

**Long Tom Watershed Council
Board of Directors Meeting
Thursday, February 2, 2012
751 S. Danebo Ave., Eugene, OR 97402**

Present: Mike Brinkley, Steve Cole, Jason Hunton, Sue Kacskos, Beth Krisko, Jim Pendergrass, Max Nielsen-Pincus, Lindsay Reaves, Charles Ruff, Deborah Saunders Evans, Chad Stroda, David Turner, Therese Walch (13)

Absent: David Ponder (1)

Guests: Ronnel Curry and Dolly Woolley

Staff: Dana Dedrick, Rob Hoshaw, Jason Schmidt

Meeting called to order at 5:35 p.m. by Chair Max Nielsen-Pincus

Giving to Nonprofits – Facts, Philosophies and Practices for LTWC

A. Giving – A Presentation & Interactive Discussion – *Ronnel Curry & Dolly Woolley*

Notes that LTWC is undertaking fundraising now before it becomes an even bigger necessity. Part of this process is to help us build up our knowledge to help us. Questions to consider: What is the process? What is our shared vision of the plan? What are the Board's responsibilities? Adds that she and Ronnel will also be doing a short meeting with each of the Board members doing asks.

Begins the presentation by stating that the board of an organization is the steward of the mission, and they have fiduciary responsibility. Board members are the people who best understand the organization; they have connections in the community that will spread in a web as we move forward. Feels the Board is moving in a direction where they're starting to take more of a fundraising responsibility.

Despite the current economic environment, philanthropic giving still totaled \$290 billion in 2010, and 74% of that figure were from individuals. In fact, 2010's total giving level increased by 3.8% from 2009. Reminds that people will need to decide if they want to give as an individual or from a corporate level.

Most charitable giving comes from people who have jobs, and 85% of people who give have jobs. Asserts that the money for philanthropic giving is still out there, and people still want to feel connected to the community through giving. For example, Food for Lane County added 700 new donors at an average gift of \$200.

Notes that people like to feel a connection to an organization. Emphasizes that people want to give, but they need help figuring out what they want to give too. The prospects that we start with first are already in our database and largely connected

with us. The number one reason that people give is because people are asked to give. Only a small percentage of people just send a check in the mail on their own.

Other key reasons why people give:

- Believe in the organization's mission/vision
- Feel like they're contributing to a community. Dolly notes that she was raised with the values that you must give back to the community, and this is a cultural value that a lot of people share.
- Giving to a stable organization
- They have high regard for the organization's leadership and if the organization is on the rise.
- Trust that the gifts are going to be used wisely. People want to know how money is spent. For example, showing them something as simple as the financial statement in our Annual Report and the list of Board members can go a long way to building that trust.
- Feel that the organization has the resources to maintain the funding capacity for their programs.
- Donors are connected through a great experience (e.g. special tours)
- They have a personal connection to the mission; they're passionate about what the organization does. Ronnel notes that the first thing she thinks about when asking someone for a gift is whether they have a personal connection to what she's asking for.

David T. asks if people give because they like to be recognized. **Dolly & Ronnel** – That can be part of the reason, but is normally not one of the top reasons. Recognition won't likely cause the gift to happen. It may be important to acknowledge a large gift, for instance, but what's more important is the relationship with the donor. However, recognition at some level is important, though.

Stories from the Perspectives of both the Asker & Askee

1. First example from Dolly: Dolly was approached by Bring Recycling. They noted that they had a new capital campaign and asked to set up a meeting with there. Dolly declined. Over the span of nine months, four people asked to talk to her about giving to Bring. She stated that her philanthropic plate was currently full, but it was the fourth person that talked to her husband that finally broke through. Her husband had a personal connection with the fundraiser, and he didn't feel he could say no. Dolly agreed to listen to their campaign project and she thought it was amazing and wanted to help. The point of her story is that we shouldn't get discouraged as fundraisers. Once a donor knows what the program is about, you may get them excited and involved. Perseverance counts.
2. Second example from Dolly: Dolly and her husband read about what was happening with Friends of Buford Park in the newspaper. It resonated with them and they just thought it was something they should get involved with. Through a simple phone call, Friends of Buford Park convinced them to give. Recommends

taking special notice of when someone is really excited about the Council's work or they ask questions. Those people should be noted as potential donors.

Deborah asks, for the Bring Recycling example, if either of the first two fundraisers had offered to send Dolly information about their really great project or ask if there was a way to make it easier for her to think about this, if she would have changed her mind. **Dolly** admits that may have worked, but when she decided to give to them after the fourth ask, it was because she and her husband were really excited. It just takes the right point in time.

