

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

Present: Steve Cole, Cary Hart, Max Nielsen-Pincus (5:40), Jim Pendergrass, Charles Ruff, Deborah Saunders Evans (5:45), David Turner, Therese Walch (8)

Absent: Mike Brinkley, Jason Hunton, Sue Kacskos, Beth Krisko, David Ponder, Chad Stroda (6)

Staff: Dana Dedrick, Rob Hoshaw, Jed Kaul

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

Business

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

Jim asks for any comments, questions, or changes:

Therese has 2 corrections on page 4:

- Change “is” to “are” where Chad mentions the Junction City Water Control Board.
- Where Therese talks about the Eugene Airport, she meant the Airport Division Staff, not the Airport Board.

MOTION TO APPROVE FEBRUARY 2013 BOARD OF DIRECTORS MINUTES with the suggested changes by C. Ruff, seconded by T. Walch. Approved unanimously.

B. Approve January 2013 Financial Reports – Jim for Treasurer Brinkley

Notes that January was a month without much work happening yet. We received about \$75,000 in grants for about 10 projects. The largest deposit was \$17,000 for the Coyote, Bear & Ferguson Creek restoration projects. Other projects with grant funding deposits in January included the Lomatium prairie restoration project north of Fern Ridge, the BLM Resource Advisory Committee grant that funds fish passage projects, the EPA Amazon Creek education grant, the BLM grant that funds ground water testing and sampling in the West Eugene Wetlands, and Council Support. We also received funding for small grants totally \$14,000. Notes that some of the money is reimbursement for expenses already incurred. This explains in part why cash went up.

Dana notes that the Balance Sheet shows about \$400,000 in retained earnings, which reflects full equity (our reserves plus all prepaid grants). Adds to what Jim was saying about grant reimbursements. Some funders give us the entire grant up front and are prepaid. OWEB will only prepay advances every 120 days. Sometimes

we spend past the money that was advanced from OWEB and they reimburse us the rest.

MOTION TO APPROVE JANUARY 2013 FINANCIAL REPORTS by C. Ruff, seconded by D. Saunders Evans. Approved unanimously.

C. Committee Updates

a). Resource Development –Deborah

Deborah has contacted board members who haven't donated yet this fiscal year, and those people have agreed to donate. Notes that we should achieve 100% board giving within a week.

Update on Individual Asks

Charles notes that he will have appointments to meet with most of his prospects, and **Deborah** has contacted her prospects. **Dana** had a great meeting with Art Johnson. He has a book called *Flying Ace* about his uncle who was renowned as one of the best World War 2 fighter pilots. The Johnsons made a \$1,500 lead gift. Adds that Art's son, Derek, is co-hosting the March 20 event with Tom Hunton. Art encouraged us to get a good donation from Derek and his wife, Lynette.

David T. adds that Derek has experience asking for money at fundraising events and feels comfortable. He has an appointment with Dana to ask Derek for a donation and talk about hosting the meeting.

Dana notes that fundraising is very big for us when we can't pay for things like outreach through grants. In terms of doing restoration projects, the easiest landowners to get involved have already been contacted and so outreach takes more time now. We also need more like 3 grants to pay for one project rather than just one grant as in the past; this increases the time staff spends grant-writing. Fundraising helps us feel more solid that we have a long-term plan.

b). Tech Team – Jed

Jed explains that there were two recent Tech Team meetings. The first on Feb 26 centered on landowner outreach in Bear Creek and how to prioritize contacting those landowners. Jed & Katie received excellent feedback on other factors in prioritization, and some people had notes about talking with specific landowners. They also presented a couple OWEB grant proposals – one for a fish passage project on Bear Creek in the coyote Creek sub-watershed. This would be a partnership between Lane County and the BLM to provide fish passage. The project was generally supported by Tech Team and seemed like a

high priority project. Jed is currently working with the landowner to prioritize a plan for that project. The second grant is on a property near the intersection of Hamm and Territorial roads. This landowner had previously worked with two other watershed councils. Mainstem Coyote Creek flows through the property, and the channel is very incised; it is 20 feet from the stream to the top of the bank in some places. There is the potential to restore oak savanna and wetland habitat too. This property is adjacent to Giustina Land & Timber property, and Cary is familiar with it. He had great insight about the property. A few Tech Team members are going to the site with Katie this spring to evaluate its potential.

