

**Long Tom Watershed Council**  
**Board of Directors AGENDA**  
**Thursday, November 3, 2011. 5:30 p.m.**

*Chair Max Nielsen-Pincus*

**5:00 Pre-meeting Q&A time**

Staff are available for new or continuing board members to ask any questions of staff –  
*Available: Jed, Rob*

**5:30 Roundtable with Special Guests – Dolly Woolley and Ronnel Curry**

- A. Roundtable with our new Development Consultants – *Dolly Woolley & Ronnel Curry*  
Our Development consultants would like to meet the Board and hear from each Board member about what benefits they've seen from Long Tom Watershed Council's work. 3 minutes each.

**6:15 Program Topics**

- B. Our plan for Resource Development work this year – *Deborah & Dana*  
C. December 1 meeting – invitation to participate  
D. Program updates – *Dana*

**7:00 Business Topics**

- E. Minutes: Decision: approve meeting minutes for Oct – *Secretary Turner*  
1. Action Items Report  
F. Treasurer's Reports: Decision: approve reports for Sept – *Treasurer Kasckos*  
G. Committee Reports – *Committee Reps*  
H. Board members on Committees & other roles - Decision. – *Max & Dana*  
I. Paperwork moment: Your volunteer hours – *Secretary*

**7:30 Reports & Announcements**

- J. Staff Reports: Feedback is requested on info provided in background  
K. Liaison Reports: Reports, announcements, watershed observations  
L. Action Items Summary

**7:45 Adjourn**

*Next Council Meeting: November 29, 5:30 p.m., Veneta or Elmira*

*Next Board meeting: Thurs, December 1 invitation, 5:30 p.m. Regular meeting: January 5<sup>th</sup>, 5:30 pm*

## Background for Agenda Items

- A. Roundtable with our New Development Consultants** – Please come prepared to share with the consultants in your own words what benefits you’ve seen from the work of the Long Tom Watershed Council.
- B. Resource Development Work Plan** – Please see attached work plan with Dolly and Ronnel. Deborah and Dana will explain the plan, what we’re hoping to achieve, and answer any questions.
- C. Invitation to Participate in Dec 1 Meeting** – Activities in December will include building our case statement, thinking about our branding, and preparing our end-of-year “ask letter”. We will have the volunteer services of local marketing and communications specialist David Funk in some capacity, and retired graphic designer, Will Mayer. We anticipate involving the Executive Committee on Dec 1 in some way, and likely Resource Development Committee also. We are inviting Board members to participate as well!
- D. Program Updates** – This is reserved time in case there are program updates, especially on the Model Watershed Program, since there are some major strategic level activities happening the week of the Board meeting.
- E. Minutes** – Board meeting minutes are attached. Secretary Turner will receive comments and changes at the meeting and ask for approval. Action items will be briefly reviewed for completion.
- F. Treasurer’s Reports** – Financial reports are attached. Treasurer Kacskos will present the report along with any changes or corrections that will be made, answer questions, and ask for approval.
- G. Committee Reports** – *primary contact listed (not necessarily who prepared the report)*
- **Resource Development** – *Deborah*. No report beyond tonight’s agenda items.
  - **Personnel Committee** - *Jim*. Report will be provided orally.
  - **Education & Involvement** – *Max for Mandy*. Report will be provided orally.
  - **Operations** – *Steve*. This committee will next meet to review how the contracting policy is working so far.
  - **Technical Team** – *Cindy* – Technical Team met on October 7.
- H. Board members on Committees** – Please see attached committee profiles and come with your ideas. I will send out my view of where folks would be most helpful in a separate email, but the final decisions will be based on *your interest and willingness!*
- I. Paperwork moment** – Do your part for administrivia... Please be ready to record your volunteer hours/travel for the last month, or more if you missed a Steering meeting.

## J. Staff Reports –

### 1. Contracts newly signed:

- Grant: “Fish Trap for the Long Tom Cutthroat Migration Study.” Funder: Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife. Title: Amount: \$3,500. Award Period: 10/19/2011 – 03/15/2012. Description: This money is to purchase a hoop trap to place at the Monroe dam as part of the Council’s cutthroat trout migration study.
- Professional Services Agreement for Fundraising Consultants Dolly Woolley and Ronnel Curry. Amount: \$7,250. Date of Services: 10/1/2011 – 5/31/2012. Description: Dolly and Ronnel will help guide the Council to develop practical, strategic, and sustainable fundraising procedures and practices with the goal of increasing revenue.

### 2. Correspondence & Media

- None this period.

### 3. Program & Project updates

Amazon Initiative – The Amazon Partners met October 19<sup>th</sup> with excellent participation. Jason Schmidt updated everyone on the progress made so far and showed them the brochure, and sample flyer aimed at businesses and video. There has been a delay in producing the data from DEQ, which is disappointing but understandable given the Triangle Lake pesticide situation (DEQ lab is running all that analysis). Currently Jason is working on the economic story for why businesses would retrofit existing impervious surfaces (save on stormwater fees). There was concern from our business representative that the water quality case isn’t compelling enough but he says a vision of trout would be very captivating. Jason will be following up with ODFW to make sure we’re clear on what can and can’t be offered.

