

**Long Tom Watershed Council
Board of Directors Meeting
Thursday, February 7, 2013
751 S. Danebo Ave., Eugene, OR 97402**

Present: Mike Brinkley, Steve Cole, Sue Kacskos, Beth Krisko, Max Nielsen-Pincus, Jim Pendergrass, David Ponder, Charles Ruff, Chad Stroda, David Turner, Therese Walch (11)

Absent: Cary Hart, Jason Hunton, Deborah Saunders Evans (3)

Staff: Dana Dedrick, Rob Hoshaw (until 6:45), Jason Schmidt (7:00 p.m.)

Meeting called to order at 5:35 p.m. by Chair Jim Pendergrass

Business

A. Approve January 2013 Board of Directors Meeting Minutes – Secretary Cole

Jim asks for any comments, additions, or corrections. None given.

**MOTION TO APPROVE JANUARY 2013 BOARD OF DIRECTORS
MINUTES by D. Ponder, seconded C. Ruff. Approved unanimously.**

**B. Approve December 2012 Financial Reports & Quarter 2 Budget vs. Actual -
Treasurer Brinkley**

Profit & Loss: Total income was \$84,167 and expenses were \$59,737 for a net income of \$24,429 in December.

Balance Sheet: Retained earnings remained the same from November to December at \$406,556. Total liabilities & equities increased from \$251,356 in November to \$270,151 in December. We're still transitioning from Umpqua Bank to Pacific Continental Bank.

Statement of Cash Flows. Cash increased during the period, from \$131,443 in November to \$166,964 in December.

Budget vs. Actual Report for FY13 Quarter 2. Jim notes that 6 months into the fiscal budget, we've undergone a heavy work period. We've spent a lot on contracted services, but when you combine with materials and services, we're tracking well. Notes that Dana has made comments in the right column for how a line item is tracking on actual vs. planned. We're right on target for several line items. Some requests for payments haven't been made yet because we're waiting on permits. We're within 10% of our expenses, so it seems the work is mostly done.

Mike/Therese asks why there's such a big difference between materials and services (we've spent less than planned) than contracted services (we've spent more than planned). **Dana** explains that when you combine those two line items there's very little variance. The two line items are closely related and have a lot to

do with how the grant was written in the original budget. **Jim** notes that in that case, we've really spent about \$265,000 and were planning for about \$269,000. **David** asks if that point argues for making a single line item combining materials & supplies with contracted services in future reports. **Dana** explains that Amanda may have said there was merit to breaking out materials and supplies. We can move money around within those categories. When writing a grant, we're estimating expenses about 2 years out.

Dana notes that when you take July's payroll, which is really payment for time in in for the prior fiscal year, the report's numbers look better.

Mike asks why there is a large difference in total travel mileage. **Dana** – we've asked Cindy to do some contract work for us, and it accounts for Cindy's travel back and forth, as well as Dana's travel to OWEB policy meetings.

Jim notes that overall, we're doing well. We're on track to meet our campaign goal. With the explanation of payroll accrual, we're tracking about \$16-18k under budget. We're in good shape with our revenue, save for being delayed \$90,000 in funding for the Owens Creek project. **Dana** mentions that we can't submit payment requests until we have all the permits in for both projects. Permits will be done in March. By the end of the year, the budget will be balanced.

MOTION TO APPROVE DECEMBER 2012 FINANCIAL REPORTS & FY2013 QUARTER 2 BUDGET VS. ACTUAL by C. Ruff, seconded by T. Walch. Approved unanimously.

C. Elect E.D. (Dana) as Corporate Secretary – Jim

Dana explains that we forgot to include Corporate Secretary in the officer slate that was approved at January's meeting. Electing Dana as Corporate Secretary allows federal IRS and State DOJ documents coming to her at the Council office, and avoids any change in the name of Corporate Secretary.

MOTION TO APPROVE DANA AS CORPORATE SECRETARY FOR THE LONG TOM WATERSHED COUNCIL by S. Cole, seconded by C. Ruff. Approved unanimously.

D. Committee Updates

a). Resource Development – David P. for Deborah

We've started our next wave of asks in the major donor campaign. We're holding a campaign event on March 20. Members of RDC are assigned prospects that will go ask those prospects for meetings to solicit gifts. As we commented on, we're on track to meet our campaign goal. There is also a February 25 event at Ninkasi – Pint Night for a Cause. Ninkasi is donating 25% of all sales that day to LTWC. Staff will be there from 5 – 9 p.m., and Board members are encouraged to come. We're requesting that we get to 100% Board giving. So far, 6 of 15 members have

contributed since last July. Please give what you're comfortable giving – what's good for you and your family. We appreciate what you can do to support us. Further details are in the background.