The second Tech Team meeting was held on March 4 and focused on how to prioritize landowners for the Willamette Outreach Project and strategies for contacting them. The meeting also discussed the U.S. Army Corps work on the Lower Long Tom. There is the potential for fish passage projects at the drop structures, and the Corps seems interested. They will face maintenance issues on the Lower Long Tom in the next few years (such as losing capacity due to flooding and erosion). We'd like to work with them toward increasing channel capacity rather than another solution, which would be to cut back a lot of the willows. Notes that dredging is off the table as an option because they're not able to get a permit for that. The Corps is excited and encouraged by the Council. They're impressed by all the partnerships we bring.

Discussion

Jim asks how far north we'll do outreach along the Willamette and will we do it on both sides of the river? **Jed/Dana** – just north of Norwood Island. We'll focus on the west bank, and projects on the east side depend on the project proposed and the landowner involved. There may be some natural ways to work over there.

Dana adds that Tech Team made multiple excellent comments for Willamette prioritization. The biggest lesson of note early on is that the timeline for Willamette restoration needs to be longer than in Bear & Ferguson Creeks because there are so many dynamics to pay attention to on such a big river – you can't make mistakes as easily due to big-river-size consequences, landowners generally have long views and history out there and remember approaches and mistakes, and finally, landowners are already stressed by the river and farming next to it, so the expectation needs to be patient, practical, and take a long-view approach.

Max asks what types of projects we'd focus on. **Dana** – the focus is hydrologic complexity, such as reconnecting side channels and revegetating floodplain forest.

Cary asks if there was a Willamette Initiative by Gov. Kulongoski. **Dana** notes that the "Three R" initiative seemed a political effort that eventually morphed and focused into related existing efforts that were already bearing fruit.

Jim notes that there are great side channel reconnection opportunities. **Max** adds that OPB Field Guide series ran an episode about the Willamette River that would be fascinating to people.

Action Item: Dana will forward the OPB Field Guide link to the board about the Willamette River.

David T. asks where the drop structures are. **Jed** – there are 3 (at the Long Tom and Ferguson confluence, at Stroda Brothers Farm, and in Monroe). These were installed in the 40s. At Monroe, adult cutthroat are able to move up the fish ladder, but we've never gotten a salmon in the fish trap there. The focus for the Lower Long Tom is allowing access for juvenile spring Chinook where they can use the Long Tom as nursery habitat.

Dana notes that Kendra Smith from the Bonneville Environmental Foundation has been reading research documenting the Long Tom River as a nursery for juvenile Chinook and other salmonids. With climate change, the ability to expand their range into these other improved habitats like what we've been doing in the Long Tom is going to be very important. It may not matter whether or not they used the Long Tom historically, or how far they moved upstream previously.

While fish can't currently get past the Stroda or Ferguson drop structures, they can access the historic Long Tom channel and move upstream that way – over by the Cox Butte area where we fixed fish passage several years ago.

Notes that if the U.S. Army Corps can open up those structures, there's not just the 26 miles of the Long Tom itself, but all the habitat we've been working on in Bear & Ferguson Creeks. Dana was impressed that even a Colonel came down for the U.S. Army Corps field tour of the Long Tom, along with 25 total Army Corps staff, including many program heads, project managers from other projects (e.g. John Day, Rogue), legal and budget departments.

Cary asks how much of the Lower Long Tom is now available. **Jed** there are about 10 miles north of Monroe that juvenile Chinook can access. The drop structure in Monroe is about 8 feet high and its function is primarily to provide

grade control for velocities and make sure the channel doesn't scour itself out. One of the fish biologists suggested taking these drop structures out and asked if they are really necessary? One alternative may be to stretch out a structure over a gradual incline. Jed worries about juvenile fish using even the best designed fish ladder.

