

**Long Tom Watershed Council  
Board of Directors Meeting  
Thursday, November 3, 2011  
751 S. Danebo Ave., Eugene, OR 97402**

Present: Mike Brinkley, Sue Kacskos, Beth Krisko, Max Nielsen-Pincus, Jim Pendergrass, David Ponder, Lindsay Reaves, Deborah Saunders Evans, Chad Stroda, David Turner, Therese Walch (11)

Absent: Steve Cole, Jason Hunton, Charles Ruff (3)

Guests: Dolly Woolley and Ronnel Curry

Staff: Dana Dedrick, Rob Hoshaw, Cindy Thieman

Meeting called to order at 5:28 p.m. by Chair Max Nielsen-Pincus

**Roundtable with Special Guests – Dolly Woolley and Ronnel Curry**

A. **Roundtable with Development Consultants** – *Dolly Woolley & Ronnel Curry*

**Dana** – The Council and the consultants have agreed to a contract and scope of work. Introduces Dolly and Ronnel; both have a wealth of experience in resource development & fundraising, including natural resources fundraising. Having both of their perspectives is going to be a huge benefit for us.

**Ronnel** has been the Executive Director for Springfield Education Foundation for about two years and met Dolly at Friends of Buford Park. Dolly & her husband were co-chairs of advisory council for FoBP's fundraising work when Ronnel was their Development Director.

*Dolly & Ronnel's question to the Board: What benefits have you seen from the Council's work? What's its utility from your perspective? What would happen if the Council was no longer here? (Will base feedback and comments on building a case statement for why people should give to the Council).*

**Deborah** – This is her 3<sup>rd</sup> year on the Board, and she's followed LTWC since it formed in 1998, when she worked for the City of Eugene. The watershed concept was attractive to her because it involved people working *with* others, and was not regulatory in nature. Councils weren't created to tell people how to do something and how much money they should spend. Emphasis is on people within a community; involves people who have a variety of interests & skills and are willing to come together—involves anyone who's interested in and cares about the watershed. LTWC brings people together to accomplish projects that improve water quality and natural resources quality, but also achieves what the landowner wants to do with his or her own operations on site. We've been tremendously successful at that, and we now have a 15-year history. Feels that a "watershed" is a new concept

for a “neighborhood.” All of us have the best interest of the watershed at heart. The Council is really neighbors working with neighbors. To date, we’ve filled a niche in rural areas where they didn’t previously have that support. The Council has the capacity to do things regulatory agencies can’t do. If we went away, there would be a big gap—and this type of work would have fewer supporters in farm, forestry, and industrial community.

**Sue** owns a 24-acre farm by the Crow High School and raises chickens & goats. She connected with LTWC in hope that we could help her with creek restoration. She first got involved as a culvert survey participant, and is happy to see a lot of good work is being done as a result of that study. She’s attracted to educating the public about watershed issues and feels we do that in an understandable way. We’re an inclusive organization and work quietly to get things done. We’ve been effective at getting grant money over the years. Mentions that at the last Education & Involvement Committee meeting, one of the discussion topics was focusing on people who owned smaller parcels of land and providing information for what they can do to improve habitat on their own.

**Beth** is new to the LTWC Board and Eugene and lives across Amazon Creek in South Eugene. She’s passionate about conservation. Likes the community feel of the watershed council and how it brings people together around natural resources—connects with the “neighbor to neighbor” conversation. Also likes the “quietness” and there seem to be “few battles” within the organization. Feels it’s cool how the organization empowers landowners to be good stewards and also inspires them.

**David P** has been on the board for about one year. Works as a Sustainability Consultant in Eugene. Three things have in particular have impressed him about LTWC: 1) The Council has a vision for what the future of the ecosystem might look like; 2) there’s an emphasis on balancing working lands with environmental enhancement and recognizing the limitations of what you can do; 3) LTWC connects urban people to rural areas of the watershed by helping them to understand where water comes from and where streams go.

**Lindsay** is also involved with Forests Today & Forever, and lives on ~700 acres of timber land. She first came to a Public Meeting in November 2009, and became involved with the Council through the culvert survey project. Since then, she has been involved with the organization in a number of different ways. The first meeting in 2009 was about oak savanna, and she connected with Bruce Newhouse, and followed his advice on upland restoration. Realized that the impacts of upland habitat enhancement were broader than just the watershed.

