

**Long Tom Watershed Council
Executive Committee & Resource Development Committee (RDC)
SPECIAL MEETING**

**Thursday, December 1, 2011
751 S. Danebo Ave., Eugene, OR 97402**

Present: Mike Brinkley (*Treasurer*), Steve Cole, Sue Kacskos (*Treasurer*), Beth Krisko (*RDC*), Max Nielsen-Pincus (*Chair & RDC*), Jim Pendergrass (*Past Chair*), David Ponder, Lindsay Reaves, Charles Ruff (*RDC*), Deborah Saunders Evans (*Vice Chair & RDC*), David Turner (*Secretary & RDC*) (11)

Absent: Chad Stroda (*Vice Chair & RDC*)

Guest: Ronnel Curry

Staff: Dana Dedrick, Rob Hoshaw, Jason Schmidt

Meeting called to order at 5:36 p.m. by Chair Max Nielsen-Pincus

Max comments on Tuesday's (November 29) Public Meeting on water quality data for small cities and the economics of restoration activities. Felt that it was a good meeting and there was an exciting and engaging discussion.

Business Topics

A. **Approve November 2011 Board of Directors Minutes** – *Secretary Turner*

Dave notes the great comments from the Board members around the room in response to Dolly and Ronnel's question about the benefits of the Council's work. Recommends that Board members hang on to these minutes for future reference.

Action Item Summary

- Dana sent reminder email about tonight's meeting.
- Sue and Lindsay hosted the Public Meeting Tuesday, November 29.
- Dana will make some key decisions on public meeting dates and topics before sharing with the Board.

**MOTION TO APPROVE NOVEMBER 2011 BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING MINUTES by D. Turner, seconded by J. Pendergrass.
Approved unanimously.**

B. **Approve October 2011 Financial Reports & Budget vs. Actual Report for Quarter 1** – *Treasurer Kacskos*

Profit & Loss – October 2011 - Our gross profit was down \$25,950 for the month of October. After adding in expenses, our net income was a negative \$55,069 for the month.

Statement of Cash Flows – Net income from Profit & Loss Report noted at top of report. The cash at the beginning of the period was \$156,632, and cash went down by about \$81,000 for the month to \$75,515, so cash is still on the positive side.

Balance Sheet – Compares September's numbers to October's, and it shows that there was a decrease for the period. Sue was a little concerned because it seemed like a sizeable decrease. Reads email explanation from Fiscal Manager Amanda Wilson. Summary of that email: There was a decline in cash since August. This can be attributed to two outstanding payment requests during the time of the report. One is an outstanding Special Investment Partnership (SIP) payment request from OWEB for about \$150,000 that should be deposited into our account soon. Secondly, there is also \$36,000 of outstanding funds from OWEB, and this should arrive in the next couple weeks. There was spike in expenses during September's field season that decreased cash flow. Also explained that the time it takes for OWEB to process payment requests can vary from anywhere to about one to six weeks. Emphasizes that we are working to make sure our system is more efficient so that we avoid payment delays in the future. Sue feels this explanation helped alleviate her concerns. General comments that this decrease in cash flow is due to the timing of grant funding and expenses.

Max notes that one of the holdups on a payment request was a landowner agreement that needed to be signed; asked if we did the work before the landowner agreement was signed. **Dana** – yes, we started the work, but the details of the agreement were worked out with the landowner beforehand, and this is a landowner we knew. In order to expedite this process in the future, she has asked Amanda to prompt restoration staff for landowner agreements as soon as she sees staff's first expense record on the project (e.g. time spent, permit applied for, expense incurred).

Quarter 1 Budget vs. Actual for FY'12 – Dana

The Budget vs. Actual report is a way to track whether the organization's budget making sense in terms of income and expenses. Notes that we're required to notify the Board of a budget variance of over 10%. Right now, there is no area of concern from her perspective. The report notes in red where a budget change has been requested for specific line items. First, Dana requests that the Donations line item be changed from \$1,700 to \$10,000. Dolly and Ronnel recommended that we raise the anticipated donations to the \$10,000 figure, and Dana feels this is reasonable. We have already received about \$2,500. Secondly, interest rates are lower for the year than calculated when we developed the budget and requests that we adjust the Interest line item from \$1,500 to \$500. Thirdly, Dana requests that we transfer \$4,500 from the Education & Involvement line item to Printing & Copying/Website. This budget transfer is to cover the upgrade of our website this year.