Jim asks if there is an implementation timeline for the structure at Stroda's. **Jed** notes that we haven't applied for implementation funding, although there has been some design work done. With the interest from the Army Corps, it's encouraging, and we may see movement soon.

Therese asks what prompted 25 members of the Army Corps to visit our watershed. **Dana** – it was part of an "Operations Project Review", and this is the first time they included some NGO partners, chiefly because of the Council's stellar reputation and our work in the area and partnership with the Corps. It was also impressive that a Tribe and our other partners were present too. The meeting was about sharing science and ideas. Tony Stroda was also there and involved in the options discussion. Adds that the Army Corps feels they have an obligation toward salmon and habitat. Lane County is growing and building in floodplain areas, and there are going to be issues about floodplain activity and water movement that arise. If we can all plan and work together and organize where water can go in a structured way, it's a win-win situation. We are now documenting where we've gotten to by drafting a joint "white paper" together, which would go through both Tech Team review and the local Army Corps district review.

Jim asks if this is a project that the Army Corps could fund entirely. **Dana** notes that the funding potential is complicated, but there are several possibilities through Army Corps operations, maintenance, or similar type funds.

Therese/Max both felt like 25 people from the Corps in attendance is a sign that there is already some investment in the project.

Deborah asks if we have ever surveyed the stream that runs through Diamond Woods. **Dana** – yes, we have fish trap in Rattlesnake Creek on Diamond Woods now. **Deborah** – heard from her daughter that cutthroat trout were found on the golf course. She recommends contacting Jeff Doyle, the General Manager, to talk about the implications of trout on the golf course.

D. Legislation Pending & OWEB Policy Updates – Dana & Jim

Dana presented 3 legislative updates

- 1) **Wetlands / Farm Bureau HB2516:** Notes that any wetland payment to a farmer is limited to 5% of market value. The reasoning is a claim that wetlands threaten farms and increase cost of farming. Dana wrote some of our watershed farmers and asked what they knew about this if they supported it. They said that they didn't understand the concerns the Farm Bureau raised, and they don't want a 5% limit but prefer market valuation. Dana shared those comments with both the City of Eugene and the other farmers. The City also sent in something in opposition (we did not). The Network of Oregon Watershed Councils testified that this restriction would make restoration work tougher and more expensive. **Jim** adds that he feels this would unnecessarily complicate restoration, and Ryan Ruggiero at MRT felt this bill wouldn't go through.
- 2) **OWEB funding to outdoor education schools.** Dana feels that while helping outdoor school is a laudable goal, it doesn't mean it's the highest priority effort, and importantly, the bill attempts an end-run around the competitive grant process. **Jim/Dana** – capacity exists to provide education through the councils. Normally we don't get involved in these kinds of things. But when it gets involved with our ability to access restoration funds, we do. **Jim** – council directors with their own education programs talked about their own experience. Have to be careful not to speak poorly of education of course.
- 3) **OWEB budget is going up for hearing on Monday, 3/18.** Dana is not attending but may write up testimony. Passed out printed summary.

Discussion of Legislative Topics

Therese asks what organization sponsored HB2516. **Dana** - Gray Family Foundation. John Gray, who is on the Gray Family board, has ties to the watershed. He is Jack Gray's father (Jack is a project landowner in Elk Creek). **Dana** feels the bill would violate the passing of Measure 76. Asserts that the turnaround time to see results from outdoor schools in relation to conservation impacts isn't the same as it is for restoration activities. Understands that education has had a difficult time with current budgets, class sizes, and the down economy. Would be interested in hearing Jack Gray's perspective.

Max/Jim note that education has a strong constituency of support. **Cary** notes that many parents likely remember having a great experience in outdoor school and what their kids to have a similar positive experience.

Dana notes that 50% of the state's general fund goes to education while natural resources are only 1%. **Max** feels that while the goal of HB2516 is good, the mechanism for helping outdoor schools is misguided.

Dana's Notes on other OWEB grant programs:

- **Special Investment Partnership (SIP) funds.** These funds for the Willamette councils will remain steady for the next couple years then

transition to something else. This grant program pairs with Meyer Memorial Trust funds. They decided to stick with the current plan for now, after considering an abrupt change.