Model Watershed & Restoration – We are in the midst of dealing with what could be a major disappointment to the capital side of our work as OWEB’s budget is looking grim, with the impact coming mainly to how many projects we can get funded to move forward with. The crux of the matter is that, while M76 was great news for long-term funding of voluntary conservation, the specifics of implementation so far include the entire grant program being put into 65% of OWEB’s funds. Previously, under M66, the 65% went to restoration and acquisition, and the other 35% went to council support, assessment, monitoring, education, and technical assistance. Now all types would have to compete for the 65%. This, when entities and landowners around the state are submitting ever-more impressive projects. As Tom Byler from OWEB says, Measure 66 was a sprint, Measure 76 is a marathon. That may mean we are here for the long haul, but with substantially reduce funding. I am working hard to stay on top of the breaking issues, be involved in the conversation, and do budget forecasting and funding model alternatives that will keep us ahead of the curve in terms of being able to plan our own organizational development.

4. **Other updates** – may be provided orally by Dana.

K. **Liaison Reports** – This is mostly reserved for formal liaison roles however if you have a key announcement from your organization or other relations in the community, please share that!

Current formal liaisons:

- **GWMA** – Jim Pendergrass
- **Small Grant Team** – \_\_\_\_\_
- **Rivers to Ridges** – Dana Dedrick

**Long Tom Watershed Council  
Board of Directors Meeting  
Thursday, October 6, 2011  
751 S. Danebo Ave., Eugene, OR 97402**

Present: Mike Brinkley, Steve Cole, Beth Krisko, Max Nielsen-Pincus, Jim Pendergrass, David Ponder, Lindsay Reaves, Charles Ruff, David Turner, Therese Walch (10)

Absent: Jason Hunton, Sue Kacskos, Deborah Saunders Evans, Chad Stroda (4)

Staff: Dana Dedrick, Rob Hoshaw, Jason Schmidt, Cindy Thieman

Meeting called to order at 5:38 p.m. by Chair Jim Pendergrass

**Business Topics**

A. **Approve September Board of Directors Meeting Minutes** – *Secretary Turner*

Jim asks for any questions or correction. **Steve** notes a spelling correction under Committee Reports on page 3. Dolly Woolley's name is misspelled.

**MOTION TO APPROVE SEPTEMBER BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
MEETING MINUTES by D. Turner, seconded by S. Cole, approved  
unanimously (Therese, Beth and Mike abstain because they were not  
at September meeting)**

B. **Approve August 2011 Financial Reports** – *Jim (for Treasurer Kacskos)*

Profit & Loss Report – We ended August with a total income of \$126,707. Most of that was incoming grants and contracts, including from the BLM, ODFW, and several smaller OWEB grants. Jim emphasizes that this is active restoration and construction season, and August and September have the heaviest cash flows. Our budget is still tracking where we anticipated at this time.

Statement of Cash Flows Report – We started with about \$212,000 in cash at the beginning of August and ended with about \$221,000 for an increase of \$9,288.

Balance Sheet Report – The balance on the statement of cash flows for both the beginning and end of August are also reflected on the Balance Sheet under "Total Checking/Savings." The balance sheet shows that even though we only gained a little over \$1,000 in total assets, we accrued cash during the month. The balance sheet also shows we had payroll liabilities of about \$8,000. Reiterates that we're tracking well to our budget at this point.

**MOTION TO APPROVE AUGUST 2011 TREASURER'S REPORTS by  
T. Walch, seconded by M. Nielsen-Pincus. Approved unanimously.**

Profit & Loss by Job Report – Dana

During the April 2011 Board meeting, an informal decision was made that Dana would report to the Board whenever a project had a budget overage of 15% or greater. This year's projects were actually within 10%, and most were right on their respective anticipated budgets. In one instance, we actually had some money left over from the BLM RAC grant, and we were able to use that money to make some improvements to a culvert replacement project completed last summer on South Fork Ferguson Creek. Dana clarifies that the projects included in the annual Profit & Loss by Job report were all completed during the past year, which could include projects that began several years ago; reiterated that the agreement was that the staff would only bring specific budgets for closed projects to the Board if there was a problem or the budget is over by 15% or more. Notes that we have about 25 open projects at this time and not all of them will be completed this year.

**Cindy** adds that there is always some variance in what projects cost, both on the positive and negative side. We're able to balance these variances out well, and we're still have a history of keeping within the Council's grant budget.

C. Committee Reports – Jim, Deborah, Max

Resource Development – Dana (for Committee Chair Deborah)

**Dana** hasn't submitted the Ford Family Foundation grant yet, but we're still moving ahead with signing the contract with the fundraising consultants. If we don't get the grant, it's a \$5,000 risk to the Council, but Dana feels it's a risk worth taking and wants to move forward with signing the consultants.

**Jim** asks if Dana feels good about our potential to get the grant. **Dana** feels that we have about a 70% chance of receiving the grant. However, looking at the Council's budget, she feels we are able to leverage the \$5,000 if we need to. We will submit the grant within the next couple of weeks, after which Ford Family will give us notice within about three months after that. The consultants will work from October through May. We were planning to pay them \$3,000 of our own money anyway, even if we don't get the grant, for a total of \$8,000. However, if we don't get the grant, we'll use \$8,000 from the Council's general fund.

**David T.** feels that the wording of the grant application should clarify that we're moving forward with hiring the consultants so that the grantors know where we stand. **Dana** agrees; states that she felt like we needed to wait to submit in order to be forthright with everything that we've agreed to with the consultants. **David T** asks that we think about how we can make this appealing to Meyer Memorial Trust. **Dana** emphasizes that she's not going to submit the grant until we can explain exactly what's happening on our end.