**Jim** has been on the Board for eight years. Learned about LTWC in late 90s – saw a project tour at Wintergreen Farm. He later connected with Cindy to participate on macro-invertebrate surveys and enjoyed counting insects in the stream. He’s interested in water and is currently a research scuba diver for the U.S. Forest Service. Jim also sits on the boards of several other nonprofits in the area. He

enjoys the “localness” of the Council – neighbors meeting neighbors – and feels it’s important to connect neighbors through the health of a local tributary. He feels we’re truly a grassroots organization, and the Council wouldn’t exist without stakeholder involvement. Likes that there’s no government edict attached to the organization.

**David T** is a landowner on Owens Creek. When he and his wife moved here, they asked around about who looked after the local watershed. First got involved with the Council by volunteering to do water surveys and also got on the list to do a restoration project on their creek. David also pays attention to larger conservation groups, but feels we have a narrow focus on one watershed and everything that moves through it. Likes the localized effort. He doesn’t feel he can contribute as much to larger organizations as to LTWC. David also loves the idea that the watershed and its tributaries can connect different land types and people. The watershed acts as a thread, and in a magnetic sort of way, draws a lot of people together. Likes that we’re committed to stewardship. Also excited about the Amazon Initiative project, which he feels will enable a new strategic visibility and audience. Feels it’s important what message we determine we want to communicate about the Council both visually and verbally.

**Chad** lives in the Lower Long Tom basin. The Long Tom River has always been part of his life. He enjoys fishing and hunting and wants to see good things happen—and wants the best for their farm. If you don’t take care of land in the right way, you don’t make money. The water is very important to their farm. He feels that opinions and ideas are well heard in the organization; there is lots of roundtable talk, which he feels accomplishes more. Remembers that his father used to catch more fish years ago, but now fishing is terrible. He would like to see fish habitat improve. The Strodas have done some grassed waterway projects. Feels that if the watershed council didn’t exist it would be scary because either no one would take care of it or the government would tell people what to do and no one would talk about it.

**Max** is a research faculty at the University of Oregon as a natural resources economist/sociologist. His work deals with issues that relate to the local level. In the past, he was an executive director for another watershed council. Feels that councils empower people who want to do good stewardship on their land, and LTWC brings technical and general capacity that allows them to do the things they want to do on their land. Feels that the work we do at a localized community level scales up to a broader improvement across the entire watershed and beyond for overall resource conditions. Cites that we do a lot of local scientific research (e.g. cutthroat trout migration study, culvert survey). We collect information about watershed conditions that we just wouldn’t know about if we weren’t here doing it, and we’re able to build a ground-up knowledge of the watershed. ODFW, the state and federal agencies aren’t here collecting that data. Also feels that LTWC has a unique situation with Amazon Creek to connect urban and rural residents because Amazon Creek has its headwaters in an urban area and flows into rural areas,

which is much different from most streams like the McKenzie. If we weren't here, there would be a more adversarial environment, both ecologically and socially.

**Mike** is involved with the watershed council because of his interest in fisheries and fishing groups, and has been involved in fisheries, restoration, non-governmental organizations, and is currently the treasurer of a wild trout organization. Also involved with a few fly fishing organizations. He's excited about how we work locally, that we're involved with landowners in a cooperative way. If you can't work with people who own land, he feels you don't have much of a chance of making progress. Feels that if we weren't here, someone would come in and tell people how to do things; we act as a protection for local landowners to keep that from happening. Local landowners like us, and we like them. He's also impressed with the amount of work that happened this summer. Very involved as a volunteer. Impressed with amount and quality of work. As a scientist himself, he admires the good science we do.

**Therese** works for City of Eugene. She loves water both professionally and personally. She's attracted to the watershed council because of its ability to do education & outreach in an effective way and complements work that the city does. Feels that the Council helps foster a broader perspective of the consequences and impacts on a larger picture. Another strength of the Council is collaboration, and it's key to collaborate across many different interests. The result of this collaboration is on the ground projects that probably otherwise wouldn't happen. The Council provides continuity.