- **Council Support.** Dana provided points against combining LTWC with 3 other councils, part of a plan that would reduce the total watershed council number to 45 from 89 (Dana testified for 60 councils as that plays out geographically in more alignment with what has formed naturally, but also limits the super small ones). Notes that Max is on the working group and will know more in April or May.
- **Long term investment strategy.** Notes that there is a hearing in Salem. The idea presented is an open grant program with decreasing funds available through the solicitation of applications, with a “focused” investment fund that the OWEB board prioritizes and continues to increase. Suggested saving monitoring funds for areas where we can’t quite figure out what to do with ecosystems we haven’t quite figured out questions for (e.g. don’t provide as much monitoring money to prove that planting trees provides shade and lower temperatures because there is research on that). The questions are what are the worthy areas that belong in the funding pot and whether there is going to be open solicitation for these areas.

Additional Discussion on Legislative Topics

Deborah asks if OWEB is still planning on reducing the number of councils.

Dana - Yes, the plan is still to consolidate or at least lower the number.

Underperforming or councils applying for new status would likely be cut/not allowed to officially form. **Jim** clarifies that a watershed council can form, however it wouldn’t automatically get approved for funding. **Dana** adds that OWEB will likely correct the codes for council incorporation. Rulemaking will begin on July 1 and Jim, Deborah, and Max have been involved if others would like to ask either of them questions.

Jim/Max offer that a staff report could be forwarded to the Board next week.

Max would be happy to forward one from the Council Support Working Group.

Cary asks if LTWC normally takes a position on an issue. **Dana** - usually not, although we do for OWEB because it directly impacts watershed councils. Notes that she represents the Council and works with Board members as they are interested.

Max notes that the initial proposal included reducing the number of watershed councils from 90-some to 60-some. They used a hydrologic “HUC” boundaries that lumped a lot of high performing councils together that would all have to share a piece of the funding pie.

Dana feels that a watershed council should be able to demonstrate a high diversity of involvement, use a science-based approach, impressive productivity, and meet fiscal standards.

E. Paperwork Moment – Secretary Cole

Collected Board volunteer match hours forms.

Program Topics

F. Upcoming Events – All

March 19 Public Meeting

Time & Place: Amazon Community Center, 27th Ave & Hilyard St. (6:00 p.m., 5:30 Board)

Dana thanks Therese for helping Jason make a good meeting agenda. Speakers will include business owner Melisa Nicol, who spoke at the Annual Meeting, landscaper Holde Fink, in addition to Therese and Jason. Topics will include Trout Friendly Landscapes, stormwater retrofit projects, and an overview of the Amazon Creek Initiative.

Max notes that he talked with Melisa yesterday and feels she's a great spokesperson for the Council because she is so excited about the work going on at the Davis Properties site.

Dana notes that we've had problems getting press for the project on South Willamette. We'd like to get articles in the paper to provide press for the businesses. **Deborah** suggests contacting local television stations. **Dana** adds that businesses really like exposure for their investment.

Deborah notes that we had a good turnout last year. **Therese** – thinks the location at Amazon Community Center is a little more centralized than at Petersen Barn. **Jim** asks about special outreach. **Dana** explains that we've had a volunteer deliver postcards and flyers to local businesses in the area. Jason has distributed to local several local businesses and business associations so they can post the meeting information on their respective list serves.

Deborah asks if we have funding to start any more projects this year. **Dana** - We have 4: 1 is done (at South Willamette), another is about to start, we'll start a third later, and we're trying to figure out the scope of a potential project at Mountain Rose Herbs. We came up with the idea of tiered match rather than a 1:1 match for funds provided by the City. This will allow us to spread the money a little better and feels we'll have a lot of demand for these types of stormwater projects. The City of

Eugene has made no commitment to further funding, but if our demand for projects exceeds the capital funds, they could consider giving us an additional capital match.

Deborah adds that someone at Montessori school asked about the stormwater projects, especially in regards to drainage issues. They're currently working with the UO landscape architecture group and wonders if they would fit into the project program through LTWC. Directed them to contact Jason Schmidt.

