

**MINUTES**  
**Long Tom Watershed Council**  
**Council Self-Evaluation & Board of Directors Meeting**  
**June 6, 2013**  
**751 S. Danebo Ave.**  
**Eugene, OR 97402**

Present: Steve Cole, Cary Hart, Sue Kacskos, Beth Krisko, Jim Pendergrass, David Ponder, Charles Ruff, Deborah Saunders Evans, Chad Stroda, Therese Walch (10)

Absent: Mike Brinkley, Jason Hunton, Max Neilsen-Pincus, David Turner (4)

Facilitator: John Moriarty

Staff: Dana Dedrick, Rob Hoshaw, Jed Kaul, Jason Schmidt

Meeting convened at 5:37 p.m. by facilitator John Moriarty.

### **Council Self-Evaluation**

#### **A. Introduction & Selecting Discussion Categories**

**Dana** introduced John Moriarty and thanked him for moderating the meeting. John is the new Executive Director for School Garden Project of Lane County, and he used to be the director of the Network of Oregon Watershed Councils. He's a trained facilitator/mediator, and served as a volunteer facilitator for LTWC for several years during our council meetings.

(Roundtable Introductions)

**John** begins by stating that he appreciates how LTWC consistently works to make something as productive as it can be and has been looking forward to assisting with this meeting. (Referencing the discussion categories) emphasizes how important some of these categories are to the work of the Council. Reviews the process of the night's meeting: Board members completed evaluation forms at home, and tonight, rather than discuss each topic at length, the goal is to prioritize which 3 topics have the most interest and meaning for Board members. The discussion of those 3 prioritized categories will focus on what the Council has really been doing well and especially those areas where the Council could do better (likely where the bulk of the discussion will occur).

Explains that Dana will provide a summary of what has happened with the action items since the 2010 Self Evaluation. After that, Board members will be invited to transfer their grades for the individual topics within the voted upon prioritized discussion categories. The degree of consensus in those grades among Board members may dictate how much discussion is needed. For instance, if there is a lot of diversity in those

answers and not much consensus, that may provide fodder for more discussion because everyone may have a different view of that topic's importance.

**Dana** explains that she met with the four absent Board members individually, and staff here tonight will each use their votes and notes to bring their thoughts to the table as best can.

**Therese** feels that all of these topics are important to the Council's effectiveness. Asks if it's part of the Board's job to differentiate which areas are more or less important. Asks if it's ok to say that all of the topics are important and move on to what we do well and what we could do better.

**Dana** answers that it's fine if Board members feel everything is important. The chosen categories indicate there's more to discuss because it's so important. You'll find your areas for discussion in the grades that are given.

**John** adds that watershed councils have many makeups; some councils felt they were doing more work in some categories than others, and maybe a particular category isn't the most important relative to a given council and it's given resources and capacity. He also understands that everything is fairly important to many people.

**Dana** if there are things where we say we're doing enough and that's fine we can move on. "Doing enough" was a helpful addition to the gradation besides "doing great" and "do better" because maybe just doing enough is ok for this particular council for that particular item.

#### Results of Voting

Membership – 1

Participation – 3

Accountability – 1

Decision-Making – 0

Meetings – 1

Staff Management – 1

**Fiscal & Project Management - 5**

**Watershed Planning & Projects – 6**

**Citizen Involvement & Support - 8**

Board members voted for the categories they were most interested in discussing before the meeting was convened. Fiscal & Project Management, Watershed Planning & Projects, and Citizen Involvement & Support were chosen. Participation received 4<sup>th</sup> place votes and would be discussed as time allowed. Absent Board members were not represented in this part of the vote.

#### **B. Results September of 2010 Self-Evaluation – Dana**

In 2010, the Board met Our Daily Bread in Veneta. Max Nielsen-Pincus facilitated. Current members Steve, Jim, Chad, Jason Hunton, and Deborah were also present at that meeting. Tony Stroda & Peg Boulay were the other board participants. The

discussion categories chosen were Accountability (4 votes), Watershed Planning & Project (4 votes), Fiscal & Project Management (5 votes), and Citizen Involvement & Support (6 votes).