David T. asks where the expense for Ronnel & Dolly appears. **Dana** – it's within the contracted services line item for about \$7,500. Adds that the Ford Family grant hasn't been submitted yet; **Deborah** offers to help finalize it.

Dana notes that if we receive the Ford Family grant, it will show up in the “Adjusted View for Balancing the Budget”

Jim asks if we increase donations to about \$10,000 as recommended by the consultants, do we want also want to increase grants & contracts to \$5,000 for the planned income of the Ford Family grant?

Beth asks how confident we are that we’ll get the grant. **Dana** – 70%.

David T. thinks it’s a fair approach to add the \$5,000 to the planned income because we went into the project thinking we’d get the grant.

Mike doesn’t feel we should add funding to the budget that we don’t have yet.

David P. suggests another approach to reduce the planned amount of the grant by 30% to reflect our 70% confidence interval. Alternatively, we could add a “Prospective Grants” line item for proposals in progress. There is general nodding, and several members seem to like this second idea.

MOTION TO APPROVE OCTOBER FINANCIAL REPORTS and FY’12 QUARTER 1 BUDGET VS. ACUAL REPORT, subject to adding about \$7,500 to the donation income line item (to equal suggested \$10,000), adding \$5,000 to a “prospective grants and contracts” planned income line item in the adjusted balance view to reflect the fundraising campaign and Ford Family grant that is about to be submitted. By J. Pendergrass, seconded by D. Saunders Evans. Approved unanimously.

Resource Development Topics

C. Update on Annual Meeting & Membership in relation to Resource Development – Dana & Deborah

The consultants presented a situational analysis to RDC about one week ago centered on instituting a cultural shift in the organization to include fundraising, and holding a kick off event for the annual campaign in February. Part of what was discussed was Council membership and the Annual Meeting in relation to resource development. Explains that the Annual Meeting is technically the only day of the year the Council has members. The organization decided on that so people couldn’t ask for membership records, and it enables less comfortable people to feel comfortable being fully involved. We don’t have gifts or tangible benefits for being a member, and without some obvious benefit, the consultants recommended that we don’t need to use the word “membership” to define our donors; instead, we could use “supporter”, “friend”, “contributor”.

At one of the previous meetings, the Board had recommended breaking the Annual Meeting into an event separate from a fundraising event because the Annual Meeting has more of a business purpose. Dana’s recommendations for defining membership and moving forward with this year’s Annual Meeting are included in the packet’s background information (not to use the term “membership” to define

supporters and to break out the Annual Meeting and not have it be part of the annual giving campaign plan).

Dana – the difference in how we define members is in our organization’s governance; we don’t have any membership dues. **Dave P./Max** – continue by adding that members get to vote on Board members at the Annual Meeting. **Sue** asks if the way we currently define membership will stay the same. **Dana** – yes, and we will not confuse the language with the fundraising campaign.

Jim adds that we need to be careful that we don’t diminish the value of the Annual Meeting, and we don’t want to decrease stakeholder inclusiveness. **Dana** notes that her vision would be to actually increase diversity. For instance, we’d go through a contact roster and make sure we specially invite a diversity of people.

Jim feels that given what we’ve just discussed, the Annual Meeting won’t look a lot different that it has in the past, save for the lack of a fundraising aspect.

Deborah doesn’t want to get rid of the “celebration” concept and feels it’s good for inclusiveness. Adds that it’s erroneous to identify the Annual meeting with fundraising because money raised has just been going toward covering the cost of the event. Suggests that we figure out how to incorporate Dana’s recommendations with still having an annual “celebration.”

David T asks if we would still approach people for donations at the Annual Meeting.

