

**SUMMARY of**  
**MINUTES**  
**ORIENT LAND TRUST (OLT) BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING**  
**SATURDAY, JANUARY 21, 2012, 9:00 AM**

[CONTACT [boardsecy@olt.org](mailto:boardsecy@olt.org) for copies of reports that were part of Board meeting packets]

**Those present - Those present - Board:** Camille Richard, Dan Jones, Doug Bishop, Jessica DuBoe, John Eiseman, Mike Blevins, Paul Zoric. **Absent:** Harold Pratt (with prior notice) **Staff:** Suzanne Ewy, Barbara Tidd, Mark Jacobi, Mike May, Neil Seitz, Terry Seitz. **Guests:** Jay Printz, Gerald (Jerry) K, Jim M, Ann B, Deb H, Chris C, Karen J, Conrad P, Tammy T, Jerry F, Tara G, Doug B

Chris C., on behalf of San Luis Valley Ecosystem Council (SLVEC), requested OLT collaborate with SLVEC in some way that would benefit both organizations. OLT staff will discuss this further with Chris.

Jay Printz was elected to the Board of Directors to fill a vacant seat with a term expiring at the July 2012 annual meeting.

Board Chair, Executive Director, Facilities Manager, Visitor Services Manager, and Secretary reports were presented. As part of the Facilities Manager report, Jerry K gave the status of the wastewater treatment facility bidding process. Matt provided information about forum communication options for within the organization.

The Treasurer presented OLT's financial reports. The Board approved the Treasurer's report.

No Stats Charts report was given in the interest of time.

Committee reports were given.

Board Development: Paul and John will not continue as directors as of the July meeting when their terms are up. Anyone interested in serving on the Board may contact Dan or Harold.

Conservation Committee (CC): Members: Camille, Chair; Jess, Suzanne, John S, Doug B, Jay, John E, Matt, Mike M. Don G will not continue on the CC. Bob B may get involved this summer. John E will talk to Jess about it. CC mission statement approval was tabled until the April meeting. Camille summarized the five broad tasks of the CC, which are to provide broad oversight (not micromanage) for conservation policy and planning in conservation easements and acquisitions, monitoring, evaluations, including an annual review of our plans and policies, and outreach and fundraising. The CC will work on a strategic land conservation plan. The Baseline Documentation Report Policy will be addressed at each annual meeting. The Declaration(s) concerning use of funds in Stewardship, Monitoring & Legal Defense Fund and Land Conservation Fund was tabled to the April meeting.

Discussion ensued about the Hot Springs Creek meanders project.

Human Resources Committee (HRC): Working on mission statement; will be working with staff to revamp how to approach staff position descriptions; moving from position to task descriptions with a strong conservation focus. HRC will try to facilitate this approach. HRC needs more committee members. Discussion ensued as to the composition of the HRC. No decision was made.

Investment: John discussed possibly investing in bonds. No decision was made.

Resource Development Committee – most recent meeting minutes were in the e-packet.

Site Planning Committee - approved the recommendation for the site of the new hot tub.

Doug B. gave an overview of OLT's new website that he is developing and showed his progress thus far.

The Board approved the Memorandum of Understanding among OLT, Crestone Baca Land Trust, and Land Trust of the Upper Arkansas.

The following revised mission statement was approved:

*Orient Land Trust is dedicated to the preservation of natural and biological resources, agricultural lands, wildlife habitat, open space, and historic and geologic features of the northern San Luis Valley for the education and enjoyment of current and future generations.*

A Resolution **CONCERNING NATURIST USE OF ORIENT MINE PARCEL** was approved allowing naturism on the Orient Mine parcel.

A Resolution **CONCERNING MEMBER ADVOCATE, now known as VISITOR LIAISON POSITION** was approved inactivating the position.

Suzanne spoke briefly about ranch planning and said this year's plan is for stabilization of ranch buildings only.

The 2012 Action/Work Plan was discussed and approved taking into consideration that the Plan is subject to realities of our place and future Board input, and it is a working document.

The 2012 budget was discussed, changes will be made, and a budget will be approved before the April meeting.

Matt introduced the Volunteer Program. The Board approved it based on Matt's presentation and as outlined in the Board packet. Matt is the volunteer coordinator.

The Board approved Suzanne and Mark approaching the seller of the Case tractor at or near dollar amounts listed in the Board packet. They are authorized to pursue owner- carry financing on it.

#### Announcements

- a. 2012 Board Meeting Schedule
  - i. January 21, April 21, July 21 (annual meeting with picnic lunch), October 20, all at 9 AM

- ii. January 22, Board & Management Retreat, Great Sand Dunes National Park
- b. Northern SLV Conservation Roundtable
  - i. January 26, 9 AM Meeting (at Joyful Journey Hot Springs Conference Room)
  - ii. February 1, 6:30-8:30 PM WATER 101 educational event (at Baca Grande Property Owners Association (POA) Hall)
- c. March 12-13, 2012 CCLT Conference, Denver [www.cclt.org](http://www.cclt.org)  
September 29-October 2, LTA Rally 2012, national land conservation conference, Salt Lake City

The Board increased Suzanne Ewy's annual salary to \$60,000 retroactive to January 1, 2012, and she will continue to have use of the Ranch house for her residence.

**ORIENT LAND TRUST (OLT) BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING**  
**OLT WELCOME CENTER**  
**SATURDAY, JANUARY 21, 2012, 9:00 AM**