*~ Dana reads absent responses from absent Board members ~*

**Steve** is a consulting forester; has a history working with Giustina Land & Timber and now works with private woodland owners. He really believes in education and working with private entities for water quality and fish and wildlife. Doesn't think another organization could do that. We're able to bring in technical and financial assistance and have meaningful projects and events (e.g. the recent Johnson and Erickson, Mattson project tours). He appreciates public education and meetings. Appreciates community conversation that's accessible for lay public. Where else could the community go for this conversation?

**Jason** is the third generation farmer on his farm and also works at Sure Crop Farm Service. Feels what LTWC does is the most tangible way of improving the watershed. Likes that both his farm and Sure Crop are tools that he can use to accomplish watershed goals, and the tradeoff of time invested is a big payoff for him. His favorite project of the Council's is the Amazon Creek pesticide program and to work with local business owners and farmers; secondarily he also enjoys working with farmers and the grazing community. Feels that other organizations can be more like a social club and possibly waste time. He likes social action. If fundraising is a part of this organization, he's all for it.

**Charles** is the operations manager for the Oregon Country Fair. He also helps to organize the Mt. Pisgah Mushroom Festival, and he participates in Cycle Oregon. He has an IT background as well. Loves riparian restoration. Sees the Oregon Country Fair as a conservancy; they're always looking to steward their land better. He wants to do more projects with the Council and Veneta through OCF. Charles feels LTWC has a holistic picture of water. OCF is one piece of that, and in order to have the fish and wildlife they want, they need a bigger geographic area for the ecosystem to be healthy. Likes that there is one organization looking out for the watershed that's neutral and that we cross boundaries for our achievements.

**Ronnel and Dolly** will be coming back to the Board in future meetings. They feel we do great work and ask permission to call the Board members for follow up for specifics. First report will be analysis of situation and what will come next.

## Program Topics

### B. Our plan for Resource Development work this year – *Deborah & Dana*

**Deborah** directs the Board to the work plan and consulting contract included in the packet. Dana and Deborah initially thought they were looking at a one-year resource development program, but they realized it was far more complicated. Now they are looking at a multi-year program to phase in a full-fledged fundraising program. We're kicking off that program with Dolly & Ronnel. The first step is to build a message and case statement and translate that into something the Board can work with to do outreach. We've tracked people who have supported us in the past. We already have a list of Board alumni and feel we're in good shape for starting up. We've never created a case statement and message or worked together as a Board to go out into community to raise money. Our goal is to have a fundraising program that is focused on staying on message and working collectively, not just on asking for money. We will ask for money as needed.

**Dana** feels good about the fundraising plan. Before the meeting, she spoke with Steve, Charles, and Jason on the phone and asked if they had any comments about plan. No one found anything they didn't like. They're interested in training & coaching and are willing to help with asks. Jason, in particular, has availability in January and February. Steve would like to select the people and organizations he asks. Charles says "fundraising is his favorite part." Dana opens the conversation up to board to hear what they think about what they're proposing: building a case statement, training them on how to build relationships. Notes that this process doesn't go straight toward an ask, unless you have a supporter already that you know you want to ask. The first phase will involve a great deal of coaching.

**David P.** states that it appears our approach is mainly to cultivate individual donors on a one-on-one basis. Wonders if the program will also consider more 'retail' fundraising methods, e.g. direct mail. Asks if we should be considering sending direct mail more than once a year as part of an ongoing reminder to our membership.

**Deborah** clarifies that we decided to start with crafting our message and get people comfortable with asking first because fundraising hasn't been a big part of our organization in the past. The program won't just focus on one-on-one donors, but maybe also a concerted mass mailing once per year, or a "legacy program." Thinks we'll come out of this with a multi-pronged effort. As the Resource Development Committee works through it, they will be coming back to the Board with ideas.

**Mike** gets lots of email requests for fundraising, including from Trout Unlimited, The Nature Conservancy, and Audubon Society. They send email requests asking for donations, and it's usually centered on a project that they're doing. Asks if that approach is something that would work for us, or should we take a different approach?

**Dolly** – we were asked to come in to help the Council secure larger gifts (\$100 - \$500 and up). For gifts of that size, people are giving to people, and first, the organization needs to build a relationship with the donor.

**Mike** recently attended an Oregon Community Foundation workshop, which is all about building relationships for building donations. Asks whether the fundraising program will also focus on building contributions from local businesses. This might especially work in regards to the Amazon Initiative.

**Dolly** – It's important to establish a relationship with local businesses too because those are often small business owners that we'd be dealing with.

