

**Long Tom Watershed Council
Board of Directors Meeting
Thursday, October 6, 2011
751 S. Danebo Ave., Eugene, OR 97402**

Present: Mike Brinkley, Steve Cole, Beth Krisko, Max Nielsen-Pincus, Jim Pendergrass, David Ponder, Lindsay Reaves, Charles Ruff, David Turner, Therese Walch (10)

Absent: Jason Hunton, Sue Kacskos, Deborah Saunders Evans, Chad Stroda (4)

Staff: Dana Dedrick, Rob Hoshaw, Jason Schmidt, Cindy Thieman

Meeting called to order at 5:38 p.m. by Chair Jim Pendergrass

Business Topics

A. **Approve September Board of Directors Meeting Minutes** – *Secretary Turner*

Jim asks for any questions or correction. **Steve** notes a spelling correction under Committee Reports on page 3. Dolly Woolley's name is misspelled.

**MOTION TO APPROVE SEPTEMBER BOARD OF DIRECTORS
MEETING MINUTES by D. Turner, seconded by S. Cole, approved
unanimously (Therese, Beth and Mike abstain because they were not
at September meeting)**

B. **Approve August 2011 Financial Reports** – *Jim (for Treasurer Kacskos)*

Profit & Loss Report – We ended August with a total income of \$126,707. Most of that was incoming grants and contracts, including from the BLM, ODFW, and several smaller OWEB grants. Jim emphasizes that this is active restoration and construction season, and August and September have the heaviest cash flows. Our budget is still tracking where we anticipated at this time.

Statement of Cash Flows Report – We started with about \$212,000 in cash at the beginning of August and ended with about \$221,000 for an increase of \$9,288.

Balance Sheet Report – The balance on the statement of cash flows for both the beginning and end of August are also reflected on the Balance Sheet under "Total Checking/Savings." The balance sheet shows that even though we only gained a little over \$1,000 in total assets, we accrued cash during the month. The balance sheet also shows we had payroll liabilities of about \$8,000. Reiterates that we're tracking well to our budget at this point.

**MOTION TO APPROVE AUGUST 2011 TREASURER'S REPORTS by
T. Walch, seconded by M. Nielsen-Pincus. Approved unanimously.**

Profit & Loss by Job Report – Dana

During the April 2011 Board meeting, an informal decision was made that Dana would report to the Board whenever a project had a budget overage of 15% or greater. This year's projects were actually within 10%, and most were right on their respective anticipated budgets. In one instance, we actually had some money left over from the BLM RAC grant, and we were able to use that money to make some improvements to a culvert replacement project completed last summer on South Fork Ferguson Creek. Dana clarifies that the projects included in the annual Profit & Loss by Job report were all completed during the past year, which could include projects that began several years ago; reiterated that the agreement was that the staff would only bring specific budgets for closed projects to the Board if there was a problem or the budget is over by 15% or more. Notes that we have about 25 open projects at this time and not all of them will be completed this year.

Cindy adds that there is always some variance in what projects cost, both on the positive and negative side. We're able to balance these variances out well, and we're still have a history of keeping within the Council's grant budget.

C. Committee Reports – Jim, Deborah, Max

Resource Development – Dana (for Committee Chair Deborah)

Dana hasn't submitted the Ford Family Foundation grant yet, but we're still moving ahead with signing the contract with the fundraising consultants. If we don't get the grant, it's a \$5,000 risk to the Council, but Dana feels it's a risk worth taking and wants to move forward with signing the consultants.

Jim asks if Dana feels good about our potential to get the grant. **Dana** feels that we have about a 70% chance of receiving the grant. However, looking at the Council's budget, she feels we are able to leverage the \$5,000 if we need to. We will submit the grant within the next couple of weeks, after which Ford Family will give us notice within about three months after that. The consultants will work from October through May. We were planning to pay them \$3,000 of our own money anyway, even if we don't get the grant, for a total of \$8,000. However, if we don't get the grant, we'll use \$8,000 from the Council's general fund.