**MINUTES**

- I. Record Attendance – **Those present - Board:** Camille Richard, Dan Jones, Doug Bishop, Jessica DuBoe, John Eiseman, Mike Blevins, Paul Zoric. **Absent:** Harold Pratt (with prior notice) **Staff:** Suzanne Ewy, Barbara Tidd, Mark J, Mike M, Neil Seitz, Terry Seitz. **Guests:** Jay Printz, Gerald (Jerry) K, Jim M, Ann B, Deb H, Chris C, Karen J, Conrad P, Tammy T, Jerry F, Tara G, Doug B
- II. Meeting Call to Order – Dan called the meeting to order at 9:11 AM.
- III. Changes to Agenda – Dan will give his Board Chair report before the Executive Director (ED) report.
- IV. Guest Questions/Comments – Dan welcomed guests. Board, staff, and guests introduced themselves.
  - a. Visitor Liaison Report (in packet) – Dan said the report is in the packet. Don G was not present.
  - b. Collaboration request from San Luis Valley Ecosystem Council (SLVEC) ([www.slvec.org](http://www.slvec.org)) (in packet) – Christine C gave some background about her involvement in the community going back to the late 1980s. Over the years because of this involvement, the SLVEC has developed a mailing list of about 3,800. SLVEC is looking for creative ways to continue to develop and maintain their database of interested folks. SLVEC recently did free radon and well testing programs in the San Luis Valley (SLV). SLVEC is always doing outreach. Their list may be beneficial for OLT in that SLVEC folks may want to support OLT. Dan suggested that SLVEC work something out with Suzanne/staff, e.g., putting something in OLT’s newsletter. Dan said per OLT policy, OLT cannot give out its mailing list. Chris suggested a self-addressed stamped envelope in our newsletter. John asked about SLVEC’s mission. Chris said its mission is to protect and restore, through research, education, and advocacy, the biological diversity, ecosystems, and natural resources of the Upper Rio Grande bioregion, balancing ecological values and human needs. SLVEC does outreach to individual households in order to get the message out about the larger issues like landscape conservation. Suzanne said OLT and SLVEC have already worked together on solar and Low Altitude Tactical Navigation (LATN) overflights. Camille suggested we could have a linked page on our website featuring different non-profits in the SLV. OLT is on SLVEC’s website. John said SLVEC’s strengths are in the central Valley. OLT’s are in the northern Valley. SLVEC has about 1300 members in the SLV. Others are outside the SLV. The Board had no reservations about collaboration. Dan stressed to work directly with staff and within the confines of OLT’s privacy policy. Suzanne said SLVEC has preserved things in the SLV that are dear to the hearts of OLT members/visitors.
- V. Election of Director – John moved to elect Jay Printz to the Board of Directors to fill a vacant seat with a term expiring at the July 2012 annual board meeting. Camille seconded the motion and the motion carried; all in favor, none opposed, no abstentions.
- VI. Board Chair Report (in packet) – Dan wanted to give his report before the ED report to give a little pep talk for staff and set the stage for Suzanne. Dan first mentioned housekeeping items that he and Barb are working on for the July annual meeting that need to be addressed annually and will

be put into one sequential group, possibly for one comprehensive vote. Then there will be three meetings per year without these votes. John commented that he really appreciates the detail work that Barb does in keeping the Board in line and also appreciates Dan in his taking care of details.

Dan went over his report commending staff for getting Elm/Willow on geothermal. The intent was to just get the concrete poured, but staff rigged it up temporarily so it is heating geothermally until we get the infrastructure in place to have all cabins going. It's pretty amazing; he used that as his launching point to continue to commend staff. Most of the Board has now seen the facilities staff and all the great things our staff is capable of. Elm/Willow is one small example. John asked if it's online for revenue. Dan said it is. Mark said it was down 'a 30-day week.' Suzanne said it was empty one morning and that evening it was occupied. Concrete curing time is the limiting factor in the timeline. Suzanne gave more details. John made additional comments. Mark said it is very well received.

Dan said we have a most amazing ED who has pulled together a most amazing staff. It is time to truly loosen the reins and trust our staff. The Board needs do its job of oversight and big picture policy and get completely out of the weeds and details of Valley View Hot Springs (VVHS) operations. John mentioned Don G's report as an example where John is feeling comfortable with leaving to staff the day-to-day operations. Paul asked for examples in which the Board has been/is too much in the weeds. Dan said a ways back with outdoor sinks and more recently with the information technology (IT) issue. Dan also commended Suzanne on her bringing in volunteers such as Jerry and Doug B. who have done tens of thousands of dollars worth of work for OLT. Rather than IT being farmed out, it is now being done in-house. We are such a unique organization that in-house is the way to go.

Staff is on the ground and dealing with the complexities and realities of the operation. They are interacting with guests. Friendliness oozes from the front desk; it's really great to see. The staff works by coming together and brainstorming with great ideas. Dan encourages the Board to spend more time here, join in, and get into the weeds a little bit if you want to, but it isn't appropriate at the board meetings or in committee meetings. Walk around with Mark, let him know what you're thinking; he is extremely receptive to our input. It doesn't need to be done through the Board.

Dan proposes effective with the July Board meeting changing the four meetings per year to four weekends per year. Board members will commit to Saturday and Sunday. That provides flexibility to split meetings over 2 days, do professional training such as fundraising, work with Suzanne's staff or volunteers, pound nails, pull weeds, or sit in the office and do fundraising work together. Dan suggests that the Board commit to these 8 days per year; a future chair can help structure how the time is utilized. It can and should vary meeting to meeting. It would be an official change to the Board Position Description so the Board would vote on it. BDC will work on this. Give comments to Dan or Harold. Jay likes the idea.

Karen J volunteered her house (Doug's rental) for Board members to stay at over Board meeting weekends.

Dan commended Jim M, Doug B, and Jerry K as having done above and beyond extraordinary work. Dan also mentioned Deb Hoffman and said he doesn't like to mention names because so many have volunteered. It continues to come back to Suzanne. She is so passionate about our mission, she exudes it and everyone wants to participate. That's OLT and our uniqueness.

In summary, Dan said if you're not on board with his suggestion that we double our meeting time and come up and spend more time here and get involved, he thinks you need to

think about stepping aside because there are other people waiting in the wings who are ready to make this level of commitment, and the organization is really ready to fly.

VII. Executive Director Report (in packet) – Suzanne said there will be more to report in April and July. The Conservation Committee is ready to fly. Over the last year and one-half, we have shored up the hot springs. This is reflected in Suzanne’s 2011 action plan. Now we are poised to fly. For fundraising, we need policy, programs, and projects. That is capacity building. We will be doing grant writing and fundraising with Board and staff. Suzanne referred to Jerry’s draft report for stabilization of structures at the Ranch.

a. Revisions to Policy and Procedures Concerning Complaints (in packet) - Suzanne introduced these changes. Suzanne’s decision is final, a person may appeal to the Board. John asked how many instances we’re talking about. Terry said it’s rare. Suzanne said there were three situations this year. John said the Board is to monitor trends, not individual situations.

Jess moved to approve the amended Policy and Procedures Concerning Complaints about Staff, Visitors (including volunteers), Board Members and Officers as shown on **pp. 17 to 20** of the print Board packet. John seconded the motion. Jay said he would prefer not to meet face to face with these people. He would like the person to put his/her complaint in writing, unless the person’s complaint involves discrimination. Dan in the past has insisted the complaint be in writing. Suzanne clarified that the policy as amended states that the appeal is to be in writing.

Doug is glad there is an appeal process. The motion carried; all in favor, none opposed, no abstentions.

John asked if we are properly staffed. Suzanne said we will hire Doug B for IT; funds will be transferred in the budget from IT to personnel payroll.

