosquitoes definitely had an impact on visitation the first two weeks of July.

**X. Committee & Task Force Reports**

**a. Board Development**

- i. Board Development Strategy – Harold pointed the Board to p. 75 of the Board Grid, which contains demographics of board members. The BDC could use another member. He suggested the Board visit briefly - What type of person is the Board looking to add to the Board? Should the Board be increased to 9 members? Harold said, yes, so long as the Board finds highly qualified people who have the characteristics to satisfy the Board's needs. If this doesn't occur with the first round, he suggests the positions stay open. Mike brought up someone's comment from the board self-evaluations that the Board be involved in discussion of board candidates.

The Board needs a female. The Board has representation in every area except fundraising. The Board doesn't have someone from the San Luis Valley. Suzanne knows a woman from Lake City who has experience with fundraising who may be a potential board member. Sunday's workshop will help in the fundraising area in getting OLT's message down. Doug said the Board is all aging; think younger. Also, look at ethnicity. Young families are coming

to OLT more and more. Paul said the Board is missing the outgoing, promoter, fundraising personality type. Dan would like to see a full Board. Harold suggested that the Board members approach potential board members individually. Staff should help the Board identify potential candidates.

Keno said it was discussed at the last meeting about expanding the BDC. Harold said nothing has been done. His work really begins today. The intent is to expand the BDC.

- b. Investment – There was no report.
- c. Land Action/Land Management – Doug reported that they haven't met. The former ED had talked to Doug about providing the committee a template for them to work from, but that didn't happen. Suzanne's operating plan includes getting the LA/LM going. Doug said they need to get management plans going.
- d. Resource Development – Deb H., RDC chair, reported that the RDC talked about doing more for members. The old VVHS membership was \$150/yr. There are now fewer members at \$150 and above than there were before OLT. Terry pointed out that benefits now are entirely different from what they were before OLT. RDC looked at a possible discount for members for a day visit, discount coupons at member renewal, and punch cards. It was thought that this would not have a negative impact on overall income and may bring more members here more often and may bring old members back. Dan thinks this is a decision for the staff. Mike thinks it would be useful to have a spreadsheet that shows each of the options. Suzanne said staff would do that analysis. Paul asked how do we incentivize people to increase their donations? Doug suggested perhaps trying one of the options and analyzing it after a year. Keno said that giving a discount for a higher membership level up front may benefit OLT in that most people will not use all of their discounts. Suzanne said that what we're really trying to promote is higher donations, not increased attendance, except in winter. Perhaps give a discount only in winter. Deb said that a year cut-off is important.

Terry wants to get a sense from the Board if it feels that it wants to do something for members or keep the status quo. Neil said when thinking about changing the price structure and connecting it to tax deductible donations, think about how that changes OLT's appearance for the public. What does it mean for the members? They'll do the math. Research this using existing data. Punch cards are easy to change. Other discounts have other issues.

Mark asked, What if we ask people to donate for a specific project? Mike pointed out that with an NPO, a restricted gift must be used for that restricted purpose and that can become a problem if priorities change. Suzanne said that survey results should address this to help determine project priorities. The Everson Ranch fundraising campaign was successful in this way following a survey to the members. Deb H. suggested volunteer work in exchange for a discount. Suzanne said we're working towards that. We must ratchet up our volunteer program. Harold echoed Dan that this should be a staff decision. Harold said there is no need to increase attendance and revenue during the five summer months unless it increases donations. This is not an objective, rather it's a consequence. Mike said that if admissions are

discounted for volunteers, then those free admissions replace paying admissions, unless they're in the winter. Suzanne added that volunteerism has its value as well.

Board objectives: (1) increase winter attendance (2) raise individuals' donation levels (3) increase volunteers (4) overall donation increase and (5) special donation programs such as grants and fundraisers.

Mike said do not consider any fee increase. Volunteerism is great, but we have no measure whether we need to incentivize it with discounts because we haven't had an active volunteer program. We don't want to do something that we can't change in a year. Harold suggested limits on, e.g., punch cards or volunteer hours for discounts.

RDC and staff will work together on it. Dan said we must send the message about how much we appreciate our donors.

Mike added that if we begin camping at the reservoir, how does that impact the quota? Suzanne thinks creating lodging at the ranch is really important for educators and researchers so as not to impact the hot springs; however, they would be day visitors. Mike mentioned possible lower priced camping at the ranch. Suzanne mentioned tipis and yurts, and pointed out that we have to consider the conservation easement restrictions.

