

**Long Tom Watershed Council
Board of Directors Meeting
Thursday, March 6, 2014
Council Office
751 S. Danebo Ave., Eugene, OR 97402**

Present: Mike Brinkley, Steve Cole, Alan Dickman, Sue Kacskos, Beth Krisko, Jim Pendergrass, John Reerslev, Charles Ruff, Deborah Saunders Evans, David Turner (10)

Absent: Cary Hart, Steve Horning, David Ponder, Therese Walch (4)

Staff: Dana Dedrick, Rob Hoshaw, Jason Schmidt

Meeting called to order at 5:35 p.m. by Deborah Saunders Evans, Chair

Roundtable Introductions for new members

Business

A. Approve February 2014 Board Meeting Minutes – *Secretary Walch*

Calls for comments, corrections, or additions. None given.

MOTION TO APPROVE February 2014 Board of Directors Meeting Minutes by J. Pendergrass, seconded by S. Cole Approved unanimously.

B. Approve January 2014 Financial Reports & Cumulative Fiscal Year 2013 Budget vs. Actual Report – *Treasurer Brinkley*

Mike notes that everything seems to be tracking well. On the Balance Sheet, the Total Assets and Total Liabilities & Equity are \$320,592. The Profit & Loss report shows a net income loss of \$3,278 and total expenses of \$28,249. Moving the Net Income forward to the Statement of Cash Flows, we end up with \$216,659 in cash at the end of the period for January 2014.

Jim notes that this is a good month as an example of baseline council operating expenses because there isn't that much implementation work going on. This report indicates the typical payroll, accrual, and what it takes in general to run the organization as a benchmark. Costs will rise substantially higher as we make payments to contractors for restoration work in summer and fall.

Budget v. Actual Report for Fiscal Year 2013 Year End

Dana – talks through the actual vs. budgeted expenses for fiscal year 2013. Reiterates that she brings variances of 10% or \$1,000 or more to the board. For income, we brought in more donations than expected because we ramped up our campaign and set modest goals. Adds that we're about 2 months behind on our taxes because of a personnel calculation mistake from the accountant. Notes that

we didn't actually lose revenue. The reason we received only 73% of planned grant income was due to work timing. For expenses, notes that education and involvement is sometimes an underspent category, with the majority of expenses to this item going towards personnel. We only need to spend this money if we promised to deliver a tour for a restoration project. The most variable line item is typically materials and services, which will often appear underspent one quarter and overspent in another, but it usually all balances out. We're under on our planned payroll expenses because we delayed hiring new staff. Notes that it will be nice to add capacity. We also spent less on trainings and conferences, likely due to staff having less available time. We spent extra on travel and mileage reimbursements, due to paying Cindy to drive to Eugene to help out a bit during her transition, and extra trips to help operate the trap at Monroe. We've also delayed IT expenses such as purchasing a printer, desktop or laptop. Notes that overall, we ended up fine.

MOTION TO APPROVE January 2014 Financial Reports and Fiscal Year 2013 Cumulative Budget vs. Actual Report by S. Kacskos, seconded by D. Turner. Approved unanimously.

C. Committee Reports

1. Resource Development – *David Turner*

Fundraising Leadership Team met recently to discuss plans for this year's campaign and for the March 12 RDC meeting next Wednesday. Will send notes out to RDC members reminding them about the meeting and the agenda.

ACTION ITEM: David Turner will send out a reminder email to RDC members with the RDC Meeting date, time, and agenda.

Opportunity for Casey Woodard to present to the Board – David also mentioned that he and Dana both attended a workshop by Casey Woodard last month. Both thought he did an excellent job, and he stressed relationship building as the key aspect of fundraising. His style makes a lot of sense in terms of the type of organization LTWC is. He was impressed by Dana's questions and seems interested in presenting to our board. Casey could even potentially talk at the April board meeting, which is good timing because of our campaign. Casey will talk about helping people learn how to define their fundraising roles, how to call people, and how to develop relationships. He'd be willing to present for an hour, free of charge.