VIII. Facilities Manager Report (in packet) – John asked if cabin renovations came in line with budget. Mark said we were under and used the funds for beds and a futon. There were no surprises. Mark said everything came together in one day. Jim M, Neil, Sandy, Rick, Dave (front desk), Mike M, Terry, Suzanne all pitched in to get it done. The functionality is what was expected. There are no temperature readings yet of the floor or water coming in and going out. Mark thinks the water temperature is in the mid-90s. Mark said they will insulate under the slab as they do the renovations. As they choose to insulate, it will be phased. Over the next few months, they plan to do Aspen, Cedar, and Cottonwood. Mike M said they’re limited by cure time of concrete. Down time in one year because of the renovations is offset by perpetuity in future years. Neil and Terry’s cabin will offset some revenue loss if we can get it online before the end of the year. We harvested about 6 kW from Willow/Elm. Flow in the stream has decreased this year. We’re in about the same place with kW as prior years because of the decrease in stream flow. Structure of south wall of Oak House – we’re good for a little while. We want to stabilize that wall. Then, we can insulate the ceiling and put in geothermal to heat the floor. We can use our resources better once that is done.

Mark discussed the tractor proposal (in packet). John and Doug asked about the utility of the tractor. Staff didn’t know the cost to subcontract a grader for the road. John said and Mark agreed the tractor needs to be covered. Mark said the US Dept. of Agriculture (USDA) has 3.75% loans on buildings, waste trailers, and waste disposal systems. Doug asked about using a building at the Ranch for storing the tractor. Mark said that was a possibility. The tractor could replace generally 5 workers. Doug said it seems like a really good deal. Others chimed in agreeing. Dan suggested that questions go to Mark during lunch or budget discussion.

a. Wastewater Treatment Facility (WWTF) – Suzanne said that Jerry prepared the RFP for the WWTF, and he conducted the meeting for us. Jerry reported that we put out the formal RFP and received four bids. One was non-responsive. Three bids are close together. We are going back to them now to respond to their questions. Jerry was impressed with the close range of costs. The soonest construction would start would be late spring/mid-summer 2013. This will depend on Colo. Dept. of Public Health & Environment’s (CDPHE) review. It takes about a year to get CDPHE’s permit. These bids are for the design and getting our permit only. All bidders use more modern treatments, are somewhat similar in how they handle sludge, aerobic and anaerobic treatment, and all meet nitrogen and other criteria. All three are about the same in terms of visibility; one is better as far as showing off. Bidders: one is a Colorado small firm, one is larger with a base in Colorado, and one is from outside Colorado. Suzanne said it’s in the competitive bidding process and therefore, is not available for the Board to see at this time. The Board will be involved in Executive Session before a decision is made. Electrical costs are quite low, less than it takes to run the current 3hp facility. Jerry said there are different categories before wastewater can be put onto, for example, edibles. There is no power required in that it is an anaerobic tank. It is equalization, a fluctuation tank only.

Jay asked about how long the WWTF would last. Jerry said it could handle contributor weekend every other weekend, which is over double week visitation. We would have to more than double capacity before the proposed system would be affected.

Mark wants folks to be aware of how much he appreciates Neil’s counsel. Dan agreed. Mark also commended housekeeping staff.

IX. Visitor Services Manager Report (in packet) – Matt commended the visitor services staff as far as their patience, in how they handle situations, and their grasp of their positions. The interpretive services plan will use current staff resources. John asked about winter bat monitoring. Matt said we have a year-around bat population, although it is not the Mexican free-tailed bats. Kirk Navo wants baseline data on the bats in case the colony is ever hit with white-nosed syndrome. Matt would like to get baseline data for the affect human sound may have on bats as well. John asked how Matt is doing. Matt said he is doing better. Dan said that Matt puts in way more than 40 hrs. per week. John said if Matt is having fun, it translates to the visitor experience.

Deb added that friends of hers have said that they really feel welcome when they check in.

Matt is looking into how to give visitors a personal connection using interpretive services – this is a goal for 2012.

John asked, what is interpretive training? Matt said it is a national interpreters’ conference about all aspects of how to give people a deeper personal connection to whatever resource you have, a better experience of what they see, an emotional vs. intellectual connection because they are more likely then to help us take care of OLT if they have an emotional connection. Matt has talked in the office about awareness, knowledge, understanding, and stewardship – it’s a continuum that you want to move visitors down. How do we get people to help us with the place? For Matt, the conference is a lot of fun and energizing for him. He has attended for the past five or six years.

Questing is another technique to make it fun, great for families. Matt said, e.g., Dec. 1 may be a good day to allow people to take photos.

Tara also talked about education to raise awareness of guests, e.g., use of biodegradable soaps, no sunscreens in ponds, etc.

- a. Forum communication options for within staff – Matt thanked Doug B with his help on this. The purpose is to try to eliminate email and have a central place for conversations and document upload that others may access. Matt has looked at TeamLab. Doug found Projectfork that could be hosted on our server. Matt said he could hook up board members if anyone wanted to look at Projectfork. These are free open-source platforms. Barb said that Dropbox is for temporary usage until a comprehensive system is established. Matt said we looked at Basecamp. It's expensive. Whatever system is chosen will have different security levels. Jess asked if instructions and a link could be provided to Board members. Matt said, yes, and that TeamLab is intuitive. Dan suggested Matt, Doug B, and Dan talk next week about how to approach this.

Camille asked that those working on the interpretive services plan work closely with the Conservation Committee.

No directors are opposed to pursuing the forum option.

- X. Secretary Report and Correspondence – Barb reported that on Dec. 15, 2011, with Terry Seitz, Barb checked the unused check supply, a task delegated to her by the Treasurer. Barb accounted for all checks. At that time, Suzanne said she would burn the Stewardship Monitoring & Legal Defense and Land Conservation Projects (LCP) closed accounts checks to ensure they are disposed of properly. Suzanne confirmed this was done. There was no correspondence since the last meeting.

Barb asked the Board if they want to continue to receive the updated Motions documents following each meeting. The Board asked that the documents be sent out following the annual meeting only.

#### XI. Treasurer Report

- a. Income Statements, Balance Sheet, Cash Flow Statement (in packet)

John commended Terry and Suzanne on budgeting as they have done in the past.

Visitor Services (VS) - Program Revenues are right in line. We did more in sales. John said we had a terrific year and exercised a lot of fiscal discipline, leadership at the top.

Land Conservation (LC) - Our donations are down a little more than 12% from budget, but we made up for it somewhat in cutting expenses. Suzanne said she thinks we're in the third year of a recession, and that we were working on capacity building. Suzanne anticipates more donations this year which includes the WWTF philosophy, hot tub, and involvement with the Ranch. John is seeing that investment in infrastructure will be paying off. John said we need to develop further skills among Board and staff. Suzanne said staff is already doing planning work in the grant writing area. Suzanne said there are now three fundraising experts on the Board. John said the bat program is starting to mature to attract people who aren't necessarily naturalists. Jay telephoned present donors during December. Suzanne said we changed the structure for membership raising levels for future reservations. Suzanne anticipates a 10% adjustment in revenue because of this change.