**Dana** – (on what we can offer donors from businesses). Sometimes the donor will want the name of the business mentioned; they may look for logo placement; we could offer some suite of opportunities for advertising. That's a marketing relationship for the business and some aspects are handled differently than a personal ask of a business owner or any individual donor, mostly so the LTWC wouldn't be used inappropriately in marketing during the relationship.

**Deborah** explains that most fundraising asks have been for a specific purpose in the past (e.g. grant match, Annual Meeting). This program will take a broader approach, and she anticipates that there may be policy issues the Board will have to address. The organization will need to make decisions about how we disperse those funds. There may also be organizational implications. Stating a specific "need" has always been important to her in fundraising, but not everyone feels that way. She feels that she was too attached to that thought initially. The Council's needs are much broader than specific projects, and more broadly, there is the issue of long-term fiscal sustainability. We don't know what's going to happen down the road. Right now, a major portion of our funding comes through the state, but that could change, and that's not something that's under our control. Administrative costs are another fundraising need that we currently downplay because of pressure from the state to ask for only 10% overhead, which they are currently trying to make

5-7%, but in reality those costs are more like 10-15%. She thinks we'll end up with unrestricted funds from a successful fundraising program. We don't currently have Board policies in place to cover where to assign those funds, but we do have a budget process.

**Chad** asks if we are going to focus more on building a relationship before asking for money. **Deborah** – yes, we'll focus on developing relationships first, especially beyond people we already know. We'll tell people what we do and why they should support our work.

**Mike** notes that people want to give money to an organization that is strong, and they need confidence that the money they give will go to successful result. He feels that we're a vibrant, strong community organization, and that will work to our advantage.

**David P.** learned from his wife that it's important to make larger donors feel important. Within our current work plan, he doesn't see a plan to make those people feel special. Asks how we can do that: through our newsletter, a special letter from Dana, or site tours just for donors? We need to make that explicit in the planning. It's a personal touch that makes them feel like they're part of a club.

**Jim** feels that the difference between a capital campaign and a more sustainable giving process is that a capital campaign focuses more on one time giving. He would like the organization to have the flexibility to sustain itself despite the ebb and flow of grant money.

**David T.** feels that we may also want to focus on the "bottom tier of the giving pyramid," or how to engage people who are already committed the organization as a broad base before we start moving them up the giving pyramid. He doesn't want to bypass the connection they have as a strong stakeholder who understands the Council's mission. Is there a way we can give them attention too? How to deal with a renewable gift each year?

**Dolly** feels that the concept of membership gives you access to the base of the giving pyramid. As we get into the program development, we can have that discussion more. We have a strong base that we can start with anyway. Feels that it's important for some people to know what level of donors they are.

**David T.** asks what the action plan is for renewable gifts. Do people know that it's coming? **Dana** feels the membership question is a good one to ask—do we need to tie giving to membership? We've avoided membership thus far because we like to keep the organization inclusive and open. **David T.** suggests that maybe "membership" is not the right word, and **Dana** suggests "supporter" or "friend."

**David P.** cautions that it takes a lot more effort for the result to get a \$20 gift from a broad base of people than a large donation from a smaller number of people.

**Mike** is impressed by the Western Rivers Conservancy because they list the names of their donors each quarter. It's a reminder for him of the opportunity to give to the organization. Having his name printed makes him feel good as a small donor.

**Beth** feels that membership implies that they're going to get something in return. When she worked with the Ohio Nature Preserve, they quantified how much it cost to put a child in camp for one day or maintain one acre on a parcel of land. Breaking the cost down to its component pieces resonated with people. Donors felt like they paid for one kid, one acre of land, etc., and that was tangible for them.

**Mike** believes that the diversity of people who are involved and the organization's inclusiveness is a big strength for us, and keeping that notion of inclusiveness is important. Cautions that if we become too much like a club, it could feel awkward.

**Max** feels it's important to know what our outputs are from the past 13 years. What are our outcomes? We need to tell that story. What does that mean? How much fish habitat has our work created? How many acres of oak savanna and woodlands have we enhanced?

**Dana** states that we can currently calculate stream miles, fish habitat miles, stream temperature cooling, etc., and **Jim** feels that we can present tree planting metrics the same way.