3. First example from Ronnel: She met Dolly through Friends of Buford Park, whom they were helping with their fundraising campaign. They only raised money for one year before the recession began, yet they had had increased their number of donors from 90 to 500. Ronnel feels that a fundraising campaign requires a plan as well as donors who feel connected to the organization. Ronnel didn't realize how much she would enjoy asking people for money. Some people feel it's a sign of weakness to ask for money, but people really feel good about giving.
4. Second example from Ronnel: Met with a donor whose husband had just passed away. He had worked at a local school district. His widow called Ronnel and wanted to discuss an endowment or legacy fund. She ended up writing a check for \$25,000. She'd never written a philanthropy check that large before, and she was happy to do it. She isn't a rich person, but she really cared about the community and wanted to give back. Giving can be a very moving, personal experience. It all takes a team effort, though. Not everyone needs to ask. What's important is that every board member has a plan to help with the fundraising effort. At a conference Ronnel attended, they said that it's usually the staff that asks, but the staff will often partner with a board member. It's powerful to say that 100% of the board has donated.

Handout: "10 easy ways to get involved without asking for money"

1. Ask business contacts to host a party
2. Ask friends to join you. This doesn't need to be asking a prospect for money right away. You could just meet with them with a friend to warm them up to the organization and see what they're interested in.
3. Meet with someone – more of a formal meeting to talk to them about the Council. Introduce them to the Council's work and listen to their interests. Again, this doesn't have to be about asking for money.
4. Hold a fundraising or "warm up" event at your home. This introduces people to the organization.
5. Write personal notes. Perfect for quieter people. This can be personal invites or thank you cards... any important touch points.
6. Go on a visit as with the ED/fundraiser
7. Hold a workshop and give LTWC the proceeds
8. Sign up to be a fundraiser. Helps staff grow so connections are made.

9. Ask people to give donations to LTWC as presents for your birthday.
10. Arrange for LTWC to speak at your group.

Introducing potential donors & keeping them involved

Fundraisers don't usually ask for money the first time they talk with someone. Cyclical loop of asking, thanking, and keeping them involved: Introduce ⇒ ask ⇒ thank them ⇒ involve them ⇒ discuss ⇒ then ask again. Even sending a newsletter to keep them involved is important.

Suggests treating their donation as an investment. Fundraisers want to make sure to keep donors involved so they can be asked again. Some donors will give up to seven times per year; however, many people only want to be asked once a year. It's our responsibility to keep them included. Recommends going to the most loyal donors first as a way to build confidence. Donors are most likely to begin at a smaller amount and go to a larger amount later. Having face-to-face interactions with donors who have given before, even if it's only \$25, is the easiest way to get them to move up to another giving level. Notes that people love to see projects on properties that we've done – great way to show off our work.

Build relationships with donors: Stair step to building a relationship

Acquire ⇒ retain ⇒ upgrade ⇒ legacy.

Schedule touch points: Send thank you cards/letters immediately – within 24-48 hours. Recommend using thank you letters as receipts. Good idea to personally thank donors at a certain level - something Board members can help with. Provide script. Also remember to annually update key donors – does not have to involve asking for money; it's an accomplishment summary to treat them as an investor. Be honest about accomplishments and needs – don't sugarcoat, but remember celebrate what you've done well. This way they'll be more inclined to give again.

Fundraising Plan: think of planning at the six month level. Important to start and stop a campaign, and also to celebrate your victories. Once the campaign is over, stop, evaluate, and plan for next year. Don't want to have burnout. Important that the campaign is something that takes place for a finite period of time. While the donor cycle is year-long, the campaign is a shorter period of time. Think of the campaign as primarily the asks themselves. Recommend that same timeline happen again next year for whatever time of year works for us.

Emphasizes getting people on the same page as far as our campaign message - not necessarily using the same words, but the same general themes.

Beth asks if the Kick Off Event is where they will do the asking. **Dolly/Ronnel** - Not necessarily. The event is more about building connections, community relationships, establishing a clear message. The packet is meant to give the board

ideas & background. Be prepared to accept a check at the event, but most people will be asked formally later.

Exercises in Identifying our Message:

1. What does LTWC believe in? (written on flipchart)

Beth/Jim – water quality

Jim – fish & habitat

Therese/David T./Charles – partnerships/community

David T. – the community story. The Long Tom River flows through many different neighborhoods and types of land, with people with varying interests. They can all share the same vision of keeping water & habitat healthy no matter what they do. There is a geographical, physical connection to river.

Deborah – the organization's ability to recognize and honor the inherent interests of people in the community. We break down barriers between scientists, landowners, and agencies. For example, on a project that improves fish habitat, we may be replacing a culvert where the landowner will want to do it for one reason, the scientific ground is there for high likelihood of success, and there is the potential for plugging in and bringing them those resources together. If the property owner was alone, the job might not get done without the partnerships.