LC projects were within budget variances. John was not called in because of variances. \$346,000 is very nice going into winter. Total liabilities are \$100,000, which is a very small amount.



John went over restricted funds including capital savings/reserve fund. The capital reserve fund does not include funds for the WWTF. John said we're trying to build reserve funds so we have the funds when we need them.

Regarding the negative balance in the LCP fund, John suggests that we act as a true 501(c)(3) and forgive this balance from one fund to the other.

John said we'll be spinning off \$90,000 of the restricted/capital savings fund in 2012.

Mark expressed his appreciation for the foresight in putting money aside for future needs.

Doug moved to approve the Treasurer's Report. Mike seconded the motion and the motion carried; all in favor, none opposed, no abstentions.

Jay asked if it is possible to put on the income statement, a percent (%) between the actual and budget and between this year and last. Terry can do this. Jay would like to see this. John will work with Terry on this.

- b. Stats Charts – John commented that he liked the information from Matt's charts as well. Matt clarified that these were for January only.

## XII. Committee & Task Force Reports

- a. Board Development (BDC) – Dan, for Harold, directed the Board to the Board Development Checklist

- i. Review of development checklist and grid (in Board packet) - Dan asked for any questions or comments from the Board. Jess said to be sure we're doing annual tasks on an annual basis. Camille added to be sure that it's matching our strategic plan. Dan asked the Board if members are accurately represented on the grid. John is 61-70. Paul moves up a notch also.

- Paul will not renew. John would like to be in the background; time to get new blood. John will not be a formal board member, but will continue to be active as an advisor; he will be on the financial side. Paul said he would remain on the Resource Development Committee (RDC).

- Suzanne asked how advisors could be engaged. Mark said at some point we need to move this on to the next generation. Tara, in her experience, has seen past board members move into an advisory capacity.

- ii. Process for upcoming board vacancy (report in packet) – The BDC will follow the procedure Harold outlined in his report. Doug pointed out that a prospective board member need not be nominated; may nominate yourself. Dan stressed that anyone interested may contact Dan or Harold. Mike asked, what is the proper forum for discussion about enlarging the board? Doug indicated that in the past some board members have stayed a long time and others have come and gone pretty fast. Dan said that's a great discussion to have, but suggested remaining stable at the new and current level of nine members for awhile before considering expanding the board size.

- b. Conservation (CC) – Camille brought our attention to OLT's mission which must pervade all aspects of our operation. The Land Committee and Land Management Comm. were merged and became the CC. Jess merged the missions and tasks from those two committees to create the draft mission statement (p. 65 of the print packet). Camille would like to table approval of the CC mission statement until after it goes to committee members. Camille summarized the

five broad tasks of the CC, which are to provide broad oversight (not micromanage) for conservation policy and planning in conservation easements and acquisitions, monitoring, evaluations, including an annual review of our plans and policies, and outreach and fundraising. Under these five headings, we want to make it more solid in terms of what the CC's tasks are. Members: Camille, Chair; Jess, Suzanne, John Scorsine, Doug B, Jay, John E, Matt, Mike M. Don will not continue on the CC. Bob B may get involved this summer. John E will talk to Jess about it.

In February, Camille is going to the Rangeland Dept. at Colo. State University to get ideas about what we can do with the Ranch-sustainability, carbon sequestration. Camille will contact George Whitten and Kyle Grote. Camille is thinking of talking to donors. She is planning to submit a GOCO Conservation Excellence Grant application (due March 2) for strategic planning and conservation to bring in funding for a strategic planning consultant. Camille and others, including staff, will work on it.

Camille wants CC to hook into all committees, including HR.

Camille wants to hold stakeholder workshops to engage federal agents, landowners, and others to define our conservation priorities and strategic actions for the next 5-10 years, whatever is decided. Her goal is to have a draft in one year for public review. She envisions a long-term strategic plan that is organic that encompasses all properties. This will define how we collaborate with our partners, other agencies. Detailed actions are outlined every year. Camille clarified that while OLT will not hold conservation easements (CEs), we will identify properties for potential CEs. Next week Andrew Mackie will train OLT staff how to approach folks about CEs. Camille said we will try to follow the model of the Gunnison Ranchland Conservation Legacy that doesn't hold CEs and collaborates with other agencies/organizations who hold CEs. OLT would help with monitoring and stewardship.

- i. Present committee mission statements (in packet) - Camille asked that this be tabled to the April meeting.
- ii. Baseline Documentation Report Policy, annual review per policy – Camille asked that this be addressed at each annual meeting.
- iii. Declaration(s) concerning use of funds in Stewardship, Monitoring & Legal Defense Fund and Land Conservation Fund (FIO) No further work on this. Camille asked that this be tabled to the April meeting.
- iv. Comprehensive ranch financial report on ranch expenses over last 5 years and budget to complete in-progress projects at ranch – Suzanne said this doesn't say a lot to her. John said we wanted to know what could be committed to the Ranch. Suzanne said this is old stuff, and we have different priorities now. Suzanne said we are in a completely different situation now. She thinks more pertinent information is work to be done going forward – what monies are available to us and what monies will be available to us as a result of our projects? Suzanne doesn't plan on basing future financial planning for the Ranch on this past information. John had requested this information.

Neil asked about getting water back to the Ranch. Suzanne said that since the last board meeting, she, Mark, Mike M., and Corey Kanuckel (US Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS) Partners for Fish & Wildlife) walked through the project. Corey explained a lot more of his process. USFWS funded

the meanders. When they went through, we didn't know that the old ditches were eroding down; there are still portions that are losing water through those areas. Meanders were pulling water out of there. Last August, they repaired at the upper meanders to stop leakage, including outside the fenced area. When Corey and the engineer walked through it with us, the erosion had stopped, seepage had come way in, water had come up a little, but it was still down. There are 2 or 3 more meanders to be put in. USFWS has lost funding, which is why they didn't come back this past year. We don't know if it's true that we're losing a lot of water from the meanders. We borrowed a flow meter, but it didn't work because the creek is too small. We have 3 flumes in thanks to Jim. Suzanne has been monitoring it this past month; the water is up 50%; a portion of that is because we don't have evapotranspiration or evaporation (because it is cold). The land right next to the creek is not frozen because the water is warm, but the earth outside is frozen. That may be a big part of why we're not losing the water. We don't have all the information at this point to decommission the meanders. When we built the fences, it moved the creek that created some problems with the meanders. Corey will be out in the next couple of weeks. Corey said 96% of the people he works with are ranchers; his primary goal is to get water to the Ranch. They are very committed to getting our water to the Ranch. Suzanne confirmed John's statement that we haven't got the results that Corey expects we'll get later on. Suzanne said her concern is that we don't have the water now and have serious dry-up issues. 80 ac. of hayfields have been planted. This won't work for the hayfields, but it may work for the Ranch. Is there the potential of digging another well at the Ranch? Neil said we can dig a well for residential use for a 40-ac. parcel. Suzanne said it would be in exchange with BLM (and referred to the Glenn allotment where BLM was going to drill a well, but OLT provided the water instead). Suzanne wonders if we can come up with an agreement with BLM to equalize this water. Doug asked if we have an historic baseline on the amount of water. Suzanne said it's hard to tell because the ditches are here and there and there is also a large pipe (6" per Doug) that was used for irrigation. An engineer said to put in a pipe to get water down there. Suzanne said we've invested so much good will, time, energy, and money into these meanders. Suzanne, having thought previously about decommissioning the meanders, now in talking with Corey, said we thought that maybe decommissioning the meanders wouldn't work. Doug said we're in a huge drought cycle. We may need 3 different delivery systems: pipe, meanders, straight ditch. Suzanne said that the fish complicate everything. We have baseline data because of the water coming out of the powerhouse. Suzanne said the ditch has changed over 100+ years; they have eroded. Suzanne doesn't think we have all the information yet to make a decision about whether or not to decommission the meanders.