**Cindy** suggests that we provide a special day for larger donors where they can see a fish trap checked, tag a fish, see a higher profile project, or have lunch out/wine tasting. Make donors feel special by giving them their own event where they not only see what we're doing, but can participate and get even more excited about what we're doing.

**Beth** feels that a "club" only has to be a small part of the strategy. General donors don't necessarily know about the special events for the upper tier of givers, and there doesn't have to be an elitist atmosphere. With her experience in Ohio, upper donors received a fancy dinner at the president of Antioch College's house. That resonated with donors.

**Chad** feels involvement is crucial, whether that's through a restoration project, watching a project—making people feel like they're part of what's going on in the organization.

**Max** feels that fundraising development itself could be a full time job. Asks how we consider the implications of the amount of time needed required to be successful?

**Deborah** states that if this works and we generate a large amount of funds, it may make sense in future to hire a development director to oversee fundraising.



**Mike** suggests putting together a DVD video of what we're doing on the ground. This could be put together professionally to show a potential donor. He feels the visual impact of a project is huge. Witnessing the scale of our projects this summer made him think that it must take a lot of money to do what we do. He feels it's something you don't really understand until you see it. **Dana** adds that a YouTube channel would be a good addition for the Council.

**Dolly** notes that during her association with Friends of Buford Park, they got some money to put together a visual image that showed what the property would look like if they could get the acquisition.

**Max** mentions that when he worked at the Upper Deschutes Watershed Council, they made three videos that were based on one large project, which they used as a centerpiece of the overall narrative of the work that they do.

**Dolly** notes that a video could be used in house party, or as a short video in a one-on-one ask. Videos are more powerful when you invite donors to see the video. It often is more effective to show the video and then do the ask letter. Cautions against using the video as the ask itself.

**Lindsay** mentions that Forests Today & Forever also uses this strategy. Feels it's important to consider the culture of the donors and what they are able to give. There has recently been a downward trend of fundraising with Forests Today and Forever, and they have a strong record of raising funds.

**Dolly** notes that the majority of 501(c)3s have seen a significant drop in fundraising. Now things are starting to creep back up. Goals need to start pretty small at first, and organizations need to do a lot of relationship building. The economy will need to improve also. Reiterates that the first year of the program is about building relationships and continuing to keep existing supporters.

**Jim** feels that the story needs to resonate locally. For instance, rural restoration resonates with those people and urban restoration more with those residents. If everyone in the watershed gave \$1, we'd make \$100,000 per year. Feels that we can't ignore the broad base of people.

**Mike** believes that we may want to target some specific people, and they may have the potential for impacting the watershed through their activities, such as the logging or timber industries. They may be willing to make donations as a sort of compensation or mitigation for their normal operations. It may be in the best interest of their reputations to look good by providing those kinds of donations.

**Dolly** states that we need to listen to people and understand what would drive them to donate. Each time you get a \$10 or \$20 donor, they make a decision because we're a great organization, but then they speak with other people within their

network, and you end up with more donors at that base level. It's important to figure out the education piece to target all the different levels of giving constituents.

**Dave T.** suggests that maybe membership is not the way to go, but rather provide a connection through giving donors a decal, bumper sticker, or something else to get the conversation going. People who get fired up about donating also may be the type of people who would like to brag about it a little bit.

**Therese** feels that there's a lot of potential for fundraising in the urban area. We might want to prioritize urban project higher, and more than just the Amazon Initiative program, which she feels is great. However, if there was a way to do a culvert replacement project closer to the urban area, we may be able to show a more direct impact of the Council's work that resonates closer to home with the urban residents.

**Dana** notes that urban restoration projects are tougher for the grant review teams to accept, but it's definitely an avenue that we can consider through a creative approach.

**Beth** asks if we write press releases when projects are completed. **Dana** answers that we used to, but one project about a dam removal actually generated negative feedback, and she was reluctant to do more project press releases after that. However, we could potentially start doing more press releases if our attention is on communicating a clear, consistent message. This idea overlaps with the Education & Involvement Committee. Do we write press releases when projects are completed?

**David T.** mentions John Clooney as a person who gave a really nice presentation on the results of restoration at Delta Ponds. **Dana** adds that he's also mentioned LTWC and our Annual Celebration.