Dolly – Have a personal story that resonates with people rather than being ambiguous. Real stories are the emotional connections.

Dana – if you can think of the three stories that you want to talk about, we can give you the photos and facts that you need and can go in your packet.

David T (asked to provide a story about his project) – neighbors, fish biologists/technical people came together to see what was done on our property. We pulled out a dam to improve fish passage and habitat. There were also trees planted along the stream. Biologists also seined for fish to see what species were present. **Dolly** – emphasizes talking about results.

2. What are the Council's Important Accomplishments?

Charles – The partnership brokerage between landowners and businesses.

Mike – Impressed by the projects because the landowner has a stake in it too. They provide in-kind assets. At the Thomson project, for instance, we buy fencing and they put it in. Impressed by the cooperation from people willing to put their own time and money into it. Feels it's a unique and progressive way to get things done.

Max – We empower people to do the things that they know are right.

Mike - We bring the technical expertise, incentive, resources. Landowners bring in cash or in-kind match.

Dolly notes that it's important for us to tell the story that landowners are not just getting something from us they're giving as well.

Max emphasizes that landowners are our biggest donors, really. They give 25% or more match for every project.

Mike asks if landowners give 25% match for culvert replacement projects.

Dana clarifies that there are plenty of projects where the project doesn't benefit the landowner. It benefits the stream.

David T adds that they do it because it feels good.

Dana – “Convince” is an important word. We keep educating, asking, and pushing until they agree to do a project. These aren't people who always come to us looking to do a project. We're asking to do enhancement on a piece of property that is of high ecological priority for habitat. We convince them to do something that they don't want to take the time or effort to do.

Charles – They're leveraging community value and their place in the community.

David T. feels that “convincing” sounds a little aggressive. Suggests that we word it more like we “help them see the benefits.”

Dana clarifies that there seems to be a misunderstanding that landowners are coming to us and asking us to do work on their property. That doesn't happen often. Since we do projects that win grants, we have to do a project that has the highest ecological value. That is more compelling, and it does take convincing, and that's a valuable part of what we do. It's also the hard part that few grantors pay for and takes focused staff time. Provides the analogy of someone you just met asking if you could remodel their bathroom, that the homeowners won't be able to use that bathroom for a few weeks, and there will be workers in and out regularly during that time. States that restoration work can be invasive.

Lindsay - What is the barrier assessment? **Dana** – We inventoried almost 300 culverts and prioritized the most significant barriers to fish passage. It gives us the info on what we need to fix and where. We conduct surveys and assessments to give us the knowledge to allow us to make a decision on where we want to do our work. Most of the watershed is privately owned, and it takes a lot of outreach to get that information – surveying requires permission from landowners. It's a cooperative trust and faith effort.

Jason asks Dana if the Council could change one thing in the watershed, what one thing that would have biggest impact is. **Dana** - Improving riparian vegetation alongside creeks. A fisheries biologist gave that answer long ago – the most important thing that needs to be done is planting native trees and shrubs and stepping back from the creek and giving the riparian area the room it needs.

David T. adds education to what LTWC believes in.

Beth feels that the bathroom analogy really resonates and needs to be communicated well, especially how challenging this work is.

Ronnel emphasizes that it's important to talk to people about it. Explain and give them examples. A talking point could be that the vast majority of our work involves LTWC approaching the landowner and asking if we can please work on their property.

Dolly –If someone wants to see who’s benefiting from the project work, they’ll realize that people didn’t come seeking the work on their property, that it was the Council who reached out to them.

Sue asks if the money through fundraising will expand our ability to do priority projects with people who we need to approach, or alternatively, those people who approach us that aren’t on high priority land.

Dana – any donations we receive is meant to help us to keep doing what we’re doing, as the funding landscape truly is changing. Adds that we were just awarded a grant with no personnel money in the budget.

Deborah notes that when organization was formed, the decision was made that LTWC would make decisions to enhance watershed on a sound scientific basis. There is an ongoing effort every year to gather that data.

Dana clarifies that any grant is restricted funds.

Charles notes that the funding that comes in really gives us that ability to do work “outside the box” of requirements.

Max notes that he has been struggling with “what’s the fundraising campaign for.” This discussion feels like an “ah-ha” moment for him. It’s like we’re still getting money to purchase the larger culverts and buy the trees, but we still need the money to pay for the scientists and project managers to make sure the right culvert gets put in and the right trees are planted in the right spot.

Mike notes that funding gives us flexibility to initiate things we may not have otherwise been able to do.

Dana adds that we haven’t been able to get any more funding for the Cutthroat Migration Study, as an example. She doesn’t want to promise that we can keep adding programs – we just want to keep our existing programs going. We can bring money and jobs into our area, and there is a lot of collaborating that goes on behind the scenes.