**Jim** feels that the risk is a decent gamble to take.

Personnel – Jim

We're going to meet with Dana on Wednesday, October 12 for her performance review. We'll have that info at the November Board meeting.

Education & Involvement – Max (for Chair Mandy Payne)

*Note: Mandy Payne is a non-Board member who has agreed to serve as the chair of this committee. Mandy is a volunteer (one of the co-volunteers of the year awardees) who helped us a lot with the Cutthroat Migration Study this past year; she joined the E&I committee earlier this spring.*

The last committee meeting was August 29; next meeting is October 27. We will look through the year's coming public meeting topics and make recommendations on which topics should be prioritized for this year.

Operations – Steve

This committee hasn't had cause to meet recently, but we will review topics as needed.

Technical Team – Cindy

Tech Team is meeting October 7 to review October OWEB restoration grant applications. Kat Beal resigned as the Board representative to Tech Team. **Jim** asks if anyone from the Board would like to serve as the Tech Team liaison, which meets about ~ 2-3 times per year.

**Dana** will talk about committee placements during the November Board meeting, and emphasizes that people can wait to make a decision about committee involvement until then. She will bring information about serving on each committee to the November meeting.

D. **Nominate & Elect Officers, approve Check Signers, other roles** – Jim & Dana

1. Officer Nominations:

Chair – Max Nielsen-Pincus, David Turner

Treasurer – (co) Sue Kasckos and Mike Brinkley

Secretary – David Turner (membership); Dana Dedrick (corporate)

Vice-Chairs – Deborah Saunders Evans, Chad Stroda

Past Chair – Jim Pendergrass

**Jim** explains that the Board Chair is annual position, but other officer roles, such as Treasurer and Vice-Chair can serve for longer—particularly the Treasurer, as it helps us maintain our fiscal controls when one person is involved in that role for more than one year.

**Dana** notes that Sue is willing to continue in her role as Treasurer; interested in having **Mike** join in to help as co-Treasurer if he's interested. Dana also recommends that she act as Corporate Secretary so that she can sign IRS

documents. **David** likes the membership Secretary position, and would rather stay in that role.

**Max** is interested in serving as the Board Chair.

**Jim** feels that having a co-Treasurer makes sense; they can back one another up. **Mike** is willing to act as co-Treasurer.

**MOTION TO APPOINT THE FOLLOWING OFFICERS AS A SLATE—  
Max Nielsen-Pincus as Board Chair; Sue Kasckos and Mike Brinkley  
as co-Treasurers; David Turner as Membership Secretary; Dana  
Dedrick as Corporate Secretary; Deborah Saunders Evans and Chad  
Stroda as Vice Chairs; and Jim Pendergrass as Past Chair—by M.  
Nielsen-Pincus, seconded by T. Walch and B. Krisko. Approved  
unanimously.**

## 2. Check Signers

**Dana** current check signers are Steve, Jim, Charles, and Deborah. It makes things easier administratively if we can maintain the same check signers if they are willing to continue.

**Jim** notes that we don't have the Treasurer sign checks as part of the Council's fiscal controls because they look at large amounts of money. Having multiple check signers is more convenient. **Dana** explains that we sign checks about 2 times per month. We don't require two signatures, but Dana has started initialing checks as well.

**Jim & Dana** explains our CIR approval process where a supervisor reviews expense requests from staff and turns the forms over to the fiscal manager for processing. The check signer reviews and signs the checks that are to go out. The Executive Director and Treasurer review all the bank statements and reports—lots of fiscal controls in place.

## 3. Other Roles

Small Grant Team – includes Mary's River Watershed Council & LTWC, as well as Benton Co. & Upper Willamette SWCDs – applicants have to be one of these four organizations. Applicants can partner together. There is money set aside for this team, and the award money prioritizes riparian restoration; urban issues receive a lower priority. Each application can ask for a maximum of \$10,000. The review process is over email, you can apply anytime, and applicants are notified in 30 days. We apply for about 2-3 small grants a year.

We are looking for a liaison to this group. In the past, we looked for people with technical expertise, although this year that's not as necessary. We basically need someone to help review applications. Dana is an interim representative on that committee. Paul Reed is the administrator. Acting as a liaison doesn't carry any hidden work—your main duty is to serve on the



review team. Board members can also wait to express their interest until the next meeting.

E. **Paperwork moment** – *Secretary Turner*

David collected volunteer match hours forms, and Dana and Rob explained how to fill them out.

## Program Topics

F. **Annual Meeting & Celebration Debrief** – *everyone*

1. Notes from Flipchart – snapshot of people's thoughts

### What Went Well

- Raffle & different ticket values – high quality of prize items
- Speakers – good amount of info for 20-30 minutes
- # of attendees
- Diversity of attendance
- Food was great
- Setting/amphitheater type seating
- “This is what it’s supposed to be about.”
- Family event
- Prefer outdoor events (except for heat/rain, but we didn’t have that)
- Connect with community before serving on Board—awesome
- Attendees were greeted right away
- Intimate setup
- Theme really worked despite appearing less matched at first
- 20+ people on project tour, lots of questions

### Things to Improve

- Beverages
- Audio too loud sometimes – have someone listen/adjust
- Consider another method for value of those prizes – probably more money in silent auction
- Hand writing receipts seemed slow – get people through registration faster
- **Idea**: Identify guests with color coded name tags for new people, landowners, etc.; allows greeters to know more about the attendees
- Liked indoor space for more intimacy/connections/conversations (almost forced because of close space)
- Conflict with agriculture season was a problem – no potential new project landowners despite extensive outreach
- (Note: Diamond Woods was just too small of an indoor space).
- Felt like more of a family event vs. an Annual Meeting.
- **Idea**: look at 2 separate events – one that incorporates family.