**Jim** suggests raising visibility through the Amazon Initiative Project by showing the striking photos of Amazon Creek in addition to the nice photos. For instance, the concrete portion of the creek looks like a "creek in a box," and this image would get people's attention.

**Max** asks that if 90% of our stakeholders are in the urban area, how many of them know what the Long Tom Watershed is?

**Beth** suggests holding a "run for the watershed" or "run around watershed" as a way to engage younger people. While it would be a lot of coordination, it could generate a lot of interest and visibility.

#### C. **December 1 meeting – invitation to participate**

**Dana** notes that she hasn't clarified what will happen at the December 1 meeting yet. **Deborah** adds that it will be an Executive Meeting and not a full Board

meeting. In her contact with Dolly and Ronnel, they thought they could use the meeting as a way to start working on a case statement. **Dana** notes that either RDC or the Executive Committee will work on the case statement, and she invites any other Board members to attend too. Adds that the result of the meeting will come back as a report to the Board.

**Therese** – Beth mentioned at the last meeting how that the Annual Celebration isn't a fundraising event, and that we should consider a separate fundraising event. Her son participated in a silent auction meeting, and she felt it was amazing how much money you can generate. Feels that an oral and/or silent auction meeting makes a lot of sense and has much potential. She's specifically thinking of the actual value of prizes that people won at this year's Annual Celebration for very little money. Those same raffle prize donors should be prime targets for a silent auction down the road.

**Action Item: Dana will send out an email about the December 1 Executive Committee/resource development meeting.**

- D. **Program Updates** – *Dana*  
(Running low on time, and there are none that aren't included in the background and staff reports).

## **Business Topics**

- E. **Approve October Board of Directors Meeting Minutes** – *Secretary Turner*

Asks for questions or comments. None. Notes that there were two main action items from the meeting: that feedback regarding the Annual Celebration is still welcome; we decided on Board officers, but the Board was to think about possible committee involvement. 2 action items – good wrap up for Annual Meeting; feedback can still come in; officers are decided.

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

- F. **Approve September 2011 Financial Reports** – *Treasurer Kacskos*

**Profit & Loss Report** – The total income for September was over \$177,000—most of that was from grants and contracts, but there were also a significant number of donations from the Annual Meeting. Overall, there were lots of expenses due to construction and implementation cost, and we ended up with a gross profit of about negative \$30,000. The net ordinary income was a loss of ~\$60k. The negative numbers reflect the time of year; September is still project implementation time, and there are a lot of costs associated with projects on the ground.

**Statement of Cash Flows** – The net income was a loss of about \$60,000. Cash at the beginning of the period went from about \$221,000 to \$157,000.

**Balance Sheet** – reminds the Board that this report compares the last two months (August and September). Our current assets are less than last month, but this is basically to be expected, once again due to the timing of project implementation. This evens out over the course of the year. Total liabilities and equities are also down from August to September.

**Mike** – asks why the balance sheet shows the credit card as accounts receivable?

**Jim** answers that sometimes we pay the credit card bill before the bill is really due. It means that for a brief period, instead of owing them money, they really owe us money, but usually by that time, we've already charged more to the account.

**Max** expected that the net income on the balance sheet would equal the net income on the profit & loss statement.

**Jim** notes that the P&L report is for the month only while the balance sheet is a running balance for the fiscal year.

**MOTION TO APPROVE SEPTEMBER 2011 TREASURER'S REPORTS by Jim, seconded by chad. Approved unanimously.**

#### G. Committee Reports

##### ***Personnel – Jim***

Jim, David P., David T., Deborah, and Jason met to review Dana's performance. The committee reviewed her work plan for previous year as well as key activities. She's needed to rearrange some of her work schedule to accommodate the resource development activities. The committee is very pleased with her performance. Jim is happy to provide anyone on the Board a copy of Dana's performance review if interested.

##### ***Education & Involvement – Max for Mandy Payne***

The E&I Committee met at the end of October, and included Steve, Lindsay, Sue, and Mandy Payne. Mandy has agreed to chair the committee. The committee looked over year's suite of topics of and other hot topics. Max highlighted a couple upcoming meetings. 1) Nov 29 Public Meeting at the Veneta Community Center. The topic will focus on the impacts of restoration on the local economy. Speakers will include contractors Jeff Jones and Dennis Cole, along with max. The contractors will provide personal stories about what this work means for local businesses in the area. Max's work has interviewed 100s of contractors who have

worked purely on resource extraction and now work on restoration. His work looks at quantifying the impacts of restoration. Recommends that we consider reaching out to other contractors for invitations to the meeting. The meeting will also feature water quality results from the small cities program. One member of the City of Veneta will speak, along with Cindy.