Deborah hopes Casey's visit will inspire the board and help gear RDC up for the campaign.

David T adds that he and Dana will meet with Casey before the April board meeting to plan the session and tell people what they can be prepared to think about. For example, identify 3 people you would like to talk about the Council to and let them know about our work. This doesn't have to be an ask for money, but it's a chance to build a relationship. Notes that board

members can help a lot with building these relationships and learning about other people's interests. Adds that Casey is part of the Woodard Family Foundation. His first job was fundraising development for Willamette University where his responsibility was to meet as many alumni around the nation as possible. This is how he developed his attitude toward developing relationships. (Board members all seem in favor of having Casey present).

David reiterates our goal of reaching 100% board giving and calls for any board members who haven't given this fiscal year to make a donation prior to Casey Woodard's presentation next month.

Dana adds that the only gift that wouldn't count is if you gave for the annual celebration. If people have a question about their donor history, email Dana or Rob.

David T adds that as a member of the board, it's special to give a stretch donation to the council. The point, though, is reaching 100% board giving, regardless of the amount. **Deborah** adds that it's not just the commitment, but it gives us leverage when we talk to donors so we can say "we have 100% of our board behind us."

2. **Nominating Committee** - *Jim*

Two board members (Steve Cole and Sue) are looking to potentially leave the board. We're looking at possibilities for people to join. Nikos Ridge, the owner of Ninkasi Brewing Co., could possibly join. Nikos was very interested in our urban business outreach grant, and Dana is going to set up an interview with him. Lindsay Reaves is also interested in rejoining the board in the near-term, now that Beth has taken over as the Executive Director at Forests Today & Forever. Invites board members to suggest anyone whom they feel would either be interested in joining the board or has the types of skill sets we're looking for.

D. **Bylaws Update – draft map for incorporating Willamette into boundary** – *Dana*

Deborah prefaces that we talked about the incorporating a portion of the Willamette River into our council boundary at the February meeting

Dana (displays draft map of possible new boundary). Notes that Jed created this map by including each sub-basin, now including Flat Creek through Junction City and east of Monroe. Indicates the current Long Tom watershed boundary, west of Junction City. There is no ridgeline there, so Flat Creek and the Willamette has been a blank space uncovered by a council. The proposal would formally cover our service area up to the Willamette River. The Calapooia Watershed Council would do the same for the Willamette in Linn County, and perhaps McKenzie River Watershed Council would want to do the same south of there. Notes that OWEB is pushing all of these council boundary changes very fast. We don't want to lose sight of the primary goal, which is to offer coverage of the Willamette without cutting it up

into a many council jurisdictions. The Willamette isn't really supposed to have jurisdictional boundaries, but on the other hand, suspects there aren't many farmers or landowners who own property on both sides of the river.

John disagrees, and feels there are quite a few cases where farmers have land on both sides of the River.

Dana – proposes a hatched area in the middle that shows collaboration among councils. For example, if a landowner has a relationship with one of the councils, they can contact that organization, or work with the council that has the capacity. It should be based on relationships, funding, and capacity rather than who has jurisdiction. Dana has proposed these ideas to OWEB and other councils.

Jim feels there is value in a defined geographical boundary that touches the Willamette.

David T asks if we would cover one bank or both. **Dana** – we would try to cover both banks, and we have support from technical experts for that approach because landowners would like to choose who they work with, based on staff, trust, and collaboration. Another reason is our new urban business outreach grant, which is supported by the McKenzie Watershed Council. The relationships would be developed by either LTWC or McKenzie staff, but we'd share one technical person. Notes that we need to share good technical people in order to retain good technical staff because money is a limiting factor.

Jim asks how far we expanded the Amazon boundary. **Dana** – it would incorporate the rest of the urban area of Eugene, except for Springfield. We wanted to capture Delta Ponds too, and now with capacity and funding, we can be a part of conservation efforts there too.