- Displays – blew over and hard to focus on
- Do raffle prizes sooner
- **Idea:** “Annual Meeting” is not a fundraising event. Do a fundraising event and advertise that (appeals to different people).
- Auction is targeted money plus you don’t lose money if you lose.

## 2. General Comments

**Jim** feels that in 8 or 9 years, this one was one of the best Annual Meetings he’s seen, including everything from the raffle, food, and Jason being willing to host. Mentioned that it was good to have Rob Handy, Lane County Commissioner, present. Thought event went well. No real improvements to mention. Speakers were great. Lynne couldn’t be there, but Jason’s comments were well-timed and Charlie’s comments were from the heart. David did a great job with the raffle. Didn’t notice the water issue (Mike did, however, so at least a few people noticed the lack of beverages).

**Max** noted that his kids were excited about winning the Christmas tree in the raffle. Impressed with the number of attendees; food & raffle was incredible. Thanks to David P. and David T. for organizing that. Speakers went well. It was a beautiful setting from his vantage point. “This is what it’s supposed to be about.” Great to be sitting in the middle of the watershed. Happy it was a family event too.

**Lindsay** – This was her second Annual Meeting. She prefers outdoor events and was glad the weather worked out. Also thought it was good that we only had 2 speakers—thought 3 would have moved the event on too slowly. Some people had louder voices, and from her seat in front of the speakers, it was hard on her ears. Other people had softer voices and were more difficult to hear. Suggests having someone to monitor the speakers. Also thought having raffle prizes of different values went very well. At first, she thought it might be confusing, but it ended up being a great way to raffle off prizes.

**Beth** – as a new board member, thought it was good to connect with the community before she begins participating in the meetings. Spoke with a landowner who talked about stewardship on his land—felt it was a very endearing, nostalgic conversation, and it reminded her of the community she’s connected to in Ohio. With a silent auction, people would have likely bid more than \$5 or \$10 for more expensive prizes.

**Jim** – we have done a silent auction twice. It worked well indoors but not so great outdoors because people wandered around too much.

**Beth** adds that it was nice to be greeted right away, and it felt very welcoming. Mentioned that Rob Handy was very thankful and complimentary—he made her feel good about joining the Council’s Board.

**Therese** thought it was a great event, and liked the fact that it was family event. Also prefers the outdoor venue. At first, she thought that the theme, “the bounty of the watershed,” didn’t seem as directly connected to the

watershed council, but now thinks that it was a wonderful topic because it broadens the audience's perspective and it suited the Council really well. From a practical standpoint, hand writing receipts seemed a little inefficient; suggests something quicker to get people past the registration table. She was a greeter and didn't recognize people as well as some, especially if someone is new. It would be beneficial to have a way to recognize whether someone was new or already connected.

**Cindy** – When compared to past Annual Meetings, this one lacked a feel of critical mass for her. She felt more moved by Diamond Woods—there was indoor space for people to talk more. She prefers indoor events later in the year so that it doesn't conflict with the agricultural season. There was more project landowner and agricultural involvement last year and was disappointed that there were no new potential project landowners this year. Felt the program was neat, the food was great, and the speakers were fantastic. At least 20 people attended the project tour, and it went well.

**Dana** notes that even with a ton of personalized outreach, we didn't get the landowner presence we wanted.

**Max** feels he interacted with a lot more people last year.

**Cindy** felt that one of the strengths of last year's meeting were the landowners providing testimonials.

**Mike** liked having the venue outside and was impressed with the beauty of the event; thought it was set up well. As a first time Annual Meeting attendee, he doesn't have a lot of comments yet. He has experience organizing raffles and live auctions. Agrees with the comments that some of the items could have garnered more money in a silent auction. It also helps if you have your fundraiser inside and right around the time when people are eating and drinking—people are often more inclined to give.

**Jim** notes that at Diamond Woods, you had to talk to people because there wasn't a lot of space to go.

**Charles** felt that Diamond Woods had a big turnout and he had good conversations, but the space was too small (lots of nodding in the affirmative). Recommends that we need a bigger indoor space. Feels that whether we hold an indoor or outdoor event is predicated on the type of program you're having and the people you're trying to reach. At Diamond Woods, there was lots of content being presented to people.

**David T.** liked that it felt like a family event; it felt casual and didn't feel like an Annual Meeting and more like a day in the park. Suggests looking at having two events—an outdoor family event and an indoor formal meeting. Agrees with Therese that it would have been helpful to know a little more about the people attending. This gives the Board a clue on how to introduce themselves. The displays weren't effective because they blew over, and we weren't able to talk about the Amazon Initiative effectively. He also was sad to see a couple large prizes, like the fishing trips, bring only about \$20 to the

Council as there were only a couple tickets in the jar. **Mike** – that’s where a silent auction would be better.