**Beth** – what is role of Board in regards to Public Meetings? **Dana** – asks the Board to self-select for to come to meetings that you're interested.

**Action Item: Sue is willing to host the November 29 meeting.**

**Action Item – Rob will send out education calendar to the Board after he finalizes the details with Dana.**

**Max** continues, adding that the January 31 meeting will focus on introducing the Amazon Initiative program. The March meeting will focus on Willamette Floodplain restoration, and we will likely work with Greenbelt Land Trust, possibly McKenzie River Trust, and local farmers. The May project tour will focus on oak savanna restoration.

**Dana** asks if it matters whether we have a meeting during spring break in Monroe. **Chad** thinks it will. Many people will be busy or out of town.

**Operations Committee – Dana**

For the next Ops committee meeting, we will want to review how the contracting policy is working. We will get together with Steve and see if anyone else wants to join.

~ Side topic ~

**David P** asked if anyone new about WREN and the Environmental Education Center piece that was on the news. There was some discussion that followed about history of the planning of the Environmental Education Center, and how the plans to build it have stalled.

**Amazon Initiative** – Dana wants to wait until Jason Schmidt is available to discuss.

**Tech Team** – met in October. Nothing new.

H. **Board members on Committees & other roles** – Max & Dana

Dana – handed out committee involvement sheet. Notable changes:

- Beth is switching from E&I to RDC

- Max is switching from RDC to Ops because he's the chair, and staying on E&I
- David T – will serve as the “champion” representative for the Amazon Initiative Program Partners – good crossover from RDC.

I. Paperwork Moment – *Secretary Turner*

Collected volunteer match hours forms.

## Reports & Announcements

J. Staff Reports – see background

K. Liaison Reports

**Jim** wasn't able to make Groundwater Management Area meeting. Will get briefed at the next meeting.

L. Action Items Summary

- **Action Item: Dana will send out an email about the December 1 Executive Committee/resource development meeting.**
- **Action Item: Sue is willing to host the November 29 meeting. Lindsay also.**
- **Action Item – Rob will send out education calendar to the Board after he finalizes the details with Dana.**

Meeting adjourned at 7:49 p.m. Chair Max Nielsen-Pincus.

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

Long Tom Watershed Council  
 Balance Sheet  
 As of October 31, 2011

|                                 | Oct 31, 11        | Sep 30, 11        |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| <b>ASSETS</b>                   |                   |                   |
| Current Assets                  |                   |                   |
| Checking/Savings                |                   |                   |
| Money Market (Umpqua Bank)      | 65,866.24         | 115,845.21        |
| Checking (Umpqua Bank)          | 9,449.75          | 40,587.19         |
| Petty Cash                      | 200.00            | 200.00            |
| Total Checking/Savings          | 75,515.99         | 156,632.40        |
| Accounts Receivable             |                   |                   |
| Accounts Receivable             | 67,930.71         | 40,791.63         |
| Total Accounts Receivable       | 67,930.71         | 40,791.63         |
| Total Current Assets            | 143,446.70        | 197,424.03        |
| <b>TOTAL ASSETS</b>             | <b>143,446.70</b> | <b>197,424.03</b> |
| <b>LIABILITIES &amp; EQUITY</b> |                   |                   |
| Liabilities                     |                   |                   |
| Current Liabilities             |                   |                   |
| Accounts Payable                |                   |                   |
| Accounts Payable                | 90.00             | (2,929.80)        |
| Total Accounts Payable          | 90.00             | (2,929.80)        |
| Credit Cards                    |                   |                   |
| Umpqua Bank Credit Card         | (2,157.31)        | (588.88)          |
| Total Credit Cards              | (2,157.31)        | (588.88)          |
| Other Current Liabilities       |                   |                   |
| Payroll Liabilities             |                   |                   |
| 401K                            | 1,920.30          | 1,920.30          |
| Health Insurance                | (316.30)          | (316.30)          |
| FWT                             | 1,924.00          | 2,036.00          |
| Medicare                        | 653.00            | 673.34            |
| Soc Sec                         | 2,341.67          | 2,414.73          |
| SUI                             | 284.05            | 378.36            |
| SWT                             | 1,326.00          | 1,383.00          |
| WBF                             | 29.68             | 32.46             |
| Total Payroll Liabilities       | 8,162.40          | 8,521.89          |
| Total Other Current Liabilities | 8,162.40          | 8,521.89          |
| Total Current Liabilities       | 6,095.09          | 5,003.21          |