Dana – we would just have guests pay for dinner.

David T asks if having guests pay for dinner would cover cost of the Annual Mtg.

Jim doesn’t think we’ve ever tried to make the Annual Meeting a fundraising event beyond just covering our costs.

Dana adds the key is not to lose stakeholder diversity buy in. Right now, it’s not easy to see how that will look.

Lindsay notes that at Forests Today & Forever, they use an Annual Meeting as a way to say thank you. They don’t expect people to pay for anything, but instead let them know that they’ll be contacting them for donations.

Deborah adds that RDC will finalize the discussions of membership and the Annual Meeting; they will come up with proposals to bring to the full Board so they can decide which model to go with. This will be the first year that we’re doing this, so we’re bound to learn along the way and make adjustments for next time

Beth appreciates what was said about keeping the Annual Meeting open to stakeholders. Feels that we could almost have a similar type of event as this year’s (e.g. host it on someone’s property, have a potluck. Feels that a potluck feels warm where people want to go and have fun.)

David P. understands the semantic distinction of membership. Clarifies that we’re still thinking of a donor base the way many people build a membership base, but we’re just going to use “supporters” and “friends” instead. (**Mike** likes the idea of “friends of the Council”).

Beth asks if “member” is used in the Council. **Dana** - yes, it’s defined in our bylaws. Members get to vote on the slate of Board of Directors.

Deborah clarifies that the original idea of the Council's Charter was to be as inclusive as possible. Anyone who works, plays, or benefits from the watershed can show up and vote at that meeting. Maybe in the future we'll want to change that definition, but feels this concept of membership is working well as it is.

Dana adds that there is no barrier to be a member. You're automatically a member whether you know of us or not.

MOTION TO AFFIRM THE CURRENT PRACTICE THAT WE'RE NOT USING THE WORD "MEMBERSHIP" AS PART OF OUR FUNDRAISING CAMPAIGN, that membership is open to anyone in the watershed, and there is no donation required, moved by J. Pendergrass, seconded by D. Turner. Approved unanimously.

David T. suggests that the Annual Meeting could be just like a regular Public Meeting; the major difference is that there is some business tacked on to it.

Dana reiterates that the goal of the Annual Meeting will be to thank people for being a part of the Council, and not asking them to donate.

INFORMAL DECISION: There was a motion made to by D. Turner to separate the Annual Meeting from the Council's fundraising campaign because the Annual meeting requires the conduct of business. However, after discussion, that MOTION WAS WITHDRAWN because it was determined a motion wasn't necessary since the previous motion covers this assertion. GENERAL AGREEMENT THAT NO MOTION WAS NECESSARY.

Lindsay wants to clarify that the Annual Meeting is our moment of membership, and the purpose is to include full stakeholder diversity.

Dana – yes, and we'll bring more details to the Board in April about the Annual Mtg.

Max adds that by not requiring members to be donors, the event is not about fundraising, but about celebrating the accomplishments of the Council.

David P – wouldn't rule out a soft ask at the Annual Meeting.

Dana agrees that's a good reason not to make a motion; it allows us flexibility with asking for donations at the Annual Meeting in the future.

D. Kick Off Event for Our Annual Campaign – Fundraising Team

Dana – The Kick Off Event for our Annual Campaign will take place either February 16 or 23 (NOTE: THESE ARE NO LONGER THE POSSIBLE DATES –Mar 22, Mar 15, Feb 23). Notes that a videographer has some raw footage for us to use. A potential venue would be the Territorial Vineyards tasting room; previously, Alan at Territorial Vineyards had mentioned they were interested in hosting Council events.

David P notes that he went to a party for Camas Education events at Territorial Vineyards. Feels that the tasting room would good for a smaller fundraising event.

Dana – the idea is to have 30 core supporters at the event. This would start by inviting five key people who have already donated as part of the campaign already

or are willing to write a check the night of the event. The event would include pithy, inspiring speeches. There is still a lot to be decided.