Alan asks if the area that would be served by the Middle Fork Willamette Watershed Council (Mid-Fork) would go below the confluence with the mainstem Willamette? **Dana** notes that none of the other councils sent in a boundary with proposed changes. She's asking other councils to consider taking those other areas. Then the councils could go to the county commissioners together and make our case for serving the entire part of the region's Willamette River. Admits this process has been a bit territorial between the councils.

Jim comments that if Mid-Fork didn't want to claim the section below confluence, we would have a case for serving there because it would form a natural line. **Dana** feels it would be more logical to leave that discussion alone for now.

Process & Next Steps

1. Discuss ideas with other councils and get their input
2. Consider how incorporating the Willamette would fit within our mission statement and if any language changes are needed
3. Present our proposal to the county commissioners

Jim comments that there was a large area that was only served by land trusts, not councils. Increasingly, OWEB is looking to fund councils that have endangered species, and the Long Tom doesn't have many of those. This presents challenges for us to find restoration funding, so the opportunity to serve an area viewed favorably for restoration by funders would be beneficial to the stability of the organization

John feels the proposed boundary changes seem fine. Adds that it seems natural that this area of the Willamette would be served by a watershed council. Unsure about the argument for serving both sides of the river, even if farmers farm on both sides. Feels some folks will just have to work with two different watershed councils. Notes with the county FSAs, landowners have to pick and choose which FSA they work with.

Jim mentions that the landowner would ultimately have the decision about who they want to work with because the main goal is for the project to be successful.

Dana – proposes that the councils on either side of the river overlap slightly, so landowners can choose the best practitioners to work with based on who they like and have an existing relationship with.

Sue asks when the decision is due. **Dana** – OWEB's due date is already passed, though she reiterates they're moving very fast and LTWC was the only one to submit a draft proposal.

Beth asks if the increased grant funding will restrict most of our work to the Willamette. **Dana** – That's a good question. We won't receive more capacity dollars, but we will be able to apply for more restoration funding. **Deborah** feels it will open the door for more partnerships, which is also the general policy direction OWEB is trending towards. Likes the flexibility for a landowner to choose which organization to work with. For the urban area, feels it's a great opportunity to expand our Amazon Creek Initiative to do urban stormwater projects. It increases our resource area for our fundraising efforts.

David T asks if staff has the capacity to take on an increased physical area of responsibility, and if that means we'll decide where we prioritize our work. **Dana** feels the funding landscape is already setting the priorities, and there's a larger pool of grant funds for projects focused on urban, Willamette, and upland restoration. Doesn't feel we'll see as much funding for fisheries in the Long Tom in the near future. Perhaps in 20 years, that changes back.

Beth asks if that will that alienate stakeholders for our fundraising efforts in Upper Long Tom and Elk Creek. **Dana** feels there's merit to the question of how much we can keep going with core riparian and fish passage projects in the heart of our rural areas.

John – feels you could spend a lot of time on projects on the Willamette.

Deborah adds that we'll bring an update to the board later on. Dana will present on what other councils and OWEB has to say. Board seems excited and intrigued by the opportunities for the future with what this could provide.

E. Paperwork Moment

Board members filled out and turned in volunteer match hours forms.

Program Topics

F. Program Presentation – Amazon Creek Initiative Program Update – Jason

Jason gave an overview of the Amazon Creek Initiative program, including the stormwater retrofits projects, a summary of the program's outreach efforts and the new business outreach grant from OWEB, Salmon Safe, and the Latino outreach contract through the EPA to educate landscapers in the Spanish speaking community on ways to reduce pesticide inputs. Jason announced that he is leaving for a job at the Bureau of Environmental Services in Portland later this month.

Mike asks for more information about the Latino outreach program. **Jason** explains that the EPA contacted LTWC about their Urban Waters program, seeking to address outreach to underserved populations. Notes that the program is a contract, not through a grant. The program will translate the info from our water quality sampling data into Spanish, and we're trying to reach a whole new population in an effort to reduce pesticide inputs. Notes that yard care workers don't typically undergo a certification process, so they may not have information about best practices and may appreciate a learning opportunity.