**Jim** – the challenge with holding a silent auction in the past is that we didn’t get any bids on some of the larger items. **Dana** notes that the problem is when we get the prizes. We didn’t have enough time to pick the rules or how to advertise the prizes this year. There were even a few prizes that came in the week or even day of the event. **Mike** adds that if he would have known about the raffle sooner, he probably could have pulled in half a dozen more prizes. He has done these kinds of events before. He feels people are a lot more generous here, and it is easier to get people and businesses to donate.

**Lindsay** felt that we bigger mass of people to raffle off the bigger ticket items so the organization received more money.

**Beth** doesn’t think of an Annual Meeting as an event where people come to donate; suggests that we consider holding a separate fundraising event.

**Max** explains that if a person puts in \$30 in raffle tickets and don’t win they may feel like they lost out. But if they bid on something and decide to pull back from the bidding war, they don’t feel like they’re out anything. **Mike** adds that a silent auction is entertainment. **Jim** adds that knowing what types of people are attending can help determine the type of fundraiser, though **Mike** feels it’s hard to predict that.

**Dana** – the first time we had a silent auction, the event was in the evening, indoors, and there was alcohol; the auction went well. The second time we had a silent auction, the event was outdoors in the afternoon, and there was no alcohol; that auction didn’t go so well. **Cindy** felt the quality of raffle prizes were better than previous years.

**Dana** - Our main disappointment was not having a good landowner turnout and the missed fundraising potential of the quality raffle prizes. **Cindy/Dana** both thought the food from LCC was wonderful, and it was great that they were able to incorporate the donated local food. **Dana** clarifies that throughout the history of the Council, the Board has expressed the belief that fundraising is not a major goal of the Annual Meeting.

**Rob** – The total number of adults attending was around 67 people. Excluding infants, there were 73 total people. This year, the total income for the Annual Meeting was \$4,024. \$1,850 was from sponsorships, \$305 from Celebration Sponsors, and the rest was from the raffle and tickets. Our expenses were \$6,542, so we lost over \$2,100. **Jim** notes that staff bill their time to unallocated funds, and it’s a direct cost to the Council. **Rob** – We still did better than last year’s Annual Meeting, where we incurred over \$8,000 in total expenses and less than \$2,000 in total income. We only had one cash sponsor from EWEB, and this year, our expenses were down because Jason was willing to hold the venue at his place.

#### G. Major Restoration Projects being proposed for this cycle – *Cindy*

*\* For the full PowerPoint presentation, please see the slideshow pdf in the LTWC Board login page of the website. \**

Cindy's slideshow explained the package grant for Owens Creek that the Council will be submitting to OWEB for the October 17 deadline. The three projects in the application package include:

- Fish passage at Owens Creek off of High Pass Road – replace undersized culverts with concrete arch spans
- Fish passage at Owens Creek at Barrows' – replace undersized culvert with bridge
- Fish passage at Owens Creek at Schudel's – remove an undersized culvert

The OWEB application requests about \$154,000. The total project cost, including match funds, is about \$387,000.

Comments & Questions:

**Jim** asks if we were able to bundle the projects as one grant. **Cindy** – yes, we were able to get a huge amount of match funding (~ \$180,000) from the BLM RAC. Kendra at the Bonneville Environmental Foundation feels that the funding request is in the acceptable range for the reviewers.

**Therese** asks if there is a county culvert replacement program. **Cindy** – Yes, although the culverts we are proposing to remove or replace are not high on their priority list. They are giving us match by providing the design.

**Mike** wonders why we don't prioritize removing the barrier furthest downstream first. Feels that's a logical progression to how you would remove barriers. **Cindy** – We have done significant barrier inventory and prioritization. Landowner outreach takes a while and is a limiting factor in removing barrier culverts. **Dana** – We proceed with removing culverts with whichever landowner is ready to move at that time. The cutthroat trout's life history in this watershed doesn't require quite the extent of connected habitat that salmon do.

**Cindy** – Explains that we're replacing a six foot culvert with a 20 foot wide concrete arch span, so there is a significant difference in size between the original barrier and the final product. The arch span is a single pre-fabricated structure that costs about \$40,000. A bridge costs around \$55,000.

**Max** – Feels that we should say the community and economic benefits on the projects will "support" rather than "create" three jobs. Also questions why we're putting such a low figure for our administrative costs. He feels we should automatically put 10% rather than present a lower figure than we can handle in our application. **Dana** explains that we're working to apply for a federal indirect cost rate to show that our administrative costs are much higher than even the 10%, and there has been some pushback from OWEB on administrative costs. They feel grantees should be closer to 5-7%.

**Therese** asks input is desired from the Board. **Dana** – The presentations are learning opportunities that allow the Board to point out errors or omissions.

H. **Staff Reports** - *Dana*

**Mike** asks about the Council's expertise to do toxics outreach. **Dana** – Yes, Jason Schmidt has that experience for the Amazon Initiative, and we have a partnership with the DEQ to analyze that data. We coordinate the entire Amazon Initiative program. We can offer businesses the same technical expertise and non-regulatory guidance that we offer to landowners.

I. **Liaison Reports**

**Jim** – Groundwater Management Area (GWMA) will meet later this month.

**Dana** - Small Grant Team & Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) – Dana is on the RAC review committee. She helped educate other review members about why trout are important to local communities and why we should not just focus on federally threatened and endangered species.