Deborah notes that the main concept is to attract a core group of donors. Maybe there is a “match challenge” or testimonials, such as from project landowners. We’ll probably have more information by January.

Lindsay likes testimonials because they’re more from the heart. **Max** adds that the testimonials from project landowners at the 2010 Annual Meeting were very good, and feels they’re effective because of the human quality.

Dana/Deborah emphasize that we’ll be pushing to have 100% Board giving in advance of the event.

David P notes that February is approaching very soon; asks if the Board needs to provide names of potential donors to invite now.

Dana – we already have 5 leads, and we’ll solicit the Board by email for more names. Dolly and Ronnel are working to help narrow down that list first. Adds that we’re targeting 50 people to invite with the goal of 30 people attending. A major donor is \$250 and up.

Mike asks if this kick off event is asking for a one time or annual donation.

Dana – depends on relationship with the donor. More important to get them to donate some at first, and we don’t want to push them too fast.

Ronnel clarifies that because we’re kicking off an “annual” campaign, donors will know that they’ll be asked annually.

David T. asks for clarification on Board giving. When is the right time? **Dana** – we want 100% giving for the fiscal year, which is July through June. It’s important to have 100% before Feb 1 so we can say we have 100% before the event.

Lindsay – clarifies that quantity doesn’t matter. **Dana/Deborah** – No, what matters is that the donation is meaningful to you. 100% Board giving is more about the process than the content.

E. Fundraising Leadership Team – *Deborah*

The fundraising consultants proposed a structure for a fundraising team. We’ll need two co-chairs, and David Turner has agreed to co-chair event with someone else. Dana will bring the perspective of the Executive Director, the co-chairs will be the fundraising managers, and Rob will be in charge of the database and tracking. Other key people haven’t been identified yet.

The next RDC meeting is Thursday, Dec 15. Goal is to have the co-chairs of the Fundraising Leadership Team identified and have ideas on how to move forward.

F. Fundraising Needs Presentation – *Dana*

Dana hands out a draft document on some ways to think about the financial needs of the LTWC, which provides a sampling of some nuggets about what programmatic needs the Council has and gives you a starting point for how to answer why someone should give to this organization. Walks through the draft, explaining the

overall situation, including funding uncertainty (reduced overall funding from OWEB, BLM RAC grant may no longer be an option), that we're not going to rehire the Stewardship Technician (Josh's position) or the seasonal field worker, and that our first personnel budget hole will hit in February 2013. That means that we have time to fill that hole.

Some of the program needs that mean the most to people are educational meetings, tours, workshops, and our website. There is also the need to help small landowners who don't have priority land for restoration funding. Reminds the Board to think in terms of "we're not building an empire by putting all the money in the bank." The nuggets break down the costs of programmatic needs into tangible examples. Designed to help the Board tell the story.

David T. asks if volunteer hours are included in the story. **Dana** Yes, we do list management time to train and supervise them, but volunteer hours aren't part of the fundraising campaign need.

Lindsay/David T. feels that it's important that this also shows we're mitigating costs by showing that we can utilize volunteers effectively. Volunteer hours can show how much staff time we're offsetting, which is an asset as a nonprofit.

G. **Building our Case Statement** – *Ronnel Curry*

Defines a case statement as a fundraising document that gives the organization the language for approaching donors to make asks. It's a living document that gives you foundation to communicate to donors why they should give. It is generally one page, and focuses on why people should give. Specific reasons on why to give can be modified to give to any potential donor. Clarifies that a case statement won't answer the depth of questions about the organization, but it will provide a background—much like an "elevator speech."

Dolly compiled case statement answers to questions submitted by the Board (handout). Dolly and Ronnel used the statements that were most relevant, combined common ideas, and put together outline of case statement. Ronnel emphasizes that they would like the Board's feedback in all areas. They want to make sure they capture the organization in the correct way so donors feel good about giving to LTWC. Feel that lack clarity about the full breadth of the Council's work, and want to make sure they capture that accurately. Ronnel underscores the importance of a tangible, succinct concept of what an organization does. She will take feedback from tonight and present a draft case statement to RDC, finalize, and take that language and apply it to different events, our website, donations, and anything related to giving. The case statement can be used for talking & training points. It's like your "brand." While annual campaign needs might change, the foundation is captured in the case statement. Document can be part of a folder of other documents to present to a prospective donor.