Action Items from 2010 Self-Evaluation

**Dana** notes that OWEB is most interested in the action items coming out of the self-evaluation.

1. **More buy-in and participation from landowners.** Tony Stroda noted that he didn't feel this was necessarily a fault of the Council, but an acknowledgement that landowner outreach takes time, and it can be difficult to change landowners' minds and convince them to work with the Council. Since 2010, LTWC has worked on outreach through the Meyer Memorial Trust Model Watershed Program and secured two technical assistance outreach grants that gave us the capacity to do more landowner outreach. We're also tracking the interest level of landowners over time, and OSU doctoral student Dan Calvert has interviewed several landowners we've worked with about their experiences and interactions with LTWC. Based on Dan's research, we'll see a summary of the values they felt before and after working with the Council.
2. **More direction was needed regarding the decision making and planning of restoration projects.** Main question: how can we make decisions about what projects we're going forward with and how they're important for the watershed? Dana wasn't entirely clear by the meaning of that recommendation.
3. **General comments about increasing citizen involvement in urban areas.** Since then, LTWC has launched the community outreach component of Amazon Initiative.
4. **Obtain formal feedback for projects from membership.**

**Therese** - asks "members" of the self-eval survey refer to everyone or just the board. **Dana** notes that the survey is usually specific, but if it didn't specify, then it's meant to be everyone in general. Adds that there are lots of councils in the state where the board is the council. Technically, LTWC's members are whoever signs in to the Annual Meeting. The spirit of our membership is really anyone who comes to any of our public events.

**Jim** - adds that a member is anyone who lives in the watershed or is otherwise a stakeholder. Sees this as two categories: people we have engaged people and people we have yet to engage. People who come to meetings are engaged, and people who sign in at annual meetings get to vote. Unless otherwise specified, the survey refers to broad membership

(Continuing with results of action items from 2010 Self Evaluation)

5. **Criteria for staff evaluation.** LTWC uses the City of Eugene staff review form, and we solicit external reviews for most staff. Suggests that perhaps we need a written

process. **Jim** feels that we do not because we have written position descriptions. Ranges and market summaries are moving targets depending on each individual watershed council. It's difficult to compare several watershed councils and say they all have to pay their staff and provide these benefits within the same range. Notes that a successful organization is based on its people and staff, and LTWC has always tried to pay staff as well as we can while trying to sustain those positions.

6. **Resource Development.** The board felt the community lacked understanding about how the Council's finances worked, and people didn't understand the need for fundraising. Since 2010, we've launched our first two fundraising campaigns, in large part to board support and Deborah's role as the RDC chair. We will have satisfactory accomplishments to report to OWEB on this action item.

### C. **Results & Discussion of Selected Priority Categories**

Board members marked their grades on specific topics for prioritized categories. Staff filled in the grades for absent Board members in order to capture their perspective.

**John** notes that overall, the vast majority of responses are that these are important or somewhat important categories, and in most cases we're doing great or at least doing enough. Most people would agree that we can always do a little better and should always aim to improve. Clarifies that with the "do better" grade we want to discuss things that the Council isn't doing sufficiently well to do its work effectively. Secondly, he takes a moment to call for people to share specific items that aren't in priority categories that people felt are really important and believe that the Council is not doing as sufficiently as it could. Alternatively, is there anything in there that the Council is doing particularly well where you want to recognize whoever is helping move that forward.

**Therese** – asks if we can come back to this question later to allow her to think about that.

#### Parking Lot Ideas

##### **Do Better**

- **Dave T** (via Dana) – Membership question #2. Dave's idea is to draft a lay person's view of membership in the long term and put that on the website. Dave is willing to draft that.
- Identify key decisions the board is making and how they fit into the Council strategy & policy needs (noted from later discussion in this meeting).

##### **Doing Great**

- Cooperation with other entities in the basin.

- Landowner participation and maintenance commitment with LTWC following up now. This is an improvement over a few years ago.

**1) Category G. Fiscal & Project Management**

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Really	Great	Enough	Do Better
23. "Board members are aware of the council's contractual commitments and understand their responsibility."	9	5	0	5	6	2
24. "Board members are aware of recordkeeping procedures and have access to records."	7	6	0	6	6	0
25. "Our council has a process for tracking project implementation and performance."	13	1	0	12	1	0
26. "Our council effectively carries out projects within schedules and budgets."	13	1	0	12	1	0
27. "Our council practices open and fair competition for goods and services."	8	6	0	9	4	0
28. "Our council gets involved in grant writing and developing strategies for funding operations and projects."	9	5	0	7	3	2

**John** observes from the grades that there is a general consensus that these topics are all important within this category. It wasn't unanimous that we're doing great in this area, and a couple people noted that there is room for improvement. Encourages people to share any examples of other places they've worked with or experienced where that organization does a particular item very well.