Potential fundraising for next year: calendars, reaching out to local landowners, making natural, locally-grown beef available to visitors, and creating sustainable crops. According to Lisa at the front desk, visitors are asking for calendars. Terry said OLT's cost was about \$4/calendar. Suzanne suggested a photography contest for the calendar to bring people into it. Mike suggested a gallery exhibit and then a juried selection to pick 12 photos. We also want to have enough t-shirts or other products to sell at the Crestone Music Festival.

- e. Site Planning – The task force met on 10/11/10. Doug presented the Site Plan Timeline (separate from the packet). Four main milestones were identified: needs, goals, revenue generating projects, and nice amenities. Needs are what we must do to shore up infrastructure. Goals are ongoing and future. Goals or purposes of revenue generating projects include things like potentially increasing accommodations, steam sauna, and enclosed massage deck because these would increase winter use.

Suzanne said we are working on various projects. Outdoor sinks are slated for next spring. Terry said that before OLT people were used to not expecting things to happen fast. She cautioned to be careful what you promise. Doug said in the task force meeting, Suzanne talked about growing organically. This is a really general sketch. Input is welcome. Dan G. could help with the timeline putting structure to this conversation. The ADA project is not immediate. What does it say about OLT? How does it affect OLT? Suzanne will look into ADA compliance requirements. Neil mentioned overall style (aesthetics, how materials/buildings fit in) for future projects. Neil said that improvements are more complex than in the past, and we need to be aware of safety issues and codes, such as plumbing, electrical, and fire. Doug said that's the purpose of a site plan, to have integration, and have it laid out and well engineered beforehand. Doug said the task force discussed this as part of the needs, e.g., a fire mitigation plan, hydro upgrade, and potential heat pump. These are not prioritized. Paul suggested a code review. Neil asked who will be responsible for a certain level of expertise in the areas of safety, and adherence to code, for example. Doug asked if this is a board issue. Mark asked if we have a cadre of members who may be, e.g., a chemical engineer, an electrical engineer.

Dan suggests using Terry's philosophy and the organic approach. Harold suggested Dan G.'s help and said that an architect should convene a committee to discuss various options which would be an organic approach. Ask questions, then create a schematic. Suzanne suggested putting together schematics, people's ideas, survey results and finding someone to facilitate this. The timeline task force should help to ensure we get input from all and commits the task force to it.

A goal is to have the survey out by Jan. 1, 2011 and responses back by March 1, 2011. The survey has to address the consequences of, for example, limiting vehicles in the Village area, which means then are people willing to walk from their vehicle to the soaking area? Dan thinks the survey will help us punch through our road blocks in moving forward with the site planning. Doug said this will help reveal our goals.

Suzanne introduced Dan and Rebecca G.

XI. Guest Questions/Comments – There were none.

XII. Unfinished Business

a. Strategic Planning

i. Land Conservation Approaches – Dan introduced this. He and Suzanne want to continue the discussion about looking at OLT as a land trust and what exactly we want to do. We're asking is accreditation the best way to go? Is that the best use of our resources? Suzanne is looking at collaborative possibilities. She said there are already three active land trusts in the Valley, and they have said that it's very competitive. RiGHT has sewn up all GOCO grants. For OLT to get into this business, OLT would have to compete for funding for conservation easements (CEs). Other land trusts' missions include holding CEs. OLT's mission does not mandate that it hold CEs, just that it promote conservation. Perhaps we work with other land trusts to educate people, be a model of conservation in terms of historical agriculture, restoration of wildlife habitat. In speaking with LTUA and RiGHT Executive Directors and CBLT's President, there is a lot we can do to help other land trusts, who are paying accreditation and/or State certification fees. We could hire a land conservation specialist, but we have so much to do on our property to be a role model. We may be able to acquire land conservation expertise by collaborating with other land trusts rather than hire a land conservation specialist for only OLT. Suzanne doesn't think there is an advantage for OLT to hold CEs. There is a need for more CEs, but not for another land trust in the Valley to hold them.

Harold asked, What is the criteria for other land trusts' CE's? Would they satisfy OLT's needs? Suzanne would go to LTUA or CBLT about holding a CE on say a 160 ac. property in our viewshed. Suzanne said RiGHT's specialty is tying up water rights. Terry said that LTUA already holds CEs in the upper end of the Valley. If you have a lot of CEs, the cost of monitoring any one of them is less. To hold one CE costs more per CE than holding many CEs. Suzanne thinks we can make the collaboration happen and that it would benefit us. OLT may get grants or help other land trusts get grants for CEs they may hold on OLT's property. If we could be a collaborative force, we could do more. Executive Directors of LTUA and RiGHT and President of CBLT will be at OLT's January Board meeting. Dan tasked

Suzanne to have meetings with these representatives prior to the January meeting and come up with specific recommendations for the Board to move forward on this.