Neil said the loss of water is due to the meanders. Not all grants are right. Neil asked Corey who said that they didn't do a baseline before the project, and they didn't consult Saguache County Soils. Neil thinks the project was ill-conceived and it should be put back to the way it was. Cottonwood trees are dead already. Neil asked the Board if it would take action. Soil will harden over the years. Dan said the Board is willing to make whatever decisions are needed but needs more information which staff is getting. John said there are competing missions – ranch and preserving wildlife (fish). Suzanne said it isn't clear that the meanders are losing that much water. Mike asked about serious flow data showing monthly flows. Neil said we have flow measurements and there is less water. Suzanne said there is less water coming out of the powerhouse. Suzanne thinks we are also losing water out of the reservoir. Perhaps put in two more flumes for more data.

Mark – we have a reservoir that if used correctly, we can tap water from it to irrigate. If it's a resource, figure out how to use it. The level of it could drop a couple of feet; it wouldn't affect the fish. Evidence suggests the reservoir is leaking but also that it's healing. We don't know how long that will take; need to explore. Perhaps dropping the reservoir will help the clay shift and heal once it's rewetted. We are trying not to have to do bentonite again and trying not to have to drain the reservoir

because the fish are there. Neil said ducks seal reservoirs really well. Mark said this is a really new reservoir. The carpet from aquatic behavior in the stream is starting to form in the reservoir. Mark said although we can't wait 5 years to solve the problem, we have a lot of tools and we need to figure out how best to use what we have. Maybe we use part of the old ditch, maybe pipeline. Neil has a good idea for getting water to the hayfields. Neil said pipe costs money and must be open to or screen out fish. If we can get in some altitudes of what height is relative to another height to establish adequate flow, we can tap into some stuff that is already in the ground, but we need the data. Jess suggested the staff report to the Board with more information on this. Jay asked the staff to tell the Board what we need to determine how we can solve the problem; give us the tools, and give the Board direction.

c. Human Resources (HRC)

- i. Present committee mission statements and chair (in packet) - Jess reported that the HRC worked together on the mission statement. They will be working with staff to revamp how to approach staff position descriptions. We are moving from position to task descriptions with a strong conservation focus. HRC will try to facilitate this approach. HRC needs more committee members.

Paul recommends that it be a board only committee. His advice as outgoing HRC chair is to omit staff representatives because of the sensitivity of issues that may be discussed. Suzanne said HR is a staff issue. Suzanne feels strongly that staff should be part of HRC. Jess suggested that HRC can determine whether staff is involved in the discussion on a case-by-case basis. HRC members sign OLT's confidentiality agreement. Jess said it is important to have the staff leader as part of HRC.

Paul said the Board needs to decide if it wants the direction of HRC to be different from when HRC was established. Jay agreed with Deb that unless it has to do with policy issues; if it is day-to-day issues, then that is staff.

Suzanne – HR is best handled by staff.

Paul - original concept of HRC was for it to be Board only; not to deal with day-to-day issues; it was to consult and have a resource for the ED to go to with tough issues; not to run HR. This kicked it up to the legal, policy realm. Paul said if you want to change that intent, that's fine.

Suzanne - expertise is within the staff and why not have the best information available on HRC? HR staff is ED oriented. We don't need HRC for legal issues; we have MSEC, an attorney. We may have policy issues in terms of experience. The best resource involves the most experienced people, and the most experienced people as a team having more than just one or two board members is to have other people to whom I can go who have the experience. To limit HRC to Board members is short-sighted.

Jess clarified that the HRC is a committee in an advising, consulting capacity.

Dan asked about changing the mission to accommodate Paul's recommendation.

Jay suggested taking out "and consult on."

In answer to Dan's question, Paul said there is, but then we lose the original intent of HRC, which was to provide that.

Dan recalled that HRC evolved because Suzanne needed board members to go to to consult on HR.

Mike said that the Board could have an HRC and there could be an HRC of staff only.

Suzanne-why not create an HRC with the best information and people with the most experience? Mike said because it involves conflict of interest. Suzanne said we deal with that with confidentiality agreements.

Dan suggested and Paul said it could work, adding a bullet point that in matters of confidentiality, the ED can go to the Chair of HRC. The HRC Chair has the option to go to the entire Board or subset of the Board.

A decision was not made at this time; the Board will consider approval before the April meeting.

d. Investment

- i. Report on bond fund investing – John said we can afford investment potential. The bond market has been very choppy. We're not willing to assume very much risk. We have CDs that are like being in the bond market. There is not much return now unless we took a lot of risk. We could start looking at Treasuries, agency bonds. John doesn't recommend that we make any major step in investing. We maybe could be making an additional \$2-4K income. In the next month, John will recommend investing for one year rather than six months. He'll look at the risk profile and potential return.

Mark asked about possibly investing in something local. John said if we buy a CD at a local bank/credit union, we are investing locally. Saguache County Credit Union CD rate is .75%.

- e. Resource Development (RDC) (minutes in e-packet) - RDC is looking at fundraising options other than an auction and raffle because those are staff and committee intensive. Camille suggested Geocache with pledges. Deb said RDC is looking at wine/beer tasting. Increased membership level will help. Adopt-A-Bat? Business really grows when people come back. We want to tap into the emotional investment of visitors for fundraising. Deb would love to get others on RDC with fundraising background. There is some difficulty working together because of the distance of RDC members.
- f. Site Planning (SPC) (report in packet) - Doug said SPC approved the recommendation for the site of the new hot tub. We'll walk by it today. There is flexibility of 20-30'. Mark said the site will work for them. We can stay away from the historic ditch; have spoken with The Nature Conservancy about it.