**Improvement Comments**

**Cary** (question #23) – notes that it's not always clear where we're at with grant obligations. The board is presented with financial reports each month, but he's still not very clear about where we're at on projects and grant cycles. Admits that some of this may still be some learning on his part as a new Board member. For instance, he would be interested in seeing schedules of when projects are going to be implemented and when payments are going to occur.

**Jim** - notes that this is good feedback because it's information the Council has, and it's just a matter of making it available.

**John** – suggests that maybe what Cary is looking for is a balance that is not information overload but provides enough information to help make decisions.

**Dana** – notes that staff will review these notes later on and come back to the Board with our response. Staff are just here to listen for now tonight.

**Therese** – adds that she would like to better understand the fiduciary responsibility of this board. Feels that every board is a bit different. Sometimes she's not very comfortable with the board financial review process because as an engineer, that's not her expertise. Would like clarity on the level of detail the board is responsible for. Adds that the board can't delve into the super fine level details, but knowing what the appropriate level of board involvement would be helpful.

**Deborah** - adds that both are really great comments. It would be easier to review financials if there were a better understanding of grant cycles. For example, a report may show that we're in the red waiting on a grant payment but really we're fine. (Comments on question #28) Notes that the board doesn't get involved with grant writing very often, and is not sure if the board necessarily needs to be actively involved in grant writing.

**Sue** mentioned that she wasn't sure if she felt she knew enough about our financials. Maybe that information is on the Board member login of the website. If not, perhaps that should be a source of information on there.

**John** – (summarizes the points for #23). It would be helpful to have more information about grant and contractual commitments and there is room for improvement, but people don't necessarily feel it's a problem area.

(back to Deborah's comment on #28).

**Deborah** – has been involved in drafting a grant several times, but it's a rare occasion. The board is made aware of grant applications and funding areas. **John** – notes that some councils don't have staff or don't have staff who are experienced with writing grants. Therefore the board may take a more active role in grant writing.

**David P.** feels that it's a more forward thinking "do better." We've done a great job with resource development, and feels there's an opportunity to institutionalize it and look for more unrestricted grants to help with capacity funding.

**John** – summarizes that we've made progress with resource development but could still build upon the strategic side.

**Jason & Max** (via Dana) – noted in their comments that the key word is "aware" of not knowledge of details surrounding financials. Staff will often ask for help when they need.

**Dave T** (via Dana) – on question #27– Dave is curious about operations updates (e.g. contractors, contractor relationships, RFP process, etc.) Steve has also expressed an interest in this area. Dave is also curious in understanding, and

most importantly, being able to explain, why projects are or are not funded, or why we don't decided to pursue a project after a site visit. Dave understands that we can't do a project everywhere, but it would be helpful to him to have a more structured way to describe why.

**Doing Great Comments**

**Therese** – feels we do a good job of carrying out projects within schedules. Notes that Jed presented projects that the Council is working on recently, and he provided a really good level of detail and general awareness that she appreciated. Got the sense that we're tracking budgets and expenses well and feels that we're accomplishing projects and timelines.

**Dana (for Dave T)** Question #25 - Encourages us to keep it up! Really likes the one page handout of the Council's work plan. He also feels that the budget makes sense and helps the board understand how many projects and of each type are being implemented.

**2) Category H: Watershed Planning & Projects**

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Really	Great	Enough	Do Better
25. "Our council identifies key issues, limiting factors, and/or watershed conditions (assessments)."	13	0	0	11	3	0
26. "Our council identifies and evaluates the major restoration priorities in our watershed (action plans)."	12	1	0	8	2	0
27. "Activities and projects address the concerns identified and move us towards our desired outcomes."	12	1	0	12	1	0
28. "Our council actively involves stakeholders in watershed-level planning and project development."	13	0	0	10	3	0
29. "Our council annually evaluates its priorities and plans."	11	2	0	8	5	0
30. "Projects implemented by the council are monitored for their effectiveness."	10	3	0	5	9	0
31. "Our plans identify outcomes for the next three to five years."	9	4	0	5	3	3

## Improvement Comments

**John** notes that for question #35, there is consensus that it's a very important topic, and there is a spread of opinions on whether we're doing great, enough, or need to do better.