Terry said that collaboration may be cheaper for OLT than having an LCS on staff if a land transaction only occurs every few years. State Certification is estimated to be \$3,500 per year. We have three years from Spring 2010 to attain accreditation based on completion of our AYO. LTA Accreditation is in addition to State Certification. Accreditation costs are lowering. In the meantime, we can comply with accreditation standards. Andrew Mackie told Suzanne that he hasn't found that not having accreditation prevents a land trust from holding CEs. Paul wants to ensure that each land trusts' boards are engaged. We have been told that GOCO will not provide funding to OLT because OLT doesn't have the organization track record that other land trusts do. OLT can learn a lot about CEs working with another land trust. Harold said we still need staff time to focus on our conservation area. Andrew M. may be interested in collaborating with OLT for a land conservation staff person. How do we advance our mission in an assertive way? An LC person for us could do promotion, outreach. Suzanne said that we would take all the steps towards holding CEs, but not hold them. Neil said he agrees with Suzanne's position. A CE leaves an open door as to the amount an organization needs in its legal defense fund. He said further that holding fee simple property has worked so far for OLT as well as for OLT's fundraising goals. Neil thinks it's positive to downplay CEs and continue with what we've done in the past. Dan said that we want to be prepared when a landowner in our area comes to us wanting to put on a CE.

Barb said that the Board needs to decide whether it will approve payment of the 2011 State Certification fee that will be due Dec. 31, 2010.

- ii. 2011 Objectives and Work Plan – Objectives 3 and 7 are revised from a draft provided to the Board earlier. Objectives are prioritized. This is the plan on which Suzanne expects the Board to measure her. Suzanne created an action plan from the objectives. The more important the objective, the more time and resources will be given to it. The proposed budget meshes with this plan.

Objective 1:

- Survey – Keno, Don G, Suzanne - via newsletter, email. Targeted to be finished by March 1, 2011.
- Member advocates: Don G and Annie P (targeted)
- Happy staff – doing pretty good, office is humming, people out talking to people.
- Suzanne is getting good feedback from visitors about staff. Suzanne moved her office. Green room will be turned into library, need to secure server first.
- Respect campaign to promote respect for everything. Less rules as we have more objects/art that remind us about respect.
- Suzanne is in Village as much as possible.
- Regular newsletters every 2 months; short is okay per Dan – it is the regularity that is critical.
- Active solicitation of comments/member advocates

Objective 2:

--Staff reorganization – Suzanne has spoken to all staff; wants to utilize and optimize skills of current employees

Objective 3: Model best practices at Ranch. These may change based on fundraising efforts.

--See lessee's quarterly report and attached letter (in public packet)

--Stake building envelope

--Decide about pivot irrigation – We need more information before approval of 2011 budget in January. This affects water allocation and work with a fundraising consultant to determine what will be done at the ranch.

--Site plan for Ranch – 2011

--Reservoir work-fish transfer, 3 additional oxbows in stream, cattle watering, trenching, weed control

Best practices is different depending on what we'll be doing with the ranch, i.e., cattle, ag., type of crops. Best practices means being progressive, trend setters. Historical ranching practices may be entirely different from 'best' practices. Corral must happen. We need to determine what 'best practices' are.

This operating plan includes both items that can be checked off and those that are ongoing.

Objective 4: Complete Village Site plan; Fall 2011 – committee has been established. A fully developed and coherent site plan will take time; hear all sides; be realistic re: time table.

Objective 5: Develop volunteer coordinator. Suzanne took this to be volunteer program. Suzanne asked Deb H. to help with this along with Lisa G. and Rick W. Database will be developed. Front desk will help with administrative support.

Objective 6: IT and security issues

-- Stabilize database, determine best DB program. Direction is not yet clear. Mike said we need to look forward. Suzanne said we need to take care of the present and the future. Security issues are being dealt with at the same time.

-- Rebuild website – may use outside contractor. Suzanne has heard that website is a big turnoff for big donors. It is now VVHS centered.

Objective 7:

-- Stabilize power system so we can use it for other projects.