Jim – asks about the Business League Structure. **David P.** explains that this is a way business contributors can get involved. There is the opportunity for shared marketing through our newsletter and website. Depending on their level of involvement, there are different levels of recognition. There is no budgetary distinction for their gifts – it's combined into the overall campaign goal. Businesses, individuals, and gifts from the annual campaign event all go into the campaign total.

For the March 20th event, we will invite people we've identified that have given in the past are targeted as prospects. The event will be similar to the last year's at Territorial's tasting room. The goal is to provide an intimate, informal setting, introduce them to the work of the Council and build familiarity with the work that we do. The idea is not necessarily for them to give at the event, but rather to have an insider experience to the Council. We want to impress them.

Question of expected attendees. 80 people is a good goal, but with the room at the Hilton, we could go as high as 100.

Dana notes that last time we got a really high attendance rate at Territorial. This year we'll be at the Hilton. All Board members are invited and encouraged to come!

David P. adds that it's important for Board members to say why the work of the Council is so important.

Jim asks if there will be a video again this year. Possibly, but it's not a focus.

Charles recommends bringing our own AV equipment. **Dana** thanks Charles for his connections in getting LTWC the room at the Hilton.

Theme selected? None yet. **Jim/Charles** note that the Hilton overlooks Amazon Creek, and they feel that's a good theme. There's the possibility of a good sunset. We'll just miss daylight savings time, but there still may be some light that evening.

Dana notes that last time we had several maps laid out with landowners looking at them. Art Johnson also showed some lovely photos of his property. **Jim** adds that it would be cool to have a big map of the Amazon because you could look out the window and identify where you are. **Charles** adds that windows can look either north or south – it's our choice. (South seems the preferred consensus).

Dana notes that Derek Johnson & Tom Hunton are co-hosts. Derek is the son of Art & Anita Johnson, and Tom Hunton is Jason Hunton's dad. We're switching up the family roles a bit this year. Last year, Jason & Art spoke.

Jim reiterates the importance of 100% Board Giving. It's not about how much, it's about helping out the organization and saying that we have 100% of our Board members giving in some capacity. Give whatever amount you're comfortable with.

b). Amazon Outreach & Communication Team – meeting tomorrow morning to talk with Dave Funk about ideas for a marketing and communications strategy.

c). Tech Team & Rural Landowner Outreach meet at the end of the month.

Therese asks for more info about the Rural Landowner Outreach Team. **Dana** explains that we have been funded to do a big outreach push in both Bear Creek and along the Willamette. We're going to use this committee to get advice from Board members on how to approach landowners in these areas – whatever comes to their minds. Who do they know? Do they have knowledge of names or information about people? Do they recommend a certain way to approach people?

Therese mentions that she feels it's logical to reach out to the Junction City Water Control District. **Dana** adds that we could go to them with Amazon Creek Initiative project updates. **Chad** notes that folks on the Junction City Water Control District Board are interested in finding out about Amazon Creek. **Dana** adds that we'll get the next set of data in this year, and we'll sit down with SureCrop. Chad knows a lot of people on the Board of the JC Water Control District. **Therese** adds that the City of Eugene manages and maintains the ditches at the airport. The Airport Division staff may be interested in hearing about the Amazon Creek project too.

d). Operations Committee – will meet after the project tracking matrix is finished.

Jim asks for any other questions? None. Adds that if there is anyone who is not on a committee who would like to be on one, there's always an opportunity.

E. Paperwork Moment – *Secretary Cole*

Collected Board volunteer match hours forms.

Added agenda item:

Miscellaneous Updates from last meeting - *Dana*

Update on 401k question form last time concerning an employee wanting to withdraw from 401k account. Our contract does not allow any withdrawals, and employees acknowledge that when they sign and enter into the 401k plan. The plan trustee is Jim, with Tony as a secondary. Jim and Dana are the ones who make the decisions. Monique Ripley at Morgan Stanley-Smith Barney (our plan advisor), Jim, and Dana all feel that withdrawals are not a good policy. Notes that our plan is being transferred to a new company, as the Hartford was bought out, but the contract will transfer over. If we want to change how the agreements are written, it

would probably cost too much. We don't allow payroll advances or 401k withdrawals. Fortunately, the employee figured out a different solution. **David P.** asks if there is a Roth version of the 401k plan. In that case, you may be able to borrow against it. **Jim** – the way he understands it, the investments under the new company should be similar to what we currently have. It costs \$400-500 to add a provision to the contract, and we haven't explored the idea of adding a Roth or IRA yet. We felt when we set the plan up that a straight 401k was the best way to go. Feels that 401ks are better than IRAs. Jim will ask Monique about those options when he sees her.