**Dana** - Rivers 2 Ridges (R2R) – used to be West Eugene Wetlands Partnership. R2R has added five new partners, including the Youth Corps. Dana acts on the Executive Level and Cindy on the Implementation level. The partnership trades equipment and shares the creation of a long-term plan.

J. **Action Items Summary**

Board members thanked Jim for his service as Board Chair this year.

Dana and Max requested feedback on the Board Topics for 2011-12.

Meeting adjourned at 7:41 p.m. by Jim Pendergrass, Past Chair.

Long Tom Watershed Council  
 Balance Sheet  
 As of September 30, 2011

	Sep 30, 11	Aug 31, 11
<b>ASSETS</b>		
Current Assets		
Checking/Savings		
Money Market (Umpqua Bank)	115,845.21	115,819.44
Checking (Umpqua Bank)	40,587.19	105,195.34
Petty Cash	200.00	200.00
Total Checking/Savings	156,632.40	221,214.78
Accounts Receivable		
Accounts Receivable	40,791.63	39,991.63
Total Accounts Receivable	40,791.63	39,991.63
Total Current Assets	197,424.03	261,206.41
<b>TOTAL ASSETS</b>	197,424.03	261,206.41
<b>LIABILITIES &amp; EQUITY</b>		
Liabilities		
Current Liabilities		
Accounts Payable		
Accounts Payable	(2,929.80)	90.00
Total Accounts Payable	(2,929.80)	90.00
Credit Cards		
Umpqua Bank Credit Card	(588.88)	243.43
Total Credit Cards	(588.88)	243.43
Other Current Liabilities		
Payroll Liabilities		
401K	1,920.30	1,920.30
Health Insurance	(316.30)	(316.30)
FWT	2,036.00	1,837.00
Medicare	673.34	634.84
Soc Sec	2,414.73	2,276.59
SUI	378.36	359.08
SWT	1,383.00	1,282.00
WBF	32.46	27.78
Total Payroll Liabilities	8,521.89	8,021.29
Total Other Current Liabilities	8,521.89	8,021.29
Total Current Liabilities	5,003.21	8,354.72
<b>Total Liabilities</b>	5,003.21	8,354.72
Equity		
Opening Fund Balance	861.91	861.91
Retained Earnings	241,449.23	241,449.23
Net Income	(49,890.32)	10,540.55
Total Equity	192,420.82	252,851.69
<b>TOTAL LIABILITIES &amp; EQUITY</b>	197,424.03	261,206.41

Long Tom Watershed Council  
 Profit & Loss  
 September 2011

	<u>Sep 11</u>
Ordinary Income/Expense	
Income	
Grants & Contracts	177,608.02
Donations	599.00
Annual Mtg	
Sponsors	1,070.00
Tickets	905.00
	<u>1,975.00</u>
Total Annual Mtg	1,975.00
Interest	25.77
	<u>180,207.79</u>
Total Income	180,207.79
Cost of Goods Sold	
Contracted Services	
Construction	63,580.29
Crews	104,095.02
Technical	5,155.47
Contracted Services - Other	1,737.00
	<u>174,567.78</u>
Total Contracted Services	174,567.78
Annual Meeting Expense	12.70
Materials & Services	35,147.40
Education & Involvement	218.28
Equip-Project	
Purchase	100.00
	<u>100.00</u>
Total Equip-Project	100.00
	<u>210,046.16</u>
Total COGS	210,046.16
Gross Profit	(29,838.37)
Expense	
Payroll Expenses	
Salaries & Wages	23,182.67
Employee Benefits	2,517.69
Payroll Tax Expense	2,171.42
	<u>27,871.78</u>
Total Payroll Expenses	27,871.78
Training/Conferences	150.00
Travel/mileage	
Meals & Lodging	11.00
Mileage	205.90
Travel/mileage - Other	1,737.94
	<u>1,954.84</u>
Total Travel/mileage	1,954.84
Occupancy	
Telephone	125.56
	<u>125.56</u>
Total Occupancy	125.56
Office Supplies	148.47
Dues & Subscriptions	7.50
Bank Fee	17.83
Misc.	225.00
Postage	91.52
	<u>30,592.50</u>
Total Expense	30,592.50
Net Ordinary Income	(60,430.87)
Net Income	<u>(60,430.87)</u>



Long Tom Watershed Council  
Statement of Cash Flows  
September 2011

	<u>Sep 11</u>
OPERATING ACTIVITIES	
Net Income	(60,430.87)
Adjustments to reconcile Net Income to net cash provided by operations:	
Accounts Receivable	(800.00)
Accounts Payable	(3,019.80)
Umpqua Bank Credit Card	(832.31)
Payroll Liabilities:FWT	199.00
Payroll Liabilities:Medicare	38.50
Payroll Liabilities:Soc Sec	138.14
Payroll Liabilities:SUI	19.28
Payroll Liabilities:SWT	101.00
Payroll Liabilities:WBF	4.68
Net cash provided by Operating Activities	<u>(64,582.38)</u>
Net cash increase for period	(64,582.38)
Cash at beginning of period	<u>221,214.78</u>
Cash at end of period	<u><u>156,632.40</u></u>