David T. asks if the goal is to go from the 2 pages of the current to one page.

Ronnel feels that one page is more readable. People who want more info can find it out through a different mechanism. Focus on the priority message and 2 or 3 points to highlight about the organization.

Max clarifies that it seems like a narrative of who we are.

Ronnel – people invest when they know you’re a financially responsible organization, have a great history, staff, quality of work, and you have the documentation to prove it. For people who know us already, they might be ready to give right now. Case statement can help provide more info. Goes on to explain process for providing feedback on the draft case statement. Board members get into groups, and each group takes one section of the draft. Explains that the first paragraph of the History section could be improved by having a more visionary, passionate, and heartfelt message. Subsequent paragraphs are more analytical.

David T. wants to make sure that the case statement will be used for this coming year’s activities and beyond; it’s the foundation of giving for multiple years. The “why ask now?” can also be broad and a long-term goal.

Ronnel – a case statement is similar to a mission statement.

Dana feels that “The Ask/Why Now?” section needs more work.

Sue asks if the draft case statement paraphrasing all board’s feedback? Yes.

Ronnel recommends that we define where our service area is and proposes we make a new map to reflect that. People need a connection to the watershed area.

David P. assumes that the final formatting will be polished, that it will be shorter and will pop more from the page.

Max thinks the case statement is like an introduction to LTWC.

Ronnel recommends reading the case statement before going into an ask so she makes sure she highlights those important messages.

Sue feels it’s important to define the watershed; a lot of people don’t know what that means. **Deborah** – agrees most people don’t automatically identify with what a watershed is and wants to come up with a good way to communicate it. **Sue** – while in California, she didn’t realize that everyone was actually part of a watershed. That itself is a reason for people to get excited about their local watershed.

David T proposes including visual images, including a map or diagram.

Jim feels he needs to know whether the statement will be paired down to one or two pages because he will look at it differently.

Sue suggests making a legal size, trifold brochure out of it.

Deborah clarifies that RDC is not asking the Board to make those kinds of decisions. What she’s asking of the Board is to identify what they feel is important, incredibly important, and things that might not need to be in the case statement.

~ Board members break into small groups for 20 minutes ~

Ronnel (after groups reconvene in conference room). There is more general discussion about what case statements are.

Beth asks if case statements have marketing language. **Ronnel** clarifies that it's not marketing material but rather a reason why people should give to you. The case statement is more of a foundation.

Feedback from each small group

History/Story Section – Mike & Deborah

Deborah thought the section should be a lot shorter and needs to lead off with a stronger, pithier statement. Second paragraph – much of this could go at the bottom to describe the watershed. Start with impact statement, get to heart of mission. Do that without throwing in too many statistics.

Mike suggests the words “bringing citizens together,” “supporting communities,” “community-based organization,” and “citizen-based watershed council.”

Challenges & Ramifications Section - David T & Charles

David and Charles came away with three basic ideas. First, that the task of the watershed council is to foster protection and restoration of those resources. Second, the Council connects different landowners to address threats through a holistic approach and acts as the connective tissue. Third, the Council guides a comprehensive overview of the watershed. It is non-regulatory, though that may be challenging for people to understand.

Ronnel – how do we answer what happens if you don't do (the work we do)?

Charles – that's tough to explain. There is a “patchwork of individuals.”

Without us, there are a 1,000 approaches yet none are unified.

Who We Are and What We Do Section - David P & Lindsay

Felt this section had too much technical jargon and the sentence structure was too long. Needs shorter, easier to read sentences. Most compelling concept – Council has “boots on the ground,” which David explains as big pieces of heavy machinery restoring woodlands, dropping logs into creeks, removing culverts, etc. Also think of the concept in terms of “money into action.” Overall, this section didn't pop for them. They felt the results and consequences bullet points could be combined, and weren't necessarily listed in terms of priority, so they numbered what they felt should be that priority level. Felt erosion issues were not addressed (e.g. bank stabilization). There is also nothing about addressing urban pollution issues. Also want to emphasize the science piece of the work we do (e.g. cutthroat trout migration study, water quality monitoring, fish passage barrier assessment).