Dana – a copy of the financial review was requested during the last meeting. It's here and available. The CPA's found that our finances are in order to the extent they can find. Everything is in order for as deep as they dug. They don't go down to the individual receipt level during a review. They look for red flags at a coarser level. The price tag on the review was \$4,500 plus \$750 for preparing our taxes. We've used the same firm for a few years now (Mueller Larson Osterman Yuma, LLP). Amanda keeps the cost down because she has a lot of experience with this and knows which questions to ask. She's very efficient for us and doesn't take much of the reviewer's time. **Jim** adds that a full audit would cost closer to \$10-12k. **Charles** asks for clarification on what is meant by avoiding incurring the cost of an audit. **Dana** – we initially decided that we wanted to do an audit every 5 years, but she found that other nonprofits don't do audits that often, however. We rethought the idea. **Jim** adds that with repeated clean reviews, we don't feel a pressing need to do an audit. A situation that may present a good opportunity to do an audit would be if either Amanda or Dana happened to leave.

Dana passed around Board skills profile. Asks people to glance at it and make sure that it looks good from their perspective. Also has Board topics list for the year.

Program Topics

F. Debrief Monroe Public Meeting & Mini Slideshow – Rob

Rob gave a brief overview of the speakers and attendees during January 29's Public Meeting on local fish in Monroe. About 25 people attended, with a good mix of landowners, volunteers, Board members, McKenzie Fly Fishers, agency people, and new members. Karen Hans and Brian Bangs spoke about the Cutthroat Trout Migration Study and lamprey, and Oregon Chub, respectively. Jed talked about the types of restoration projects LTWC does to improve fish habitat, and gave a few tips for simple ways that landowners could improve habitat for fish on their stream.

Rob then gave a brief slideshow of recent photos from the Cutthroat Migration Study, including of two 12" + fish caught in Rattlesnake Creek at Diamond Woods. We're catching some of the largest fish of the entire study in this small tributary to the Long Tom just south of its confluence with the Willamette.

Mike felt that the most interesting fact from the public meeting was that lampreys live for 5-7 years in the bottom of the stream. He felt that Karen's lamprey talk was very interesting. Lampreys are fascinating and evolutionarily very old. **Dana** adds that lampreys were the number one species of cultural significance for Native Americans.

David P asks if we capture the names of people who attend a meeting in such a way where we ask for a donation (e.g. thank you card, postcard). Feels it's an easy way to build a list. Idea is that it's an immediate response. (e.g. "Thank you for attending. Please consider donating.")

Steve was impressed that we continually keep getting new people, and noted that the sign in sheet showed 6 first time attendees.

Jim notes that the last Meeting in Monroe only had about 9 people (thinking of the last meeting at the Monroe library). The forestry meeting in March 2011 had a good turnout.

Dana notes that we need co-hosts for the upcoming public meeting on March 19. It will focus on Amazon Creek stormwater improvement and the project on South Willamette St. We can also likely announce the DEQ grant at that time.

Therese asks if there is any venue closer to the project than Petersen Barn. **Dana** – yes, we want to have a project tour of the project site at South Willamette with other key business owners.

Action Item: Sue will co-host March 19 public meeting. (Dana still looking for a 2nd co-host)

G. Upcoming Events

Dana asked if anyone had questions about the events. Dana said that she's announcing the Ninkasi event on Feb 25 as having board and staff folks there so let her know when you can come between 5-m and 9pm and she'll make sure we have coverage for the evening. Your role is to tell stories and enjoy getting to know people, telling them about the Long Tom Watershed Council and why it's important to you. Same for the March 20 campaign event – talk with people, build relationships. Board members with prospects will be focusing on those folks. David T mentioned that all Board members would have some prospects; Charles seconded that that would be a good idea if it isn't already the case. All Board members are encouraged to come to the March 20 event at the Hilton.