-- Wastewater treatment plant – must move forward in 2011

-- Massage deck – will assemble kit over winter

-- Steam sauna – survey first

--Double hot tub – one hotter than another; \$4,000 estimate is based on use of volunteer help

--ADA bathroom; retrofit main bath or 'pool shed' to ADA bathroom (\$15,000 est.) – possible; retrofitting main baths may be a problem. If convert existing bath, you lose space. Roofline is an issue if we expand the existing building. Mike: We need one ADA bath for each type of facility. Mike said that we need one at swimming pool area for sure. He doesn't know if we also need one at the main bath. Mark said that if we built one across

the parking lot from the other restroom, it would be the most centrally located. Dan suggested an ADA compliant campsite near the ADA bath. The massage deck must be ADA compliant.

Objective 8: Suzanne is delegating to land committee.

Objective 9: Suzanne will make regular periodic contact with committees.

Objective 10: regular mailing of donor letters, large donor attraction will be addressed in the Sunday workshop, grant solicitation; will task front desk and tap into their talent

Objective 11: BDC

Objective 12: Define objectives. Fundraising workshop on Sunday. Find out what board function can be.

Objective 13: NSLVC Roundtable, meeting with other land trusts, work with local agencies – ongoing

Objective 14: housing at ranch, solicit from local colleges, specialist's students; take OLT accomplishments to local schools

Objective 15: education of staff

Objective 16: public collaboration, neighbor relationship building, work with schools

Objective 17: public collaboration, neighbor relationship building, work with schools, build community projects, attend local functions

Objective 18: see Suzanne's discussion above – get services rather than hire that person

Doug congratulated Suzanne for mending fences with Tim G.

Harold thinks Suzanne is setting up herself and the Board for difficulties by including almost everything on the initial list with only general objectives lacking specificity and completion dates. Description must be clear enough so that when Suzanne writes her progress report, it can be compared to objectives to determine if she has accomplished the objectives. Harold is concerned that Suzanne has overextended herself with this ambitious plan. Dan suggested grouping tangibles vs. ongoing. Harold said there should be details for ongoing tasks as well. Harold is not clear what the outcomes of many of the tasks will be. Harold reminded Suzanne that this operating plan will be the basis for her review. Wastewater treatment plant, for example, needs some detail on what happens on it in 2010 and 2011. Suzanne said that some tasks are nebulous because a decision needs to be made on it before she can move forward with the task. Harold said these tasks evolve and Suzanne and the Board should work together on the work plans and review them at every board meeting, though not in this detail. Harold said that a purist would say that you need evidence to the board of the outcome. Harold and Suzanne discussed how to measure final outcomes against objectives based on Suzanne's list of tasks in the Plan. If tasks are completed in 2010, Harold suggests taking them off this Plan. Others disagreed. Suzanne wants to leave the projects in; perhaps look at some as a percentage rather than all as mandates. Suzanne said, for example, if we achieve 80% of a project, that may be success. Reach for the sky. Harold said many tasks need to be broken down into smaller increments. Dan said that, e.g., regarding objectives 1 through 7, there is not much difference among them as far as priority. Mike said we cannot continue to revisit every decision. Paul thinks we're confusing an evaluation and a work plan and trying to make them one in the same.

He says don't lose the spirit of the work plan. Then, work on evaluation criteria over the next couple of months. Harold is looking for more specifics on each of the tasks on the Plan so that the outcome is clear making the evaluation more straight forward.

Doug sees this as kind of a draft and will work from this. The Board will not evaluate Suzanne at end of 2010 based on this list. There may be places where you can tighten it up; he's impressed with the bullet points. Harold is looking for more. Suzanne suggests staff work on it with her and bring it to the Board in January when she knows more, which would be 2011 only tasks. The budget would be tied into this.

Mike said fundamentally this is a great document; be cognizant of priority of items; star those items that will be measuring devices.

Harold said this Plan includes all objectives all to be accomplished in 2011.

Dan said that the Objectives are a 3 to 5 year plan that were the result of a one-year Strategic Planning process.

Harold said that he has Suzanne's best welfare in mind; there is too much in here.

Mark said to consider this as more of a brainstorming; it will be more concrete at the January meeting; in addition to goals that are concrete, we want to see improvement in this, in this, etc.

Dan said this is the first work plan that the Board has worked on with an ED in recent years. The Board approves it without formal vote. He asked Suzanne to come back in January with it refined in more detail to protect herself. No board member disagreed.

b. Approval of hiring of Facilities Manager

Harold moved to reaffirm the Board's previous vote to approve the hiring of Mark J. as OLT's Facilities Manager. Mike seconded, and the motion carried: all in favor, none opposed, no abstentions.