March 20 Campaign Event

Jim - We could use more RSVPs for the event. Adds that 3 of his contacts are coming. **Deborah** has spoken to 4 people and only one person said they are coming for sure. Notes that we had a large turnout last year. **Dana** feels that many people will wait until the deadline to register. We're starting a round of calls this upcoming week to encourage folks to come. Unofficial last date is Friday, 3/15. Volunteers will help Dana and Rob make the calls.

David T. cautions against calling people twice by mistake. **Dana** encourages the Board to let her know if they have received a confirmed RSVP from an invitee. Asks for Board members who are going to attend (Steve, Jim, Deborah, Charles, David Turner, and maybe Therese).

David T. adds that everyone invited is targeted to give \$250 or more. An ask will be made that night to let them know that they can give there. The goal for the campaign is about \$20,000. Feels the two hosts will do a great job. Tom Hunton is very eager about his involvement. The other co-host is Derek Johnson, who is on the Board of the Lane County Arts Center. He's going to make a pitch for us. **Deborah** adds that invitations went out under the return addresses of either of the two hosts.

David T talks about resources to bring as good conversation pieces. Bringing projects map, good photographs, but maybe not Annual Meeting posters or thermometer about fundraising. Asks for thoughts.

Deborah is not familiar with space. **Charles** explains that it's a big open space with windows facing south. Should plan on having easels. Thinks it's helpful to have a large map that shows the watershed itself. Most people think the watershed is "out there" not in much of Eugene. More of a milling event, rather than seating. Maybe some stations, some short and small bistro tables with chairs for people who need to sit. Will bring projector and screen and/or laptop with slideshow.

Deborah is concerned about being selective about what we bring. Is important to have some references. Feels visual slideshow got lost in the back of the room. But a slideshow is cool if it's on the wall rather than on a computer. **Charles** – long wall could do a slideshow. We would bring our own equipment. **Jim** – thinks a bigger

screen is better. **David T.** adds that we could separate the slideshow and general milling areas. **Charles** adds that we could even have some seats by presentation.

Deborah suggests having some of the fundraising packets available. **David T.** Suggests picking out about 2-4 project or program comments to bring to talk about. Feels if it's a big room we want to have a lot of activity. **Jim** feels 2 or 3 things cause people to congregate and starts conversation, while 7 or 8 things requires Board and staff at each station to facilitate the conversation. Felt the one map at the Ninjas Pint Night was a great place to naturally attract people. Feels the slideshow really augment the map.

Dana feels that the substance really comes from hosts. Summarizes the recommendations that we're really trying to provide a few quality resources such as photos and a good poster/map. Want to get people emotionally connected.

Charles suggests that the slideshow or flyover could stand alone and doesn't need attention. Several people note that they're not keen on project posters because there is too much text for this event.

Deborah – RDC is going to want time to seek out their contacts. We need to have that ambient time. The event last year was great because of all the spontaneous, dynamic conversations among people.

Charles notes that we won't have AV sound. Hosts will need to speak loudly and enunciate because we don't have a microphone. It's a big expense.

G. Slideshow on Restoration Projects Recently Completed & In Progress - Jed

Jed presented on the in-stream and riparian restoration work done this past summer. Significant work was done in Ferguson Creek at Trey & Tammie Hagen's, Jim & Maria Bradshaw's, and Andy & Maryrae Thomson's. Work was also done at the Barrow family's property on Owens Creek. Notably, LTWC placed 250 logs in over 3.5 miles of stream, removed or replaced 5 fish passage barriers, and maintained 70,000 native plants that were put in the ground last year. This year, we're putting in 80,000 plants on 40 acres of land.

There was discussion and several questions during and after the presentation, and Jed responded to those questions.

Reports & Announcements

H. Staff Reports

In background.

I. **Board Member Reports**

None given.

J. **Action Items Summary**

- Dana will forward the link to the OPB piece on the Willamette River.

Meeting adjourned at 7:26 p.m. by Chair Jim Pendergrass

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