Mike asks what trainings are available. **Jason** – we'll hold trainings and public meetings targeted to the Spanish population to use pesticides more sparingly, and to apply the right dose and quantity at the correct time of year.

Mike asks how outreach efforts went with retailers. **Jason** notes that we found the staff turnover rates at retail businesses are too frequent to have much of an impact. The managers were even totally different, almost on a seasonal basis. With larger stores, the decisions need to be addressed at a much higher level, but to get to those people, there needs to be a market-driven approach. **Mike** feels it makes sense to begin working with people who are actually applying the chemicals. **Dana** adds that for the larger retail stores, Jerry's had the most robust and developed training opportunity for staff.

Beth asked if Jason was responsible for all the outreach and relationship building at the sites where we did projects or talked about doing projects. **Jason** explains that he did most of the outreach, with a few volunteers helping. There were also referrals, such as from Friends of Trees and Bring. **Beth** asks if there is a priority area for projects. **Jason** explains that our priority area is based on the pesticide monitoring data, where impervious surfaces are highest, and proximity to the creek. That priority area is the stretch between Roosevelt & W. 11th Ave. Notes that with our first 2 stormwater retrofit projects, the goal was to get projects on the ground as demo sites to help with the outreach and exposure of the program. First 2 projects – get them in wherever possible to get a demo site going to get the word out.

John asks if we've received funding from the EPA for pesticide program. Adds that the EPA had a program in the late 90s that was the pesticide environmental stewardship program. **Jason** explains that the Pesticide Stewardship Partnership programs are modeled off that EPA program, but are run through DEQ. We're getting the funding for that part of the program through Meyer Memorial Trust. **John** suggests visiting www.epa.gov/pesp as a possible funding source. Notes that the EPA gives out \$500,000 per year for regional grants. Several board members voice their suggestion for looking into this as a funding source.

Deborah notes that from our outreach efforts, we've developed great opportunities and see the Amazon program growing in the future. Feels that it has helped us elevate awareness of LTWC in the urban area. The board congratulates Jason on the success of the Amazon Creek program and his new job.

G. Annual Celebration – Rob

Rob explains that in speaking with Dana about council meeting topics, we noticed a possible Annual Celebration topic that we wanted to bring to the board for further ideas. The speaker would be Tom Hunton, who is well respected and known in both rural and urban areas through his farm, SureCrop Farm Service, Camas Country Mill, and now the new malting facility. We would want to model the event after the 2012 Annual Celebration at the Vets' Club, with a cocktail party feel, a shorter speaker and program, and stations with appetizers. We've identified 2 posters so far this year: ThermoFisher and South Willamette Center programs. (for more info on this idea, see board background).

Deborah would like to see more than 2 posters. Agrees that the 2012 model was very successful. Adds that was the best Annual Meeting she's ever been to.

Jim likes focusing on Tom Hunton as the speaker because there's so much he could talk about.

Charles adds that the "field to table" topic would be a viable focus. Feels the "local" part of this is the story to tell. The story can focus on "local" as within 50 miles. This watershed is really special in what it has to offer with the food grown here and what's available locally. That's not available everywhere. Suggests that we need a tagline.

Beth suggests including a business speaker from one of the stormwater projects. Wonders if it is too much to focus both on the field to table topic and the Amazon Creek program.

Jim adds that we want to bring it all together, but we should blend it somehow.

Charles suggests bringing the new watershed map with the expanded boundary if it's ready by then. Also suggests a map showing where the ingredients tonight are coming from as a fun graphic. **David T** seconds that it would great to have the new boundary map available. **Mike** adds that there's a lot of local beer brewed here. "Ninkasi's Beershed."

Date: Mid-late October.

Venue: Vet's Club would be great again, but there's frequently dancing upstairs. Perhaps Eugene Hilton. WOW Hall could also work at \$30/nonprofits and open catering.

Mike suggests Lewis & Clark catering on MLK as a venue location. It's on the river and has a patio (can hold 70-100 people). \$35 set up fee.