Lunch break included a tour of Elm/Willow renovations, Meadow Pond Bridge, and new hot tub site.

- g. Tech – Matt introduced Doug B. who is working on the website. Suzanne said Doug B. will finish the website and build a database as an employee.
- i. Website/Database/Online Reservation System (ORS) Doug B. briefed the Board on the new website showing progress thus far. Doug B. thanked all staff. Doug B. said a website is easy to put together and that it must convey the information to the public easily. The website will be focused initially on OLT and its mission with a link to VVHS as a separate site for the hot springs. Updating will be more efficient.
- The current database is working. We need a fresh start with it. It will be part of an information system.

Goal is to make the website a visual history to tell what is happening. Website will include interactive Google mapping, FAQs; some information will purposely not be included to provide for visitors' exploration and surprise. Icons will be used for online version of information sheet new visitors receive upon registration/check-in.

Online reservation system could take a good long time. Doug B. won't know how long until he gets into it.

How do we have uninterrupted online reservation system if power goes down? Doug B. thinks that he has a solution to avoid double bookings.

There will be a mobile version of the website so it will be good visually on a cell phone.

Doug B. will be looking at automatic renewal donations, pet deposits, credit card security, etc.

Doug B. thinks the new website will go live in a month or so.

Website can continue to evolve after it goes live. Scientific data, project management could be added. This is Doug B.'s proposal. Staff will need to review and provide Doug B. information for certain content, such as fundraising.

Jess-asked about teambuilding – projects/tasks on timeline. This will be part of backend of the website.

Database will track donors, reservations, to be updated by users continuously.

Bigger project - Waitlist system must be managed by staff – this will need to be custom coded. Alert system will be in place.

Neil said that there could be confusion and problems with IRS if vvhs.com is used because of OLT's non-profit status. vvhs.com is seamlessly/blindly directed to olt.org. Neil said to avoid using vvhs.com. Doug B. said there needs to be a distinction between VVHS and OLT to approach both audiences. Doug B. will research what is available. Mike B. isn't sure two domains are necessary. Dan suggested that those who have information speak to Doug B. Doug B. said we can look at different website domain options.

XIII. Guest Questions/Comments – There were no questions or comments.

XIV. Unfinished Business

Minutes of the 10/15/11 regular meeting e-vote approval: Doug moved to approve the minutes. John seconded the motion and the motion was approved; all in favor, none opposed, no abstentions. The e-vote concluded on 10/31/11.

MOU among OLT, Land Trust of the Upper Arkansas (LTUA), and Crestone Baca Land Trust (CBLT) e-vote approval: Camille moved to approve the MOU among OLT, LTUA, and CBLT. Jessica seconded the motion and the motion was approved; all in favor, none opposed, no abstentions. The e-vote concluded on 11/21/11.

a. Mission statement revision (see top of agenda) – Doug asked what was changed – added the word, "education" and omitted "non-profit land trust." Neil said education is in OLT's 501(c)(3) documents. Dan and Suzanne said funders need to see it.

Jess moved to revise the mission statement to read:

*Orient Land Trust is dedicated to the preservation of natural and biological resources, agricultural lands, wildlife habitat, open space, and historic and geologic features of the northern San Luis Valley for the education and enjoyment of current and future generations.*

Jay seconded the motion and the motion carried; all in favor, none opposed, no abstentions.

- b. Resolution Concerning Naturist Use of Orient Mine Parcel (in packet) – Dan introduced this giving some background as to its origin. We cannot do a deed restriction as was done on the VVHS parcel. This is based on that and has been reviewed by OLT’s attorney.

Matt is in favor of allowing nudity at the Mine parcel. Matt said if we have a youth group going up to the Mine, that will be the number one stumbling block. Matt would like the option to say if, e.g., one day/night could we ask you to throw a robe on? It would be helpful for outreach and education efforts. Dan suggested staff look at it for possible amendment in the future. Suzanne asked if staff could make a one-time exception. Dan said for Suzanne to tell us based on the way the resolution reads. Doug said someone might not get the word if it’s a one-time situation.

Matt met with BLM about signage. There will be space for special announcements.

Paul moved to approve the Resolution ***CONCERNING NATURIST USE OF ORIENT MINE PARCEL*** as shown on pp. **80 to 84** of the print Board packet. John seconded the motion. There was no further discussion and the motion carried; all in favor, none opposed, no abstentions.

- c. Visitor relations & liaison position (in packet) – Dan introduced the resolution Concerning Member Advocate, nka Visitor Liaison Position. It is the same as was presented to the Board in July 2011. Dan said staff is providing multiple conduits for visitors’ feedback to OLT. The resolution calls for suggestion boxes being liberally sprinkled throughout the Village. Dan spoke with Don G about this. Don’s remaining concern is that guests have a direct conduit to the Board. Dan said the Board isn’t in the weeds about particular visitor actions. Suzanne said the position description says that the Visitor Liaison will work with staff. That has not happened. Dan said there is an email link on the website to the Board Chair. Doug would like to give it more time. Doug said we may want a different conduit. Dan said Don has other ideas as well and has no ego attached to being in the position. Matt said it will be more a part of camp host duties. Paul said the visitor survey also adds to being able to eliminate the position.

Camille moved to approve the Resolution ***CONCERNING MEMBER ADVOCATE, now known as VISITOR LIAISON POSITION*** as shown on pp. **85 to 86** of the print Board packet. Jess seconded the motion and the motion carried; Camille, Jess, Paul, Mike, John in favor, Doug opposed, Jay abstained.

- d. Conservation Plan and Ranch Planning (see in packet) – Suzanne reported that this started as a task force and has evolved into a committee. We have an interim maintenance ranch plan. We want to move forward to get funding for projects on the Ranch within the next year. We’ll have a conservation strategic plan. We want to move out into the community and even further out into the greater conservation world. Ranch planning is more immediate. See 2012 action plan and budget for costs. Camille said the long-term ranch plan is an integral part of the conservation plan. The Ranch report addresses just the immediate needs. The very near term actions are the foundation for what needs to be addressed this year.

Doug asked if there are any buildings that will not be restored. Suzanne said we have a very reasonable rescue plan on which to build the rest of the plan. This year’s plan is stabilizing

only. Jerry's report would have cost OLT around \$12,000. Estimated costs are materials only because staff can provide most of the labor. There is the shuffle with personnel expenses.

Suzanne confirmed that this will not be an every year expense. Suzanne said we don't know the historic uses of all of the buildings. Jerry spoke about being able to document a historical time of each building. Neil said every building had a water spigot. They're gone now. Camille asked about possibly engaging a history major student to document the history of the Ranch.

Suzanne said Cherrye is going through OLT's files.