Results and Benefits Section – Sue and Steve

Felt like this section should be personalized (e.g. use words like “we,” “our,” “us,” and “our community”). They really felt the urge to rewrite the first paragraph because they didn't feel it flowed well. The concepts are good, but the writing needs work. They add that we've won an award, and that might be worth mentioning. This section also seems somewhat repetitive of the

section before it (e.g. highlighting restoration of our natural resources, education, and volunteering). There is lots of overlap across sections, and we could combine some text, such as results with why we do the work we do (e.g. "... planted 100,000 native trees and shrubs" but *why?*).

Mike feels that some people will be impressed with bullet point details; other people won't. Emphasizes the idea of having a folder to hand to prospective donors, including a brochure, financial statement, video, etc.

Ronnel – the case statement is a compelling reason for people to give.

People want to know that the money is used wisely; in some cases, donors may want money to go to a specific place.

Steve feels that Cindy's monitoring report needs to be in here because it's an important part of the Council's history, and we provide it and use it.

Dana agrees that we should consider including mentioning that we have specific data on each local stream, and we know where we need to work.

Deborah/Dana/Max – science allows us to develop the information to know how to be strategic (e.g. we know how to plant what tree where; we're not just planting any tree anywhere).

Steve feels we should keep the community-based benefits in the document.

The Ask/Why Now? Section – Max, Jim, and Beth

Max feels that the concepts are correct in this section, but there needs to be rewriting to make the words active and inspiring. For instance, "We build a community and culture that supports watershed stewardship." Describes our organization as one that builds a culture that addresses problems for the long-term. We need help now to tangibly contribute to this.

Mike summed up Max's statement as "building a legacy."

Beth describes our goals as we want to ensure that we maintain water quality and save habitat; we make people feel like they need to act.

David P adds that we should make people feel like if they don't act, there will be a consequence.

Charles – "preserve" and "restore" are the two words his group came up with as meaningful to use. He feels that part of the reason to donate now is that the funding landscape is changing and the grant world is a rapidly changing landscape that we can't rely solely on for our funding.

Jim feels it is challenging to clearly explain the difference between programmatic and unrestricted funds.

David P describes it as "in an era of government austerity, there are less public dollars to go around." Not sure if funding issues should go in case statement. What gets people to right the check is the work the organization does and the mission we're trying to fulfill. May not be as compelling to a potential donor to say a grant opportunity got cut, but maybe that's a nugget to share in a meeting. (Max agrees).

Deborah believes that part of answer is that we what we do that no one else does. We have the ability to outreach to individual landowners and businesses, and we have the track record of completing successful projects.

Outreach gives people the opportunity to determine their future. We're more like a bottom-up rather than a top-down model. We work one on one with folks, we have the resources to do projects, and our work benefits both the landowners we work with and the watershed as a whole.

Jim adds that we can't do that without their support.

Deborah notes that we realize no one else is doing what we do, and we'd like to ensure our long term stability. Maybe we'd also like to do more.

Jim adds that we're building on a sense of community involvement. Feels that most people below the Fern Ridge Dam know what watershed they live in whereas many people living in the urban area probably don't.

Dana adds that private dollars are responsive versus directive. "We're going to keep the lights on with their donations." You're creating the foundation to support the entire effort.

Jim believes we need to be careful how you say that. They may ask why we need donations when they look at the total sum of our income and not understand the expenses and how grants are project specific.

H. **Paperwork moment** – *Secretary Turner*

Dave collected volunteer match hours forms.

Meeting adjourned at 7:54 p.m. Chair Max Nielsen-Pincus.

Notes prepared by Rob Hoshaw, reviewed by Dana and Dave, and submitted by Dave Turner.