Charles mentioned they might be pricey and not willing to do nonprofit discounts.

Jim does his Dive Club at Amici's at Holiday Inn (it's the convention facility there) on Kruse Way – good AV set up, have a menu, etc..

Charles notes that his favorite place is Sprouts at 3rd and A in Springfield (NedCo took it over and made it an "Incubator Kitchen" and is very reasonably priced. Notes that WOW hall doesn't have food and isn't the greatest for venue space. Wonders if we could rent Cosmic Pizza.

Dana suggests that we could do Sprouts in Springfield next year or after that, when we could announce that area councils are working together and demonstrate that.

ACTION ITEM: Charles & Jim will join the Annual Meeting Team.

Next step: check with Tom Hunton for some dates, then venue, then Charles.

H. Council meeting topics – Rob

Rob explained the four major themes and three targeted program areas of council meetings to the board, per the background info. Idea is to provide a guide when planning future council meetings. Passed out new board & public meeting calendar. Asked board members to submit speaker ideas.

Deborah, Alan like the lamprey meeting idea for April. Local lore opportunity! Announce it in newsletter.

Dana mentions we're looking for a tribal biologist to talk about the cultural significance of lamprey and as a cultural food source.

Kathy Linn heads tribal leadership program, ask Alan. **Dave T** will ask at Natural History Museum.

I. Personnel Opportunities

Deborah notes draft personnel changes and opportunities. No decisions have been made yet. This update is meant to inform the board and get feedback.

Dana mentions that we're in a period of flux, but emphasizes the importance of maintaining our stellar reputation and showing people that the Council remains steady and effective. Quickly summarizes the draft position descriptions included in board packet. Dana's reducing her hours to 30/week, with the plans to add a

development and communications director. Feels the revenue will be there to support a position full time. In the interim, we're looking to hire an Amazon temp to replace Jason for 3 months. The next step after that will be to hire 2 people (Amazon technical specialist and an education & outreach person). We also have a multi-talented operations manager, and we're looking for opportunities where he could take on other roles as well. Notes that restoration team will remain stable. Emphasizes that we have loyal staff that stay a long time. Feels good about this trajectory and estimates we have 1-2 years of funding confirmed for these positions.

Beth asks why Dana is reducing hours. **Dana** explains that she's going to try reducing her hours to about 30/week, primarily for health reasons. Explains that there are opportunities to save money with her working fewer hours and put that cost savings toward the hiring of additional staff. Notes that there may be an opportunity to share outreach and communications staff with another watershed council. Adds the only entirely new positions are a development director and a second position for the Amazon Creek Initiative program. Feels that if we want to make more money through fundraising, we need to work more at it. The only way to do that is to have a dedicated staff for fundraising.

Deborah adds that the positions outlined in the background really represent the full scale of work that needs to be covered. We realized there's a technical component to the Amazon Creek program that needs to be covered by one person. We're still investigating the pieces of Dana's work that could go to another person. We've know that we need a development director, but that's been delayed due to funding uncertainties. Adds that LTWC is also considering sharing grant-funded positions between area councils, and increasing fundraising revenue to help fund a position.

Mike asks for clarification on the 2 positions replacing Jason. **Dana** a stormwater/LID person who is a technical expert and secondly, an education and outreach position. We're looking for water quality as a secondary skill for the technical person. In the interim, we need to hire a temp because there is no staff capacity for pinch hitting until we fill the full time positions. We only need a couple days per week through June or July. That's the person who will transfer the knowledge to the new person and help train him/her.

Beth notes that a development director will cost about 80% of an Executive Director's salary.

Deborah concludes that there will be a later report back to the board and Dana is open to any thoughts or advice.

Reports & Announcements

J. Staff Reports

See agenda packet background.

K. Liaison Reports

None given.

L. Action Items Summary

- David Turner will send out a reminder email to RDC members with the RDC Meeting date, time, and agenda.
- Charles & Jim will join the Annual Meeting Team.

Adjourned at 7:35 p.m. by Chair Deborah Saunders Evans.