- e. Strategic Plan prioritization and 2012 work plan (in packet) – The Board didn't give Suzanne a prioritization of tasks. Jess commended Suzanne for putting this together for being so thorough and having such a good perspective for what can be done.

Suzanne said that governor and website database are to be finished up.

Suzanne said the amazing team is digging into this stuff and wants to keep what is in the Action Plan. We have hired well. Staff helped develop the Action Plan.

Dan said this is the Board's chance to give input to the Plan. John is thinking part of our mission is education. John suggested a Neil & Terry scholarship for local kids going to college studying ranching, land management.

Neil passed to the Board printed material from a Colorado naturist resort that talks about opportunities for kids to be naturists. Neil said educate, have a comfortable atmosphere. Neil said we don't really have an atmosphere for kids where they feel comfortable and secure. Educate parents and let younger kids know what their options are. It is required somewhere in OLT's documents that we educate visitors about naturism. Neil thinks we have to take naturism seriously.

Mark said we don't have a real gathering place, e.g., game tables, for teens. A community center would be a really good facility for something like this. This is something to keep in mind for the future when planning such a facility. Camille said an outdoor play area would be good too. We used to have volleyball, horseshoes, and sandbox. Staff may partner with a school (Colo. School of Mines) for innovative engineering plans for such things as bear resistant trash containers.

Doug would like to see a prioritization. Separate sections help. John said that all finished projects could be dropped off. Dan said considering that the Board hasn't prioritized, this Plan is extraordinary. Suzanne said we're building on the 2011 foundation. Camille said we're not different from a lot of other organizations. Camille thinks this Plan is addressing this quite well. We need to develop a strategic plan to refer back to on an annual basis. Suzanne would like to have items prioritized. Jess said that priorities can be helpful to accomplish goals but they will often determine goals for you. Our local realities will determine priorities. Camille said they shift. Suzanne said we've hired well and staff has a passion to do it and a demonstrated commitment. Jay likes the Plan because it's explicit, sets goals, says how and when tasks are going to be done. Jay commended Suzanne on the Plan. Mike said we could still prioritize tasks. Suzanne said it depends on what happens – Board needs to trust staff. Mark said these things make themselves prominently known. The Plan is a blueprint that may have to be modified in the field. Doug said he would like to see in the Plan focusing on certain things. Camille suggested a milestone table either by quarter or month which helps allocate tasks. For Matt, it depends on when visitor business picks up leaving staff with little to no time for things other than that related to visitors. Camille said it would help the Board. Suzanne is reticent to put out dates because of her past experience knowing that things happen. Suzanne said we're committed to accomplishing tasks and will give the Board updates. Doug said let's treat it as an organic document. Mark and Matt said to please



contact them is you want. Doug B. said the key is communication along the way to make this happen. We have respect and responsibility. Sometimes we need recognition of, e.g., a deadline. Website may help communication to Board. Jess-making a one-year timetable is great and allowing staff to prioritize within that timetable. By approving the Plan, the Board is saying we support it and does use it as an evaluation tool. Doug said keep the Board updated, keep it organic. Dan will talk in Executive Session about changing the ED evaluation process. Jay hasn't heard feedback on accomplished tasks. He would like that. Suzanne does this and references Action Plan items in her reports to the Board.

Suzanne-Sometimes someone will walk in the door who offers to help which causes changes in the timeline of the Plan.

Mike-for example, community center – Suzanne said this could happen if money were to become available, we'll move forward on it.

Mark – This is a laundry list of priorities integral to other processes. If the Board acts on this, the Board recognizes these as priorities and leaves it to staff how to accomplish them, recognizing some may not be accomplished, some need not be accomplished. This is to ratify that we're all on the same page.

Mike-We have limited money and labor. Suzanne-items are in the budget. Jess-if it's organic, then it can be changed based on unforeseen circumstances. Mark – some items can go into the next Plan.

Matt – in communicating with visitors, 'under promise, over deliver' and visitors have more faith in OLT.

Neil - need critical thinking about what is being done; what might be consequences of a particular project. Jess - delegate to staff. Matt said this is an integral part of the planning process. Mark - fire safety is on his mind for any project.

Jess moved to approve the 2012 Action Plan as shown on pp. **92 to 103** of the print Board packet taking into consideration that the Plan is subject to realities of our place and it is a working document. John seconded the motion. John said we need to give guidance to staff as to what it thinks are priorities at this time. Doug said staff and he want to treat it as an organic thing. Paul-without a formal list of priorities, this addresses what the Board is thinking, but we've transformed from a semi-formal planning organization to an organic organization. If the Board has a prioritized list going forward, it should be able to be incorporated into this list. Suzanne agreed. Doug said the Site Planning Committee determined that it needs to plan organically. Recognizing the organic process, he wants the Board to still have a say in prioritizing and how things move forward. Suzanne said, come work with us, communicate with us. Decisions are made on the ground. Mark spoke about the organic process that occurs with staff in talking about construction projects. Paul was referring to bigger strategic issues.

Paul amended the motion to add, "and future board input." Doug seconded the amendment. The amendment carried; all in favor, none opposed, no abstentions.

A vote was then taken on the motion and the motion carried; all in favor, none opposed, no abstentions.

- f. 2012 budget (in packet) – John gave an overview and said that Suzanne and Terry have really good control on revenue and expenses. The Board needs to decide where it wants to put its cash reserves. John highlighted the bottom lines of each of the budgets: VS=\$35,000; LC= about \$1,000. John then highlighted items in each budget. We actually have the \$35,000 + an additional \$127,000 for discretionary spending, but we've allocated it because we want to continue to accrue funds for the WWTF, pool improvements, tractor, and Essen payments (2

more pymts. on this). Suzanne said \$20,000 grants and \$15,000 gov't. grants are anticipated and will be based on specific projects. If we don't receive funding, we won't spend the money. We anticipate about \$162,000 in the combined budgets; we need to decide where to spend it. Suzanne and Terry have already determined where Suzanne would like to spend it. See Ranch improvements for ranch stabilization expenses. Do we want to spend the \$127,000 as Suzanne and Terry have allocated it? John said the tractor expense is hitting our bottom line. Suzanne said we could finance it. John may suggest that in that it would cement a relationship with a bank. We are not hurting now with cash flows. Paying cash for the tractor would be like extending the Essen payment for another year.