David T. feels that the wording of the grant application should clarify that we're moving forward with hiring the consultants so that the grantors know where we stand. **Dana** agrees; states that she felt like we needed to wait to submit in order to be forthright with everything that we've agreed to with the consultants. **David T** asks that we think about how we can make this appealing to Meyer Memorial Trust. **Dana** emphasizes that she's not going to submit the grant until we can explain exactly what's happening on our end.

Jim feels that the risk is a decent gamble to take.

Personnel – Jim

We're going to meet with Dana on Wednesday, October 12 for her performance review. We'll have that info at the November Board meeting.

Education & Involvement – Max (for Chair Mandy Payne)

Note: Mandy Payne is a non-Board member who has agreed to serve as the chair of this committee. Mandy is a volunteer (one of the co-volunteers of the year awardees) who helped us a lot with the Cutthroat Migration Study this past year; she joined the E&I committee earlier this spring.

The last committee meeting was August 29; next meeting is October 27. We will look through the year's coming public meeting topics and make recommendations on which topics should be prioritized for this year.

Operations – Steve

This committee hasn't had cause to meet recently, but we will review topics as needed.

Technical Team – Cindy

Tech Team is meeting October 7 to review October OWEB restoration grant applications. Kat Beal resigned as the Board representative to Tech Team. **Jim** asks if anyone from the Board would like to serve as the Tech Team liaison, which meets about ~ 2-3 times per year.

Dana will talk about committee placements during the November Board meeting, and emphasizes that people can wait to make a decision about committee involvement until then. She will bring information about serving on each committee to the November meeting.

D. **Nominate & Elect Officers, approve Check Signers, other roles** – Jim & Dana

1. Officer Nominations:

Chair – Max Nielsen-Pincus, David Turner

Treasurer – (co) Sue Kasckos and Mike Brinkley

Secretary – David Turner (membership); Dana Dedrick (corporate)

Vice-Chairs – Deborah Saunders Evans, Chad Stroda

Past Chair – Jim Pendergrass

Jim explains that the Board Chair is annual position, but other officer roles, such as Treasurer and Vice-Chair can serve for longer—particularly the Treasurer, as it helps us maintain our fiscal controls when one person is involved in that role for more than one year.

Dana notes that Sue is willing to continue in her role as Treasurer; interested in having **Mike** join in to help as co-Treasurer if he's interested. Dana also recommends that she act as Corporate Secretary so that she can sign IRS

documents. **David** likes the membership Secretary position, and would rather stay in that role.

Max is interested in serving as the Board Chair.

Jim feels that having a co-Treasurer makes sense; they can back one another up. **Mike** is willing to act as co-Treasurer.

**MOTION TO APPOINT THE FOLLOWING OFFICERS AS A SLATE—
Max Nielsen-Pincus as Board Chair; Sue Kasckos and Mike Brinkley
as co-Treasurers; David Turner as Membership Secretary; Dana
Dedrick as Corporate Secretary; Deborah Saunders Evans and Chad
Stroda as Vice Chairs; and Jim Pendergrass as Past Chair—by M.
Nielsen-Pincus, seconded by T. Walch and B. Krisko. Approved
unanimously.**

2. Check Signers

Dana current check signers are Steve, Jim, Charles, and Deborah. It makes things easier administratively if we can maintain the same check signers if they are willing to continue.

Jim notes that we don't have the Treasurer sign checks as part of the Council's fiscal controls because they look at large amounts of money. Having multiple check signers is more convenient. **Dana** explains that we sign checks about 2 times per month. We don't require two signatures, but Dana has started initialing checks as well.

Jim & Dana explains our CIR approval process where a supervisor reviews expense requests from staff and turns the forms over to the fiscal manager for processing. The check signer reviews and signs the checks that are to go out. The Executive Director and Treasurer review all the bank statements and reports—lots of fiscal controls in place.

3. Other Roles

Small Grant Team – includes Mary's River Watershed Council & LTWC, as well as Benton Co. & Upper Willamette SWCDs – applicants have to be one of these four organizations. Applicants can partner together. There is money set aside for this team, and the award money prioritizes riparian restoration; urban issues receive a lower priority. Each application can ask for a maximum of \$10,000. The review process is over email, you can apply anytime, and applicants are notified in 30 days. We apply for about 2-3 small grants a year.