**David P** feels like we hear the outcomes for short-term restoration implementation goals and our long term vision, but doesn't always see the link between the two or how it's necessarily connected to other long-term outcomes.

**Chad** – feels we're doing fairly well on #35. For example, we started work on the Amazon Creek Initiative well before he joined the board. When he joined, LTWC looked at ways to increase urban outreach, and now we're doing that.

**John** - it seems the point is how tracking the finer scale of a project relates to the long-term outlook of what is measured and communicated (referring to David P's comment).

**David P** – admits he doesn't have an answer to his comment of how we could improve, but he would like to know what something is going to look like in 3-5 years. What are the intermediate goals between the short and long term ones?

**Jim** – notes that we have a 3-year work plan that could translate that into what watershed improvement outcomes and benchmark checks we can expect.

**Chad** – notes that landowner participation is a key to much of this discussion because we don't know to what degree many landowners will participate. It's hard to predict.

**Dana** – adds that we do effectiveness monitoring for OWEB restoration projects.

**Jim** - feels questions #34 & #35 run together. The key point is that it's a funding challenge to do this really well.

**John** asks for examples of other places that frame midrange goals well. None provided.

**Cary** (question #29) – commenting from a landowner's perspective, he's not sure if a small watershed council should get involved so much in water temperature monitoring and that level of scientific research. Suggests perhaps leaving that to larger agencies who've identified scientific priorities within a larger region. We could look at ways where we could implement the strategies for achieving the benchmarks these agencies have set. Wonders if landowners may feel uneasy knowing that temperature monitoring is occurring on or near their property. Notes that resource amendments are very complicated processes that require doctoral level results before they are implemented. Many of these are 5-6 year projects with lots of variables. Asks if collecting this data really matters because we know there are major resource issues already.

**Chad** asks if monitoring occurs after projects

**Dana** notes that we collected water temperature data for six years at the beginning when we did the assessment. As part of the context for our involvement, there was only one sampling station for temperature in Monroe



and the agencies were broadly blaming upstream people without looking at the bigger picture of the entire watershed. Acknowledges the caution to step back and look at how much monitoring we're doing and why we're doing it, as it's resource-intensive.

**Jim** notes that stream miles opened is an example of a clear measurable indicator for the watershed council as a result of our work.

**Cary** – for example, if there are not trees on a stream reach, there is no real need to monitor there because we know the water quality is poor.

**John** adds that the Council has been able to give reassurance on data because agencies haven't always collected data.

**Cary** adds that landowners may be worried that we give data to agencies like the DEQ (which we do). His main point is that we be careful what we spend our time on and what purpose it's serving

**Dana** admits she sometimes feel she's trying to conduct more science to satisfy grant funders.

**Chad** notes that personally, he would rather have LTWC conducting the science than an agency. Feels that landowners are curious about the results, but are more comfortable with the watershed council than an agency that could be perceived as more aggressive if a problem is found.

### **Doing Well Comments**

**Mike** (via Jed) - on question #29 – feels it's the most important thing that we do. We do a good job of following up with landowners to get them involved with ecological feasible projects.

**Max** (via Jason) - on question #32 – project presentations & tours are very helpful for the board to understand what staff is doing, and it's also a nice package of info to pass along to other people the board interacts with.

**Cary** (regarding #30) – is impressed with the screening process that goes into potential landowner outreach and identifying priority project areas that will have the biggest impact.

**Dave T** (via Dana) - question #30 – encourages us to keep bragging about how we prioritize. Continue with presentations at the small scale and strategic planning on the macro scale

**John** notes that LTWC has moved past the landowners who are the most amenable to restoration projects and we've handled the prioritization project of the next, more challenging set of landowners, well.

**Deborah** adds that we cooperate with other resource groups – both private and non-profit - so that the work LTWC does complements the other restoration work that's going on in the basin. We're part of the big picture, and these relationships are complicated in this watershed.

**Chad** adds that he enjoys the presentations and visuals at Board Meetings about the work we're doing. Would like to see at least 5-10 minutes at each meeting about what's going on – even if it's only a few photos.

**3) Category I: Citizen Involvement & Support**

36. "Our council and its projects are actively supported overall .....and by:
- a. local people
  - b. local government
  - c. industry & business
  - d. community groups
  - e. landowners
  - f. conservation interests
29. "Citizens understand our organization's purpose."
30. "Community members feel our council is successful and effective."
31. "Our council works to increase citizen understanding of watershed conditions & concerns."

Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Really	Great	Enough	Do Better
9	0	0	2	6	0
12	1	0	4	9	1
8	4	0	4	9	1
10	3	0	3	6	2
8	6	0	1	9	1
13	0	0	7	5	0
8	4	0	4	8	0
6	5	0	4	4	5
11	3	0	5	5	3
10	3	0	5	3	5

**John** notes that there is general consensus that all of these topics for this category are very important. Feels this challenging category and would like to spend enough time discussing it.

**Improvement Comments**

**Chad** feels that people that know and understand LTWC feel involved and informed. Adds that we can only do so much and there are many people out there. Feels it would hard to ever really be great on this category.

**Deborah** adds that she's biased somewhat in the organization of the question. For instance, a project landowner and their neighbors are likely to know a lot about LTWC other landowners may be less clear about the Council.

**Charles** (broadly speaking on the first group of stakeholders) – feels this relates more to a PR & communications project. The Council and their staff do a good job of narrowing down prospects into effective restoration projects, but we could do a better job of bragging about our work so people are more aware because awareness generates support.

**Beth** notes that since she came on the board a big goal has been to develop more awareness. Feels we've been doing better, but it's still a work in progress.

**John** summarizes that there is recognition that we've improved awareness of the Council but there's still more to do.

**Deborah** adds that through active outreach and fundraising we've become more aware of the specific target areas we need to work on generating awareness.

**Jim** looks at it by evaluating where we were 2 years ago vs. today. Feels we've come a long way in our process, engagement and results. We're doing great compared to where we were.

**David P** feels there's no strategy for broader outreach to the community. For example, we don't have a table at the Oregon Country Fair. We're not building our list in any consistent way through a postcard campaign. The mass communication plan isn't there yet.

**Cary** feels the awareness answer may be different for Monroe residents than Eugene because they are different people. We may be looking at different strategies.

**Steve** (in regards to local people). Notes that at a past public meeting, a small landowner wanted to do a project, and he needed to explain that projects are prioritized and we can't do projects everywhere, but emphasized that there is expertise here and they may be able to come in and talk to staff if they want help. Feels education is a really important service we can offer.

**John** adds that this resource isn't as obvious as the project implementation side.

**Steve** adds that some small landowners may be upset that they can't get a project. By acting as an educational resource, it's a way to offer them help.

**Sue** (question #39). She has received lots of emails from an organization that does a great job announcing their achievements and explaining what they do. These are short emails and would like to see LTWC do more of that. Feels this would be a fairly inexpensive investment. For instance, we could post that we tagged large cutthroat on a local golf course. Frequency may just need to be once every two months to keep us on people's radar.

**John** mentions software like Constant Contact.

**Beth** feels the public doesn't understand what a watershed council is, and we need to educate them about it. There's a general lack of awareness.

**Sue** notes that we could put out an announcement of an accomplishment and explain how it relates to the mission of LTWC, who was involved, and use it as a way to build energy and ask for donations.

**Mike** (via Jed) – echoed Beth's comments. Feels there's a lack of participation from local government, business, and industry. We could use a communication organizer. He also wants to focus on increasing awareness in Amazon Creek.

**Cary** asks who you'd email announcement to (probably current newsletter list).

**David P** adds that we also need to "build the choir" and it's not enough to rely on the people who already show up to meetings. We can't rely on people passively showing up. We need to engage them, collect their information, and them to the contact list.

**Dana** (regarding Steve's comments on small landowners) Notes that one of the struggles is that we don't have the funding or capacity to necessarily be a resource. Asks if Steve has seen that work well elsewhere or if he has ideas of what would be helpful to people. Adds that the Soil & Water Conservation District is funded as an available resource. It's a tougher situation for LTWC because we're primarily grant funded.

**Steve** adds that people have to understand that the watershed council is a limited resource. Staff has the expertise to help answer some questions, but that we do a project on everyone's property even if we might want to.

David P – seen groups create handbooks for small sustainable forestry landscapes. Concern is that if you open up Jed's time to TA calls, we could distribute a handout as another outreach tool.

**John** summarizes that the concern is that we don't have the capacity as a grant-funded organization to be a resource.

**Steve** clarifies that if we can't handle 100 people coming in asking questions, but if we can direct them to where they can go for help, that would be beneficial to the landowner.