John said we need to discuss if we want to increase our revenues. John would not be favor of any large increase in prices. Doug would vote against that at this point. John said to save our increases for our next big project. Suzanne said there may be grants to help offset future project expenses. We are making about \$160,000 on \$900,000 in revenue. This is a community-based organization. Suzanne said this is an investment in that staff is building revenue. Revenues could be increased via our website shopping cart. John is very comfortable with the basic numbers of running the operation. We need to decide what to support in the way of new initiatives. About \$22,000 is needed for Ranch stabilization, \$35,000 for the tractor, and seed money for pool improvements. What do we need to spend money on in 2012 that is not in the budget? Cabin renovations are in the budget under construction loan. John said we either can take that from the capital reserve or finance it through a construction loan. Mark mentioned a possible USDA loan(s). Camille said that the USDA loan process is long. Elm/Willow cost \$3,000 per cabin for floors and kitchen renovation. If cabins can be heated adequately, we may not have to do insulation. \$55,650 includes insulation and new windows in addition to floors.

Mark – The only reason to go for a loan is to do renovations all at once. There is one more kitchen to do, which is not that expensive. If we decide not to get a loan, most of the \$55,650 goes away. We will do manifold piping to connect it all this year. That cost will be not more than \$10,000.

Suzanne/Mark - \$10,000 for the three cabins left to get them hooked up. This is not in the budget at this time. \$9,000 and \$20,000 seeds are conditional. They're not in this budget. We have to consider where we're going to get this seed money for swimming pool improvements and the WWTF. John recommends we accept the budget, add \$20,000 for the WWTF, \$9,000 for swimming pool improvements, and \$10,000 for 3 more cabins. We could roll off \$4,000 from capital reserves to cover these items. John thinks we'll have a positive number at year-end.

Mark thinks we won't get to the Oak House construction.

Doug asked if payroll matches this year. Suzanne said it's about a 15% increase. She moved IT out of professional services and moved it to payroll expenses. Doug – We are spending about \$40,000 from the budget on cabin renovations.

John said don't worry about the term, "net income" because that term is a for-profit term. Rather, look at cash flows.

Suzanne said \$23,000 is not in the LC budget for near-term Ranch stabilization.

Swimming pool improvements seed money is not going to be used in 2012.

Mike suggested the tractor be housed in the bobcat barn or other ranch building and move that \$10,000 renovation cost from LC to VS budgets.

John suggests: decide whether the Board is comfortable with the budget for the general basic operations not including, e.g., \$127,000, tractor, new construction, Essen purchase, and

seed money. Dan is comfortable knowing we have the cushion of the capital reserve fund. John is also comfortable with this. Essen's \$40,000 we will pay.

Tractor purchase would be coming from operating income. Doug said it seems like a good buy and we will need it. Further, if we can't do something else in order to buy the tractor, we should do it. Mark-purchase is timely.

John-new construction anticipated expenditures:

\$15,000 new hot tub

\$5,000 – Oak house foundation

\$3,000 – bear proof trash containers

Board is comfortable with the above.

Seed money (not in budget)

John – continue to put \$20,000 toward WWTF

\$9,000 for pool – put off per Suzanne

\$10,000 – 3 remaining cabin renovations (not in budget)

Suzanne-\$22,000 for Ranch stabilization is included in budget.

Board reached consensus with changes as discussed above. The budget will come back to the Board with near zero net income without spending anything from and adding to capital reserves. The only change is not seeding pool improvements.

John - This supports the 2012 Action Plan.

Terry and Suzanne will rework the budget and send it back to the Board highlighting any changes. The Board will consider approval before the April meeting.

#### XV. New Business

- a. Volunteer Program (in packet) – Matt introduced the program and recognized Lisa G for her work on the forms. Matt will omit years on the forms. Matt said volunteers are covered by OLT's worker's compensation insurance. We have a standard waiver form for volunteers to sign. Funds are budgeted for volunteers.

Camille said to combine Land Action and Land Management Plan Committees and change to Conservation Committee. Jess brought up about grant writing volunteers. Suzanne/Camille said volunteers can help with writing, whereas management will stay with OLT staff. Camille said it's up to staff and the volunteer coordinator to be clear about volunteer responsibilities and management of volunteers.

Suzanne, Dan and others commended Matt on his work on this and are pleased to see it getting off the ground. Matt will want feedback on the program in the future.

Camille moved to approve a Volunteer Program based on the presentation by Matt G and outlined on pp. **113 to 124** of the print Board packet. John seconded the motion. Mike suggested giving Lisa a thank you on this. Matt is our volunteer coordinator. The motion carried; all in favor, none opposed, no abstentions.

TRACTOR MOTION:

John moved that the OLT board approve Suzanne and Mark approaching the seller of the Case tractor at or near dollar amounts listed in the Board packet. We authorize them to pursue owner-carry financing on it. Doug seconded the motion. If owner-carry financing does not work, a bank could be approached. Jay said there will be a substantial difference between owner and bank financing. The motion carried, all in favor, none opposed, no abstentions.

Matt found volunteer tracking software for about \$300 that he'll be discussing this with Suzanne and Matt.

XVI. How did we do today? Self-examination on our governance –Jess said we are seeing more of the forest and less of the trees. We need to be vigilant about it. Example was the 20 min. spent on how to get water to the Ranch. Jess likes the suggestion of breaking up the meeting into 2 days. Doug – they are important discussions. Dan - any board discussions are valuable. Jess - if we can get them in their proper place, that would be good. She likes the transition into more of an organic board (rather than linear), which is more appropriate for our place. We can still accomplish goals; we can adapt as needed. Doug – didn't like the budget format. John, Suzanne, Terry will work on the format to compare to last year's actual for the Board to see. We've done this before.

XVII. Announcements

- a. 2012 Board Meeting Schedule
  - i. January 21, April 21, July 21 (annual meeting with picnic lunch), October 20, all at 9 AM
  - ii. January 22, Board & Management Retreat, Great Sand Dunes National Park
- b. Northern SLV Conservation Roundtable
  - i. January 26, 9 AM Meeting (at Joyful Journey Hot Springs Conference Room)
  - ii. February 1, 6:30-8:30 PM WATER 101 educational event (at Baca Grande Property Owners Association (POA) Hall)
- c. March 12-13, 2012 CCLT Conference, Denver [www.cclt.org](http://www.cclt.org)
- d. September 29-October 2, LTA Rally 2012, national land conservation conference, Salt Lake City

XVIII. Executive Session - The regular Board meeting adjourned at 3:36 PM, and the Board reconvened in Executive Session at 7:10 PM at the Great Sand Dunes National Park and Preserve to discuss Board and personnel matters.

Executive Session adjourned at 9:24 PM, and the Board briefly reconvened in regular session to approve a motion concerning Suzanne Ewy's compensation. John moved to raise Suzanne Ewy's annual salary to \$60,000, retroactive to January 1, 2012. This salary increase is in addition to her use of the Ranch house as her residence. Jess seconded the motion, and the motion carried, all in favor, none opposed, no abstentions.

The regular meeting was adjourned at 9:28 PM.

Submitted by:

Approved by:

\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_  
Barbara Tidd, Secretary      Date

\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_  
Dan Jones, Chair      Date