We are looking for a liaison to this group. In the past, we looked for people with technical expertise, although this year that's not as necessary. We basically need someone to help review applications. Dana is an interim representative on that committee. Paul Reed is the administrator. Acting as a liaison doesn't carry any hidden work—your main duty is to serve on the

review team. Board members can also wait to express their interest until the next meeting.

E. **Paperwork moment** – *Secretary Turner*

David collected volunteer match hours forms, and Dana and Rob explained how to fill them out.

Program Topics

F. **Annual Meeting & Celebration Debrief** – *everyone*

1. Notes from Flipchart – snapshot of people's thoughts

What Went Well

- Raffle & different ticket values – high quality of prize items
- Speakers – good amount of info for 20-30 minutes
- # of attendees
- Diversity of attendance
- Food was great
- Setting/amphitheater type seating
- “This is what it’s supposed to be about.”
- Family event
- Prefer outdoor events (except for heat/rain, but we didn’t have that)
- Connect with community before serving on Board—awesome
- Attendees were greeted right away
- Intimate setup
- Theme really worked despite appearing less matched at first
- 20+ people on project tour, lots of questions

Things to Improve

- Beverages
- Audio too loud sometimes – have someone listen/adjust
- Consider another method for value of those prizes – probably more money in silent auction
- Hand writing receipts seemed slow – get people through registration faster
- **Idea:** Identify guests with color coded name tags for new people, landowners, etc.; allows greeters to know more about the attendees
- Liked indoor space for more intimacy/connections/conversations (almost forced because of close space)
- Conflict with agriculture season was a problem – no potential new project landowners despite extensive outreach
- (Note: Diamond Woods was just too small of an indoor space).
- Felt like more of a family event vs. an Annual Meeting.
- **Idea:** look at 2 separate events – one that incorporates family.

- Displays – blew over and hard to focus on
- Do raffle prizes sooner
- **Idea:** “Annual Meeting” is not a fundraising event. Do a fundraising event and advertise that (appeals to different people).
- Auction is targeted money plus you don’t lose money if you lose.

2. General Comments

Jim feels that in 8 or 9 years, this one was one of the best Annual Meetings he’s seen, including everything from the raffle, food, and Jason being willing to host. Mentioned that it was good to have Rob Handy, Lane County Commissioner, present. Thought event went well. No real improvements to mention. Speakers were great. Lynne couldn’t be there, but Jason’s comments were well-timed and Charlie’s comments were from the heart. David did a great job with the raffle. Didn’t notice the water issue (Mike did, however, so at least a few people noticed the lack of beverages).

Max noted that his kids were excited about winning the Christmas tree in the raffle. Impressed with the number of attendees; food & raffle was incredible. Thanks to David P. and David T. for organizing that. Speakers went well. It was a beautiful setting from his vantage point. “This is what it’s supposed to be about.” Great to be sitting in the middle of the watershed. Happy it was a family event too.

Lindsay – This was her second Annual Meeting. She prefers outdoor events and was glad the weather worked out. Also thought it was good that we only had 2 speakers—thought 3 would have moved the event on too slowly. Some people had louder voices, and from her seat in front of the speakers, it was hard on her ears. Other people had softer voices and were more difficult to hear. Suggests having someone to monitor the speakers. Also thought having raffle prizes of different values went very well. At first, she thought it might be confusing, but it ended up being a great way to raffle off prizes.

Beth – as a new board member, thought it was good to connect with the community before she begins participating in the meetings. Spoke with a landowner who talked about stewardship on his land—felt it was a very endearing, nostalgic conversation, and it reminded her of the community she’s connected to in Ohio. With a silent auction, people would have likely bid more than \$5 or \$10 for more expensive prizes.

Jim – we have done a silent auction twice. It worked well indoors but not so great outdoors because people wandered around too much.

Beth adds that it was nice to be greeted right away, and it felt very welcoming. Mentioned that Rob Handy was very thankful and complimentary—he made her feel good about joining the Council’s Board.