Notes prepared by Rob Hoshaw, reviewed by Dana and Therese, and submitted by Therese Walch.

Long Tom Watershed Council
Balance Sheet
As of February 28, 2014

	Feb 28, 14	Jan 31, 14
ASSETS		
Current Assets		
Checking/Savings		
Money Market (PCB)	126,259.66	126,245.13
Checking (PCB)	36,225.90	90,214.16
Petty Cash	200.00	200.00
Total Checking/Savings	162,685.56	216,659.29
Accounts Receivable		
Accounts Receivable	112,932.33	103,932.33
Total Accounts Receivable	112,932.33	103,932.33
Total Current Assets	275,617.89	320,591.62
TOTAL ASSETS	275,617.89	320,591.62
LIABILITIES & EQUITY		
Liabilities		
Current Liabilities		
Credit Cards		
PCB Credit Card	(214.07)	(714.76)
Total Credit Cards	(214.07)	(714.76)
Other Current Liabilities		
Payroll Liabilities		
401K	154.86	154.86
Health Insurance	(162.60)	(162.72)
FWT	(576.00)	(576.00)
SUI	1,193.44	1,193.44
SWT	(396.00)	(396.00)
WBF	(12.47)	(12.47)
Payroll Liabilities - Other	7,699.97	5,133.27
Total Payroll Liabilities	7,901.20	5,334.38
Total Other Current Liabilities	7,901.20	5,334.38
Total Current Liabilities	7,687.13	4,619.62
Total Liabilities	7,687.13	4,619.62
Equity		
Opening Fund Balance	861.91	861.91
Retained Earnings	476,065.39	476,065.39
Net Income	(208,996.54)	(160,955.30)
Total Equity	267,930.76	315,972.00
TOTAL LIABILITIES & EQUITY	275,617.89	320,591.62

9:42 AM
03/24/14

Long Tom Watershed Council
Statement of Cash Flows
February 2014

	<u>Feb 14</u>
OPERATING ACTIVITIES	
Net Income	(48,041.24)
Adjustments to reconcile Net Income to net cash provided by operations:	
Accounts Receivable	(9,000.00)
PCB Credit Card	500.69
Payroll Liabilities	2,566.70
Payroll Liabilities:Health Insurance	0.12
Net cash provided by Operating Activities	<u>(53,973.73)</u>
Net cash increase for period	(53,973.73)
Cash at beginning of period	<u>216,659.29</u>
Cash at end of period	<u><u>162,685.56</u></u>

	<u>Feb 14</u>
Ordinary Income/Expense	
Income	
Grants & Contracts	8,000.00
Donations	
Business League	<u>500.00</u>
Total Donations	500.00
Interest	<u>14.53</u>
Total Income	8,514.53
Expense	
Working Meals	14.50
Contracted Services	
Technical	3,712.50
Construction	1,500.00
Lab Analysis	170.77
Crews	<u>17,595.01</u>
Total Contracted Services	22,978.28
Education & Involvement	47.58
Materials & Services	2,361.12
Payroll Expenses	
Comm Payroll Exp Allocation	0.00
Salaries & Wages	21,167.45
Employee Benefits	3,081.35
Payroll Tax Expense	<u>2,027.26</u>
Total Payroll Expenses	26,276.06
Training/Conferences	125.00
Travel/mileage	
Mileage	<u>347.71</u>
Total Travel/mileage	347.71
Equip-Office	
Rent/repair	<u>94.50</u>
Total Equip-Office	94.50
Risk Management	1,270.00
Professional Services	
Accounting	<u>2,200.00</u>
Total Professional Services	2,200.00
Occupancy	
Internet	17.49
Telephone	<u>129.37</u>
Total Occupancy	146.86
Office Supplies	4.99
Dues & Subscriptions	132.00
Corporate fees	214.00
Postage	12.35
Printing/copying	<u>330.82</u>
Total Expense	<u>56,555.77</u>
Net Ordinary Income	<u>(48,041.24)</u>
Net Income	<u><u>(48,041.24)</u></u>