**Jed** adds that sometimes people randomly coming in and asking questions have turned into priority restoration projects. It becomes more of an issue if someone wants a site visit and we know we can't do it because it's not a high ecological priority.

**Deborah** adds that one potential interface that would help us grow is the larger issue of mass marketing and outreach beyond resource development. Suggests putting it in work plan for next year to discuss because we really don't do that. How do we get outside of our membership ring? (Maybe a topic for parking lot?)

**Mike** (via Jed) notes that we need higher visibility as an organization

**Deborah** feels it's a good opportunity because we have interns now and our website has recently been improved.

**Charles** adds that there's a high profile stormwater project in south Eugene on Willamette St. We could put out a project sign and tell people how to find out more. Feels that you need a mix of media. Adds that we've talked before about social media. Twitter may not be the best fit for us, but feels Facebook is good.

**Jason H** (via Dana) - question #37 – Jason has no specific ideas, but felt that more urban people would support the council if they knew about it.

**John** notes that questions #37-39 all revolve around a communication plan and an overall communication plan is missing. Citizens aren't as aware of LTWC as they could be.

**Jim** feels it seems that citizens who know about us support us. Don't know of many people who know about LTWC and think we do a bad job. This is a question about the people who don't know we exist yet. Feels questions #37 & #38 are a single question – how do we expand the choir? The Amazon Initiative is our first major foray into the urban area and has broadened accessibility into Eugene far more than before. The current challenge is how to continue to improve. There's a limit to staff and RDC's capacity. We should think of how to be strategic in specific next steps to move us toward furthering that goal.

**Beth** feels there are people who know about us but don't understand us. Many people see us as a different group than we are. She didn't fully understand what LTWC did until she came on the board and she has a master's degree in environmental science.

**David P** adds that it may not matter if people understand the nuances of what we do. People may be attracted to work of council in a more generic sense. The key point is that we're working for clean water & habitat, that LTWC is citizen-driven, but they may not care about the fine details of our work.

**Beth** feels people also want to know where they're dollars are going.

**Dave P** doesn't think that's necessarily true.

**Beth** feels if they don't know, then they'll give to an organization like The Nature Conservancy instead.

**John** sees another conversation emerging: how to identify how LTWC is unique and how do we explain that LTWC is the only organization that does this particular work in this watershed.

**Jim** adds that the key word is here. While Oregon Wild and The Nature Conservancy are great organizations, they're work isn't focused here. We've accomplished a lot in big picture of council progress from 2 years ago, and it's hard to say were' not doing well.

**John** adds that there's a lot of positive momentum.

**Dave T** (via Dana) - Feels that we're a little over cautious with the press. He also would like to get new signs out on project sites. Thirdly, he wants to spread the base of knowledge among Board members. He would like Board members to rotate through committees. For example, people would participate on a project area, and then move to an operations/admin area. Dana suggested as a follow up that Board members consider joining a committee where they have a core skill and joining a committee where it's a stretch skill. For the stretch skill, they could lend their energy but also learn in an area that's a stretch for them.

**Therese** (regarding local government). Feels that the Amazon Creek Initiative is a good example of how LTWC has worked to find a niche in the urban area that complements what's already going on. While there is already much happening through the City of Eugene, lots more can certainly be done. She thinks this partnership is part of the reason why the Amazon Creek Initiative will be really successful. It's complimentary and has a good partnership. LTWC fulfills a niche by doing things that the City can't do as effectively.

**Chad** (regarding outreach) Feels we definitely want to continue improving, but looking at two years ago, we set goals for Amazon Creek and fundraising and we've met those goals. Hopefully we continue improving as we have.

**John** notes that as member of the public who receives our mailings, he's noticed an increase in visibility.

**4) Category B: Participation (voted 4<sup>th</sup>)**

- 5) "Our council actively involves key people and community leaders in projects and/or activities."
- 6) "Our council members share a common vision and purpose."
- 7) "Members are aware of and involved in projects and/or activities. (Council members)"

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Really	Great	Enough	Do Better
5)	9	3	0	7	5	0
6)	7	2	2	8	2	0
7)	7	5	0	8	2	2

**John** summarizes that it seems people feel the Council is mostly doing well on #7, but there could be a few improvements.