Therese thought it was a great event, and liked the fact that it was family event. Also prefers the outdoor venue. At first, she thought that the theme, “the bounty of the watershed,” didn’t seem as directly connected to the

watershed council, but now thinks that it was a wonderful topic because it broadens the audience's perspective and it suited the Council really well. From a practical standpoint, hand writing receipts seemed a little inefficient; suggests something quicker to get people past the registration table. She was a greeter and didn't recognize people as well as some, especially if someone is new. It would be beneficial to have a way to recognize whether someone was new or already connected.

Cindy – When compared to past Annual Meetings, this one lacked a feel of critical mass for her. She felt more moved by Diamond Woods—there was indoor space for people to talk more. She prefers indoor events later in the year so that it doesn't conflict with the agricultural season. There was more project landowner and agricultural involvement last year and was disappointed that there were no new potential project landowners this year. Felt the program was neat, the food was great, and the speakers were fantastic. At least 20 people attended the project tour, and it went well.

Dana notes that even with a ton of personalized outreach, we didn't get the landowner presence we wanted.

Max feels he interacted with a lot more people last year.

Cindy felt that one of the strengths of last year's meeting were the landowners providing testimonials.

Mike liked having the venue outside and was impressed with the beauty of the event; thought it was set up well. As a first time Annual Meeting attendee, he doesn't have a lot of comments yet. He has experience organizing raffles and live auctions. Agrees with the comments that some of the items could have garnered more money in a silent auction. It also helps if you have your fundraiser inside and right around the time when people are eating and drinking—people are often more inclined to give.

Jim notes that at Diamond Woods, you had to talk to people because there wasn't a lot of space to go.

Charles felt that Diamond Woods had a big turnout and he had good conversations, but the space was too small (lots of nodding in the affirmative). Recommends that we need a bigger indoor space. Feels that whether we hold an indoor or outdoor event is predicated on the type of program you're having and the people you're trying to reach. At Diamond Woods, there was lots of content being presented to people.

David T. liked that it felt like a family event; it felt casual and didn't feel like an Annual Meeting and more like a day in the park. Suggests looking at having two events—an outdoor family event and an indoor formal meeting. Agrees with Therese that it would have been helpful to know a little more about the people attending. This gives the Board a clue on how to introduce themselves. The displays weren't effective because they blew over, and we weren't able to talk about the Amazon Initiative effectively. He also was sad to see a couple large prizes, like the fishing trips, bring only about \$20 to the

Council as there were only a couple tickets in the jar. **Mike** – that’s where a silent auction would be better.

Jim – the challenge with holding a silent auction in the past is that we didn’t get any bids on some of the larger items. **Dana** notes that the problem is when we get the prizes. We didn’t have enough time to pick the rules or how to advertise the prizes this year. There were even a few prizes that came in the week or even day of the event. **Mike** adds that if he would have known about the raffle sooner, he probably could have pulled in half a dozen more prizes. He has done these kinds of events before. He feels people are a lot more generous here, and it is easier to get people and businesses to donate.

Lindsay felt that we bigger mass of people to raffle off the bigger ticket items so the organization received more money.

Beth doesn’t think of an Annual Meeting as an event where people come to donate; suggests that we consider holding a separate fundraising event.

Max explains that if a person puts in \$30 in raffle tickets and don’t win they may feel like they lost out. But if they bid on something and decide to pull back from the bidding war, they don’t feel like they’re out anything. **Mike** adds that a silent auction is entertainment. **Jim** adds that knowing what types of people are attending can help determine the type of fundraiser, though **Mike** feels it’s hard to predict that.

Dana – the first time we had a silent auction, the event was in the evening, indoors, and there was alcohol; the auction went well. The second time we had a silent auction, the event was outdoors in the afternoon, and there was no alcohol; that auction didn’t go so well. **Cindy** felt the quality of raffle prizes were better than previous years.

Dana - Our main disappointment was not having a good landowner turnout and the missed fundraising potential of the quality raffle prizes. **Cindy/Dana** both thought the food from LCC was wonderful, and it was great that they were able to incorporate the donated local food. **Dana** clarifies that throughout the history of the Council, the Board has expressed the belief that fundraising is not a major goal of the Annual Meeting.