4:36 PM  
11/28/11  
Accrual Basis

Long Tom Watershed Council  
Balance Sheet  
As of October 31, 2011

|                            | <u>Oct 31, 11</u>        | <u>Sep 30, 11</u>        |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Total Liabilities          | 6,095.09                 | 5,003.21                 |
| Equity                     |                          |                          |
| Opening Fund Balance       | 861.91                   | 861.91                   |
| Retained Earnings          | 252,085.93               | 252,085.93               |
| Net Income                 | (115,596.23)             | (60,527.02)              |
| Total Equity               | <u>137,351.61</u>        | <u>192,420.82</u>        |
| TOTAL LIABILITIES & EQUITY | <u><u>143,446.70</u></u> | <u><u>197,424.03</u></u> |



|                             | <u>Oct 11</u>             |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Ordinary Income/Expense     |                           |
| Income                      |                           |
| Grants & Contracts          | 27,139.08                 |
| Donations                   | 87.12                     |
| Annual Mtg                  |                           |
| Sponsors                    | <u>500.00</u>             |
| Total Annual Mtg            | 500.00                    |
| Interest                    | <u>21.03</u>              |
| Total Income                | 27,747.23                 |
| Cost of Goods Sold          |                           |
| Contracted Services         |                           |
| Construction                | 2,923.59                  |
| Crews                       | 35,502.40                 |
| Other                       | 4,867.70                  |
| Technical                   | 6,598.25                  |
| Contracted Services - Other | <u>3,350.00</u>           |
| Total Contracted Services   | 53,241.94                 |
| Annual Meeting Expense      | 370.22                    |
| Materials & Services        | 32.50                     |
| Education & Involvement     | <u>53.56</u>              |
| Total COGS                  | 53,698.22                 |
| Gross Profit                | (25,950.99)               |
| Expense                     |                           |
| Payroll Expenses            |                           |
| Salaries & Wages            | 22,480.36                 |
| Employee Benefits           | 3,023.78                  |
| Payroll Tax Expense         | <u>2,022.00</u>           |
| Total Payroll Expenses      | 27,526.14                 |
| Training/Conferences        | 250.00                    |
| Travel/mileage              |                           |
| Mileage                     | 41.41                     |
| Travel/mileage - Other      | <u>1,216.86</u>           |
| Total Travel/mileage        | 1,258.27                  |
| Occupancy                   |                           |
| Telephone                   | <u>83.81</u>              |
| Total Occupancy             | 83.81                     |
| Total Expense               | <u>29,118.22</u>          |
| Net Ordinary Income         | <u>(55,069.21)</u>        |
| Net Income                  | <u><u>(55,069.21)</u></u> |

Long Tom Watershed Council  
Statement of Cash Flows  
October 2011

|  | <u>Oct 11</u>           |
|--|-------------------------|
| OPERATING ACTIVITIES   |                         |
| Net Income   | (55,069.21)             |
| Adjustments to reconcile Net Income<br>to net cash provided by operations: |                         |
| Accounts Receivable  | (27,139.08)             |
| Accounts Payable   | 3,019.80                |
| Umpqua Bank Credit Card  | (1,568.43)              |
| Payroll Liabilities:FWT  | (112.00)                |
| Payroll Liabilities:Medicare   | (20.34)                 |
| Payroll Liabilities:Soc Sec  | (73.06)                 |
| Payroll Liabilities:SUI  | (94.31)                 |
| Payroll Liabilities:SWT  | (57.00)                 |
| Payroll Liabilities:WBF  | (2.78)                  |
| Net cash provided by Operating Activities                                  | <u>(81,116.41)</u>      |
| Net cash increase for period   | (81,116.41)             |
| Cash at beginning of period  | <u>156,632.40</u>       |
| Cash at end of period  | <u><u>75,515.99</u></u> |