

Hopi Tourism Strategic Plan
Tourism Cohort Meeting Notes
Thursday, April 22, 2021 — 3 PM MST
Zoom Video Conference/Teleconference

1. Call to Order – Brian Cole

Brian Cole called the meeting to order at 3:10 pm MST.

2. Self-introductions

Attending the meeting were LaMon Begay, Lahoma Davidson, Marilyn Fredericks, Andrew Gashwazra, Iva Honyestewa, Marlinda Kooyaquaptewa, Romalita Laban, Wendi Lewis, Colleen Lucero, Berni Navakuku, James Surveyor, Wayne Taylor, and Brian Cole.

3. New Hopi Tourism Organizational Structure

Brian Cole began the meeting with a quick report on a few items of other business. Cole reported that he had met with Clint Kaasa of USDA Rural Development to advise him of a slight change in the project methodology resulting from discovering that Hopi Relief is working on the artisans' directory. Kaasa approved the change of scope. Cole then updated the Cohort on the fact that \$6,878.80 remains in the Hopi Tourism Travel and Training Fund (HTTTF). This is money that can be directed by the Cohort for appropriate tourism travel and training needs. Finally, Cole reported on a visit that he and Andrew Gashwazra made to Amangiri, a high-end resort in Southern Utah with an interest in Hopi.

Romalita Laban opened the discussion on organizational development with a statement of how she was pleased that Wendi Lewis, Marlinda Kooyaquaptewa, and Iva Honyestewa had committed to serving on the non-profit board. Laban indicated that Colleen Lucero would be a good addition to the board.

Berni Navakuku indicated that although Kooyaquaptewa was committed to the board, she was unable to attend last time due to a difficulty with logging on to Zoom due to poor Wi-Fi. (Shortly thereafter, Kooyaquaptewa joined the Zoom meeting by phone.) Navakuku indicated that Kooyaquaptewa would prefer not to serve also as the Statutory Agent. The Statutory Agent would be responsible for the official documents. Navakuku asked James Surveyor if he or MDC would be willing to fulfil the role.

LaMon Begay then asked Lucero if she would be willing to serve on the board. Lucero declined but indicated she was very willing to participate in efforts by the Cohort. Lucero indicated that she was aware that the Statutory Agent does have significant responsibility and she has been a part of an effort that deferred this responsibility to a law firm.

Marilyn Fredericks noted that the initial Board of Directors can be established as an *interim* Board. The role of the interim board would be to set up the corporation. The interim period might be one year. There would then be a meeting to establish a permanent board.

Navakuku indicated that the concept of an interim board was a good idea. Cole then asked if there was consensus on an interim board. Lewis stated that she was in favor of the board

serving in an interim capacity. Surveyor agreed with the concept of the interim board. No one spoke against the interim concept.

Navakuku then asked if MDC could serve as a Statutory Agent. Surveyor replied that he would consider this (later, Surveyor agreed that MDC could serve this function). Surveyor stressed that MDC is always a supporter of Hopi entrepreneurship.

Lahoma Davidson said that the non-profit can start developing the paperwork, but the paperwork would have to be finalized as a part of filing the non-profit. Surveyor asked if the Statutory Agent can be an EIN. Davidson stated that there was a need for a name and an address associated with the Statutory Agent. Begay offered his name and address as the Statutory Agent. It was noted that Begay lives in Maricopa County. Davidson replied that there is an advantage to a Statutory Agent in Maricopa County as it is one of two Arizona counties that do not require the publishing of the non-profit filing in a local newspaper.

Surveyor then affirmed that MDC could serve as the Statutory Agent with an address of 1 Legacy Lane, Tuba City AZ 86045.

Cole then asked about the length of the interim period. Davidson replied that this would be considered in the development of the bylaws. Davidson also stressed the importance of staggered terms for non-profit board members.

Cole inquired as to the Cohort's view of the future relationship between the Cohort and the non-profit board. Navakuku replied that she anticipated the continued active involvement of the Cohort members. Fredericks also supported the notion that the Cohort would remain involved.

Cole then asked for volunteers to serve on an ad hoc non-profit bylaws subcommittee. Navakuku, Fredericks, Davidson and Laban volunteered. They would bring back a draft recommendation for the bylaws for the next meeting. Cole stated the next meeting was scheduled for May 13 and this would be on the agenda.

Gashwazra stated that he was preparing a final report to the Economic Development Administration (EDA) associated with the grant-funded work of the Tourism Cohort. Cole indicated that the only remaining funding associated with that phase of the project is the HTTTF funding. Cole noted that, if appropriate, he could see transferring those funds to the non-profit if that were consistent with Hopi Tribe and EDA expectations.

4. Website Research and Project – Tabled

No report.

5. Virtual Hopi Tourism Training Event – Tabled

No report.

6. Hopi Tourism Facilities Planning

No report.

7. Other business

Surveyor reported that he had reached out to the Office of General Counsel (OGC) for advice on the non-profit formation process. He has not heard back from OGC. Surveyor indicated that the MDC attorney would offer some assistance on the matter.

8. Next Meeting

Cole noted the next meeting would be at 3 pm MST on Thursday, May 13.

9. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 pm MST.