H. Updates and Discussion around Restoration Grant Programs & Policy – Dana

Dana provided an oral update as follows.

Notes that this is turning out to be a very busy time for statewide policy and she wants to update the Board on what she's hearing and saying on behalf of the Council. **Max, Deborah & Jim** have been the involved Board members. Bottom line: OWEB now has "permanent" funding, but less than before for now due to

economy. They're proposing major changes to their grant programs. A complicating factor is newer staff in charge (Meta, Lauri). Some people feel we're losing the heart of the movement with Ken Bierly's retirement, and moving toward an OWEB Board where one of the longer tenured members has served 2 years. Also adds that our new grant program manager for partnerships will be our Willamette rep, which means we'll have a new one of those.

1. **Council Support Policy testimony.** Pointed out that:

- performance needed to be recognized, that
- communities that have responded to Oregon Plan at this point are the key communities,
- focus on effectiveness not efficiency,
- justification for 60 councils (vs 89),
- cover the state with no ecological prioritization and by absorbing councils,
- west side justified in more funds.
- process has been rough, please move forward with data/participation, watershed complexity (biological and social), performance and effectiveness.

2. **Long Term Investment Strategy testimony.** Key point: where is evaluation of Soil & Water Conservation Districts?; also native species (not endangered species) affects science and conservation so where is technical evaluation?

- OWEB proposal to cap the open grant program and shift funds to prioritized areas/issues and partnerships/leverage (could translate to ESA and/or to matching agency priorities, and/or to pulses of investment around state leaving others dry).
- New funding calls for outreach leading to projects vs education – this is good and bad and OWEB board wants to work around it.
- Moving fast – all decided by June

3. **Related, Willamette SIP (Special Investment Partnership)** (focused pot of funds)

- Asking all organizations to get together and summarize accomplishments (within 2 weeks - done), and then in 6 more weeks collaboratively identify needs for 6 years and define ecological priorities and geographic areas. That's over 20 orgs from here to Portland and a rushed timeline.
 - Notes that these organizations have friendly people, but we have always quietly competed. It's very awkward to all of a sudden collaborate. Dana will be trying to emphasize 1) organizational

stability and that 2) conservation should stay proactive, not slip back to “priority species”

- Completely unclear how much to prioritize for SIP (Special Investment Partnership) dollars because anything for SIP is then ineligible for the rest but we don’t know how much funding will go to SIP and it is for our Model Watershed Program and mainstem Willamette. Huge uncertainty and brand new “collaboration” among competing orgs.
- Unclear how much to focus on detailed projects (by Sept) vs broad

4. Next Steps

- Send testimony to Courtney (last name?) and meet with her; try to influence OWEB further in a logical outcome (now)
- Long term investment start listening session – Feb 21, 1pm Salem
- Develop our project list and focus areas for Willamette funding discussion – by Feb 21 also; final revisions March
- Attend all OWEB board meetings and testify (March 12, 13, June Pendleton, Sept Burns, more)
- What else?
- Who wants to be involved?

David P asked how the Board could help at this time. He suggested that Board members are really the people who could speak up about the LTWC with OWEB Board members, legislators, and county commissioners if Dana thinks that would help. **Dana** said she was trying to figure out the paths of influence in and around OWEB currently and it’s hard to have the time. Jim is working with OWEB as the Network Interim Director and will know about bills. **Therese** mentioned to let her know as soon as possible if there are bills of interest because the City of Eugene has a legislative affairs person that can review items that might be of City interest. **Chad** mentioned that if ESA species become more of a focus, LTWC has the Dusky Canada Goose and others in wetlands and prairies that would rank highly for projects. He knows of some specific locations in the watershed. **Dana** will ask him to describe to a Restoration Team member.

Reports & Announcements

I. Staff Reports

Jim welcomed comments on things listed in the Agenda background.

Jason S. reported on the two grants being submitted for the Amazon Creek Initiative this month and next, and that the DEQ one is more secure at this point in the process. **Dana** thanked Therese for writing a letter of support on short notice. **Beth** recommended focusing on Marketing and Communications students for the Amazon internship.

David P, Max, and **Beth** identified as frequent users of Facebook when Dana queried.

Mike was curious if the Deck Cooperative Landowner Agreement would be in regards to the revegetation of the site that had poor riparian plant growth.

J. Board Member Reports

None given.

K. Action Items Summary

Sue will co-host March 19 public meeting

Meeting adjourned at 7:32 p.m. by Chair Jim Pendergrass

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