**---Exhibit A**

**Technical Assistance Grant  
Scope of Work for Fundraising Implementation Consultant**

*Overall Goal and Approach: Position the Long Tom Watershed Council (LTWC) to increase its revenue. Train and coach LTWC’s Resource Development Committee (RDC), Board, Staff, and other key members such that they have the confidence and ability to fundraise. This includes working with the Council’s team to update goals, write a case statement that is the basis for outreach efforts, and determine an appropriate fundraising model/approach, as well as training the board and staff to identify and approach potential donors and develop long-term relationships with an ever-expanding community of donors.*

<b>When</b>	<b>Task</b>	<b>Estimated Hours*</b>	<b>Meetings And Work Involved</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<b>Outcomes</b>
Oct- Nov	Review LTWC’s fundraising history, donation tracking system, resources, and the mission & work of our organization (E)	3 hours	1 hour with Dana & Deborah  Research and written analysis	\$375	Consultant has sound understanding of organization, what we already have and what our needs are. <b>Provide written analysis including summary of situation and areas of major strengths, concerns &amp; recommendations.</b>
Oct- Nov	Recommend any necessary changes to prospect/donation tracking system (C)	2 hours	Staff interview to determine current practice Write recommendations	\$250	LTWC staff can make donation tracking system ready to fully support implementation and track history <b>Identify necessary steps, key elements of system, and outline for data entry policy.</b>
Nov - Dec	Facilitate development of Council’s Case statement and “message”- first with RDC, then with Board. Messages for range of potential donor types. Modify existing materials; create some new. (C)	12 hours	1-2 meetings with leadership. 1 Work session(s) with full Board. Write case statement and materials. LTWC review.	\$1,500	Board & RDC have case statement and messages (majority agreement)  <b>Folders for fundraisers, contribution forms/pledge forms/thank you’s and invoices.</b>
Early Dec	Improve current end-of-year ask; choose prospects to send to (D)	3 hours	Assist/advise with year-end ask.	\$375	<b>Year-end written ask and mailing list</b>

Jan	Identify attainable financial goals in relation to needs, Strategic Plan and budget (B)	4 hours	Meet with Dana; present to Council team/Board	\$500	LTWC is able to fund its budget, and fundraisers are successful in their endeavor. <b>Written recommendations and suggested financial goal options with rationale</b>
Jan-Feb	Train Board & Resource Committee on fundraising process and specific methods per “giving pyramid” levels; identify prospects. (B)	12 hours	2 trainings w/Council team members. 2 hour donor identification work session. Individual support if necessary. Write Action Plan	\$1,500	RDC members and others feel confident on <i>how</i> to proceed. <b>Fundraising Action Plan including roles, steps, timing, people required, prospect tracking system.</b>
Dec - May	Initial “Annual Campaign” w/major ask months February & March. Help make some asks, coach staff and RDC/board members who are doing the asking. (D)	18 hours	Up to 5 ride-a-longs. Review messages & experiences. Individual Support. Write summary.	\$2,250	LTWC fundraisers gain experience and show some success in fundraising. Identify prospects; increase the number of prospects, sponsors and donors in order to meet the campaign goal. <b>Brief written summary of activity.</b>
May	Establish criteria for using privately donated funds (if unrestricted by donors). (C)	1 hour	Review & comment on draft provided by LTWC.	\$125	RDC have <b>recommendations</b> from consultant for criteria to consider when using donor funds.
June	Provide recommendations on how to move forward with fundraising strategy (E)	3 hours	Write recommendations	\$375	LTWC is well positioned to increase revenue and develop a community of donors. Timeline and materials in place for sustainable efforts <b>Recommendations</b> in terms of current capacity and looking ahead to organization structure, new donor cultivation, responsiveness to donations), incl. citations of resources
		Total estimate 58 hours @\$125/hr. <b>\$7,250</b>			

*\* Hours do not include Long Tom Watershed Council staff time devoted to the project. Hours reflect estimated consultant time, however consultants’ work is focused on deliverables.*

# **Operations Committee Profile Long Tom Watershed Council**

## **Purpose**

The Operations Committee is a standing committee comprised of board members\* with experience in organizational operations, procedures, administration, and policies. The committee focuses on the on-going and recurring activities involved in the operation of the Council. The committee's function is to help the Council operate in an effective and efficient manner that is consistent with legal standards and accepted organizational practices.

## **Scope of Work**

- Assist the Executive Director and Operations Manager with identifying operations issues that would benefit from new or updated procedures and guidelines.
- Conduct background research on procedures and guidelines, and develop proposals for board review and adoption.
- Serve as sounding board for staff and board members about adequacy of operational procedures, guidelines, and policies.

## **Timeline**

Meet on a regular basis, 2-4 times per year. Meetings dates, times, and locations will be coordinated by the Vice-Chair for Operations and the Operations Manager, and agenda topics will be agreed upon by committee members and staff.

## **Leadership**

The Operations Committee is chaired by the Vice-Chair of Operations. For the year October 2009-October 2010, the Vice-Chair of Operations is Eric Wold.

## **Membership**

The Operations Committee strives to have 3 members at a time.