XIII. New Business

- a. 2011 Budget Planning – Dan said the Board would like to see one or two more iterations of the budget before January. The board reviewed the budget. Terry said highlighted items are flexible. The Land Conservation budget is for conservation PROJECTS, not fundraising. More intangibles are under Visitor Services. A certain amount of staff time is allocated to the Land Conservation budget. Maybe allocate more technology expenses to land conservation. See p. 29 of packet – Conservation Owes Operating Acct. Barb pointed out Terry's note at the bottom of p. 29 regarding funds to the stewardship defense account, that this was an area of concern for the State when OLT received its certification. She doesn't know what the State would say at the time of certification renewal if OLT does not increase that amount in 2010. \$3500 in professional fees is the State certification renewal fee. Terry indicated that visitor services revenue generally increases the year after a price increase. Mike said that \$14,000 for technology may not buy that much. Neil asked if any of these items could be forestalled into 2012 in order to give some breathing room in the budget. Mike said that this ties to the Operating Plan. Terry thinks this is a realistic budget. The Board may want to put more funds towards one project than another. The steam sauna cannot be completed until we have a site plan. Doug asked, how do we budget for reserves? Building back up our capital reserves and endowment is not in the 2011 budget. Dan and Doug think we should up that as a priority.

**Dan suggests that by Thanksgiving the Board see a draft budget that John E. has gone over including some accommodation for reserves and that shows a positive bottom line.**

Suzanne asked that we look at the pivot sprinkler and steam sauna = \$46,000 that are in the budget. Are these going to happen? We need to look at those issues between now and Thanksgiving. Research needs to be done to make a decision on the pivot. Therefore, it may come off the 2011 budget because there are policy decisions that need to be made before a decision on the pivot sprinkler is made.

Mike said we need more bathroom facilities. Re: ADA bathrooms, we are looking at doing one of three options in 2011. Mark doesn't see us putting a shower in an ADA bath retrofitted to the pool shed. Mike said they'd previously looked at making the existing sauna ADA compliant.

**Harold asked that staff create a capital construction budget that we can afford and list in priority specific projects for the Board to approve in January.**

We need to find out the deadline for installing the pivot sprinkler.

- b. Approaches to Fundraising – Dan reported that two applicants for ED were Jerry M. and Edward G., who expressed interest in helping OLT with fundraising. Both have really good ideas and skills. Sunday's workshop with Edward G. is to help OLT create a clear, strong message to large donors. Neil knows of a large donor that is holding funds for a specific project. Jerry has a vested interest in this area. He's looking at us as a model for high-altitude food production. Jerry's strength would be to write a business plan for OLT. Jerry will attend the January board meeting and wants to meet with the Executive Committee. The Fundraising workshop is Sunday at 9 AM at the Ranch.

XIV. How did we do today? Self-examination on our governance – Harold thinks the Board got into the weeds too much today. Sometimes the board needs more details from staff and sometimes the board gets into the weeds because it wants to express its opinion. Harold wants to know the purpose of each item, what specific decision the board is looking towards, and he wants this put into the Agenda. It's good that the Board held to the meeting time. Suzanne didn't have anything to add. There were no comments from guests.

XV. Announcements - Dan made the following announcements:

- a. Tomorrow's schedule (board and staff only)
  - i. 9-11am Fundraising Workshop
  - ii. 11-Noon Lunch and carpool to Sand Dunes
  - iii. Noon-3pm Sand Dunes Tour
- b. 2011 Board Meeting Schedule
  - i. January 15, 9am at Everson Ranch
  - ii. April 16, 9am at Everson Ranch
  - iii. July 16, 9am at Seitz Residence – Annual meeting including Meet & Greet Picnic
  - iv. October 15, 9am at Everson Ranch

XVI. Executive Session - The regular Board meeting adjourned at 3:04 PM, and the Board reconvened in Executive Session at 3:21 PM to discuss land conservation issues, personnel and operations.

XVII. Following discussion in Executive Session, the Board briefly paused from Executive Session and reconvened in regular session for the following motion: Doug moved that OLT account for the payroll error with respect to Suzanne Ewy’s paychecks for August and September, not require Suzanne to pay the overpayment back to OLT, and consider the overpayment part of a 2010 bonus to be determined. Paul seconded, and the motion carried: all in favor, none opposed, no abstentions.

The Board reconvened back in Executive Session.

Submitted by:

Approved by:

\_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_

Barbara Tidd, Secretary

Date

Dan Jones, Chair

Date