**Improvement Comments**

**Deborah** (question #7) feels that the Council does a great job orienting new Board members. After 15 years, there are lots of things that have changed, particularly in the last 5 years. Perhaps it's time to reevaluate expectations for Board members in terms of joining committees (thinking of Dave T's comments). Feels it's an institutional age process. This board works great, especially with its balance of diversity.

**Doing Great Comments**

**Dave T** (via Dana) notes that meetings and tours are very good. He loves the handouts of maps and photos so people can become a teacher at home. He thinks people may at least share what they learned with others at home. Likes that we actively involve keep people in the community and encourages us to keep doing that.

**Max** (via Jason) noted that public events have diverse stakeholder participation from around the watershed.

**Mike** (via Jed) feels board orientation is excellent and also has enjoyed his involvement with fundraising.

(More comments for Parking Lot)

**Steve** notes that we didn't always require landowner participation on restoration projects, and we've improved this area through our contracting policy. He's familiar with one forestry project where a landowner walked away after a project was completed and on one followed up. We're now following up and that's a big improvement from several years ago (Jim agrees).

**Dana (for Dave T)** on accountability – feels the website has increased our transparency in a good way. On decision-making, he'd like the board to be

reminded what kinds of decisions are being made and why. Sometimes clarity is needed on whether something is a policy decision (such as strategic planning, work planning or budgeting).

**Therese** notes that Dave's comments express what she's been thinking. Recognizes there's a lot of effort that goes into preparing for meetings by staff. It's challenging to put all that together. Feel like our meetings could sometimes be more productive, but not sure exactly what that means. Would also like key decisions the board is responsible for identified. The board receives a lot of updates, but it would help to have the broad-level decisions signaled out. Suggests perhaps adding whether something is a policy decision, action plan, etc. on the board meeting agenda. She feels knowing where their responsibilities lie would help the board identify what level of detail a topic is worth and prioritize their time and efforts).

**Dana (for Dave T)** feels we need to be more explicit.

**Therese** notes that decisions are evaluated in regards with our mission & vision. As a logistical comment, she feels that we shouldn't be afraid to cancel a meeting if there's an occasion where there isn't enough substantive topics to discuss.

**John** thanks the Board members for their input and invites them to leave their self-evaluation survey form if they choose. Identifies the next steps as identifying action items. Feels this discussion generated excellent feedback and Board members clearly put a lot of thought into their comments.

## **Board Business**

(Dana Passes around thank you cards: John Deck & Pat McDowell for hosting/speaking at the Deck Family Farm Tour on May 28; to Kurt & Mary Koehler and the Redtail Fund of the Oregon Community Foundation for a donation of \$1,000 each.)

### **D. Approve May 2013 Board of Directors Meeting Minutes**

Jim asks for any comments or corrections. None given.

**MOTION TO APPROVE MAY 2013 BOARD OF DIRECTORS MINUTES by D. Saunders Evans, seconded by T. Walch. Approved unanimously.**

### **E. Approve April Financial Reports – Jim for Treasurer Brinkley**

In April, our total income was just over \$31,000 - \$22,000 from grants and \$9,000 from donations. General expenses were mostly payroll. There were no particular contract expenses. Our net income was \$4,200. Our cash increased during April and lowered our net loss for the fiscal year to date to \$193,000. That's a big number that's viewed as a

huge loss, but we just got \$200,000 from Meyer Memorial Trust and OWEB grants that will mitigate that. At our May meeting, we received a budget variance report.

**Cary** notes that it's helpful to see what activities are occurring in the field at any time. **Jim** feels it's important that people understand the big picture about project cycles.

**MOTION TO APPROVE APRIL TREASURER'S REPORTS by D. Ponder, seconded by C. Stroda. Approved unanimously.**

**F. Annual Meeting & Celebration – Dana**

We have an idea for an Annual Meeting location and theme. We need an Annual Meeting Committee to share this idea with. We want to do this before the July Board Meeting because otherwise it's getting kind of late.

**ACTION ITEM: Jim & Deborah will join the Annual Meeting Committee. Therese is away until July 2<sup>nd</sup>, but will help after that.**

The normal date for the next Board Meeting would fall on July 4<sup>th</sup>. Would the following Thursday on July 11<sup>th</sup> work? General agreement, yes.

Meeting adjourned at July 7:43 by Chair Jim Pendergrass

Minutes prepared by Rob Hoshaw, reviewed by Dana and Steve, submitted by Steve Cole.