*For 2010-11, members are: Steve Cole, Eric Wold, Jim Pendergrass.*

*History: For the year October 2009-October 2010, the board members are Eric Wold, Jim Pendergrass, and Patti Little.*

## **Staff**

Rob Hoshaw, Operations Manager  
Dana Dedrick, Executive Director

*\*See Article VI(1) of the LTWC bylaws for a description of the authorities and procedures governing Board Committees.*



## Resource Development Committee (RDC)

### ***Purpose***

The RDC is a standing committee comprised of Board members, staff, and Council members. It was established in 2009 to research, develop, and implement strategies that will supplement existing funding with community giving and other resources outside traditional grant sources in order to improve the long-term fiscal stability of the organization. The RDC will report to the Board and provide information to the Council as needed and upon request.

### ***Scope*** *(numbers do not indicate a priority order)*

1. Document and evaluate existing revenue streams (financial and in-kind) annually *(done in 2010)*
2. Identify message and practices for communicating message
3. Identify audiences and fundraising targets
4. Identify and implement fundraising activities, including a community giving program
5. Establish both short and long term funding strategies and methods
6. Annually review fundraising goals during the Council's budget development process
7. Propose criteria for prioritization and disbursement of supplemental funds

### ***Timeline***

The RDC will establish a regular meeting schedule based on need and availability. At a minimum the RDC will meet quarterly.

### ***Leadership & Membership***

Chair: Deborah Saunders Evans

Membership: *Chad Stroda, Charles Ruff, Max Nielsen-Pincus, David Turner. Council members or advisors can be added or consulted as the committee desires.*

Staff: Dana Dedrick (Executive Director), Rob Hoshaw (Operations Manager)

*RDC will recruit additional members or advisors from Steering Committee alumni and the LTWC community.*



## Education & Involvement Committee

### **Purpose**

The Education & Involvement Committee helps the Council meet its goals of improved watershed conditions by increasing awareness, knowledge, skills, and involvement. *This is a standing committee and can include people that are not Board members. There will be at least one member of the Board on this Committee unless another liaison to the Board is arranged. This committee has staff support.*

### **Scope of Work**

- Identify and recommend **education and involvement strategies**
- Identify and review **educational materials and messages**
- Determine scope of **Public Meeting topics and educational objectives.**
- Assist planning of individual **Public Meetings and Tours**
  - Draft agendas, suggest locations, recruit speakers, prepare newsletter background (~3-4 weeks before meeting)
  - Outreach - identify audiences, special invites, and specific contacts for each
  - Secure speaker (staff will handle speaker support & logistics) and outline potential talking points
  - Attend public meetings, interact with guests, and evaluate meeting.
  
- Recommend actions to Board of Directors when necessary

### **Timeline**

Meet quarterly or more frequently as needed (i.e. monthly or bimonthly). There are 6 Public Meetings and Tours per year, plus the educational component of the Annual Meeting & Celebration and occasional special tours or workshops. For all meetings, please send in materials for the newsletter and confirm logistical and speaker arrangements 3-4 weeks before.

### **Leadership & Membership**

*Chairperson - Mandy Payne*

*Members - Steve Cole, Max Nielsen-Pincus, Sue Kacskos, and Beth Krisko, Lindsay Reaves, Brenda Cervantes*

## ***Staff Support***

Rob Hoshaw, Operations Manager

Dana Dedrick, Watershed Coordinator

## ***Additional Resources at Council office***

- "Education and Business Topics - LTWC Council Meetings, 2008 - present"
- "Principles Guiding Council Meeting Design"
- "Council Meeting Procedure Roles"
- "Council Program Checklist"
- "LTWC Committee Operations"

# Technical Team Profile

## Long Tom Watershed Council

### Purpose

The Technical Team is a standing, Non-Board Committee\* comprising people with scientific backgrounds or technical expertise. Its function is to help the Council meet its goals regarding improved watershed conditions through enhancement plans and projects. The Technical Team will review projects for feasibility and appropriateness. Technical Team will also recommend priorities to Staff or Steering Committee as requested. There will be one joint member of Steering Committee and Technical Team at all times.

*\*For the powers and restriction of non-board committees, please refer to LTWC bylaws, Section VI:2.*

### Scope of Work

- Assist and advise with project identification, development, and prioritization, including attending site visits as requested and available.
- Assist and advise with the Conservation Strategy and other strategic planning efforts.
- Assist and advise on other science-related issues, including Adaptive Management principles and practices.
- Provide technical expertise as requested and able, such as for tours, discussions with grantors, council meetings and discussions, documents.

### Timeline

Meet on a regular basis, 2-4 times per year, including meeting(s) 1-2 months before project grants are submitted.

### Leadership

Chair - currently open

Chair may be rotated by decision of the Technical Team.



## **Membership**

*Kat Beal, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wildlife Biologist, Expertise-western pond turtle and native amphibians*

*Ed Alverson, The Nature Conservancy, Botanist, Expertise-conservation of wetlands and threatened upland habitat (oak savanna, prairie, woodlands, old growth)*

*Becky Flitcroft, Oregon State University, Research Fellow in Fisheries; Expertise-fish population ecology*

*Steve Smith, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Wildlife Biologist, Expertise-restoration of wetlands, prairie, savanna, and woodlands.*

*Karen Hans, Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife, Fisheries Biologist*

*Pat McDowell, U of O, Fluvial Geomorphologist, Expertise- Morphological responses to river restoration.*

*Ad-Hoc Members, as requested by Staff or Steering Committee.*

## **Staff**

Cindy Thieman, Restoration Director - Expertise - biology, water quality, planning, restoration design and implementation

Jed Kaul, Restoration Technician - Expertise - fisheries, riparian ecology