Rob – The total number of adults attending was around 67 people. Excluding infants, there were 73 total people. This year, the total income for the Annual Meeting was \$4,024. \$1,850 was from sponsorships, \$305 from Celebration Sponsors, and the rest was from the raffle and tickets. Our expenses were \$6,542, so we lost over \$2,100. **Jim** notes that staff bill their time to unallocated funds, and it’s a direct cost to the Council. **Rob** – We still did better than last year’s Annual Meeting, where we incurred over \$8,000 in total expenses and less than \$2,000 in total income. We only had one cash sponsor from EWEB, and this year, our expenses were down because Jason was willing to hold the venue at his place.

G. Major Restoration Projects being proposed for this cycle – *Cindy*

** For the full PowerPoint presentation, please see the slideshow pdf in the LTWC Board login page of the website. **

Cindy's slideshow explained the package grant for Owens Creek that the Council will be submitting to OWEB for the October 17 deadline. The three projects in the application package include:

- Fish passage at Owens Creek off of High Pass Road – replace undersized culverts with concrete arch spans
- Fish passage at Owens Creek at Barrows' – replace undersized culvert with bridge
- Fish passage at Owens Creek at Schudel's – remove an undersized culvert

The OWEB application requests about \$154,000. The total project cost, including match funds, is about \$387,000.

Comments & Questions:

Jim asks if we were able to bundle the projects as one grant. **Cindy** – yes, we were able to get a huge amount of match funding (~ \$180,000) from the BLM RAC. Kendra at the Bonneville Environmental Foundation feels that the funding request is in the acceptable range for the reviewers.

Therese asks if there is a county culvert replacement program. **Cindy** – Yes, although the culverts we are proposing to remove or replace are not high on their priority list. They are giving us match by providing the design.

Mike wonders why we don't prioritize removing the barrier furthest downstream first. Feels that's a logical progression to how you would remove barriers. **Cindy** – We have done significant barrier inventory and prioritization. Landowner outreach takes a while and is a limiting factor in removing barrier culverts. **Dana** – We proceed with removing culverts with whichever landowner is ready to move at that time. The cutthroat trout's life history in this watershed doesn't require quite the extent of connected habitat that salmon do.

Cindy – Explains that we're replacing a six foot culvert with a 20 foot wide concrete arch span, so there is a significant difference in size between the original barrier and the final product. The arch span is a single pre-fabricated structure that costs about \$40,000. A bridge costs around \$55,000.

Max – Feels that we should say the community and economic benefits on the projects will "support" rather than "create" three jobs. Also questions why we're putting such a low figure for our administrative costs. He feels we should automatically put 10% rather than present a lower figure than we can handle in our application. **Dana** explains that we're working to apply for a federal indirect cost rate to show that our administrative costs are much higher than even the 10%, and there has been some pushback from OWEB on administrative costs. They feel grantees should be closer to 5-7%.

Therese asks input is desired from the Board. **Dana** – The presentations are learning opportunities that allow the Board to point out errors or omissions.

H. **Staff Reports** - *Dana*

Mike asks about the Council's expertise to do toxics outreach. **Dana** – Yes, Jason Schmidt has that experience for the Amazon Initiative, and we have a partnership with the DEQ to analyze that data. We coordinate the entire Amazon Initiative program. We can offer businesses the same technical expertise and non-regulatory guidance that we offer to landowners.

I. **Liaison Reports**

Jim – Groundwater Management Area (GWMA) will meet later this month.

Dana - Small Grant Team & Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) – Dana is on the RAC review committee. She helped educate other review members about why trout are important to local communities and why we should not just focus on federally threatened and endangered species.

Dana - Rivers 2 Ridges (R2R) – used to be West Eugene Wetlands Partnership. R2R has added five new partners, including the Youth Corps. Dana acts on the Executive Level and Cindy on the Implementation level. The partnership trades equipment and shares the creation of a long-term plan.

J. **Action Items Summary**

Board members thanked Jim for his service as Board Chair this year.

Dana and Max requested feedback on the Board Topics for 2011-12.

Meeting adjourned at 7:41 p.m. by Jim Pendergrass, Past Chair.