Sue asks if we have a list of projects and how much we need for each project to keep proceeding.

Dana – That would require time and number crunching.

Jim adds that sometimes it’s hard to come up with those numbers. Sometimes, we get a grant that gives us money for 80% of the funds to do the project. Any unrestricted funds give you leverage to move forward with that project anyway. We’ll try to augment grants with unrestricted funds.

Dolly – The campaign is a general fund campaign, it’s not a project campaign.

Sue - Would like to know how much projects cost and how much is required to do this work.

Dana – Those numbers are available in the project profiles.

Jim reiterates that it’s a general fund campaign, and it allows us to do a number of things that specific project related grants don’t, such as education & outreach, monitoring – everything not covered by a specific grant. We spend about 10% of our budget on administrative costs, but funders will often only want to give us 5-8% of a project budget for admin. Feels that 10% is already a low number.

Ronnel suggests that we tell that story. Funders will understand.

Charles wants to understand the relationship between research and the funding landscape. There are priorities with the different granting agencies. Are the agencies setting priorities for this watershed?

Dana – They recognize we need fish passage, water quality, etc. We have to find the best project that competes for the grants.

Charles – There are probably a lot of projects that are probably good projects that we don't do because they don't fit the funding landscape. Fundraising could help with organizational flexibility – those projects become much more under our control rather than the whims of the grant landscape.

Deborah notes that it's becoming more difficult to cover our true administrative costs.

Mike – We need money to do things that we don't have funding to do, such as marketing and redesigning our logo. In order to make money you have to spend money. Need to make investments on making ourselves more visible in the community.

Dana – The message should stay at level of a general fund. The money is to keep our organization solid for this watershed, for this community, for fish.

David T suggests that maybe at tomorrow's Fundraising Leadership Team meeting, we can answer what this new might best go toward so it can be a talking point.

Max reiterates that the grant money is not going away. We're asking people to give so we can keep asking people to participate. grant \$ is not going away – we're asking people to give so we can keep asking people to participate.

Dolly/Ronnel – Think of who is involved. Note that we all come from different parts of the watershed, our Board is diverse. We rotate our board. Key staff has been here for a long time. Potential donors will find this important.

Ronnel suggests making the connection to where the person lives. Use that as a launching point.

Dana notes that it's a good idea to describe the organization that teases them a little to help guide conversation.

Program & Business Topics

B. Debrief January 31 public meeting on Amazon Creek Initiative – All

Deborah was impressed with number of people there. She liked the way it flowed.

Jason H – most impressed by Tom Mendes; Rusty Rexius was also very good.

Deborah thought there were lots of great questions.

David T – good photographs; liked that Jason included blue lines that showed the direction of stream flow.

Mike learned a lot; felt the handouts in the back were impressive – a lot that people could pick up and go away with.

Jason H felt it would have been helpful to point out Rexius or the names of the buildings/important landmarks to orient people. Would have helped to mark the PowerPoint with a visual label.

Mike felt there was a good conversation on the sustainable use of pesticide, for instance where zinc comes from. There was a good question about using less damaging products. Thought Rusty's points on how we're not quite ready to get everyone on board right now, but we're converting a few people at a time was good.

David T. notes that the first public meeting Rusty attended, he seemed more cautious of supporting us, but at this last meeting, he seemed really on board with our efforts because he felt it's a good thing to do.

Max – We're empowering people to do the right thing.

Lindsay liked that the event seemed very calm. People were respectful. Everyone had a voice and was heard. The meeting raised a lot more questions than were answered, but the point was not necessarily to provide all the answers yet.

Deborah – The meeting also illustrated the kinds of things our organization can do that other people can't.

Dana – It was good that the City of Eugene formally recognized the Council's data.

Lindsay adds that the meeting could have been the first time people heard about this issue with Amazon Creek and what we're doing about it.

Jim was impressed by the number of people he's never seen before.

Mike notes that people may have come because they were interested in Amazon, but they learned who was behind the scenes, and that was important.

Dana liked that there were a diversity of people (e.g. residents, people from EWEB, a university student with volunteer potential.) People at EWEB or Eugene can tell citizens who call them about us. Rusty gave us the answers on what we need to do to make people care from a business perspective – excellent presentation.

Jason H notes that for 2011, SureCrop Farm Service now has numbers for how many pounds of each chemical are going into the watershed. For instance, lots of copper is going to vineyards. For dry chemicals, 35% of the sales are organic.

Dana – The DEQ prioritized keeping our data going because we've only had one year of data collection. They'll run our samples for at least one more year. We're a priority for the state because people want to understand the impact from runoff in an urban area.

C. **Approve January 2012 Board of Directors Minutes** – *Secretary Turner*

David T. notes that the minutes really capture the conversation with David Funk. Recommends that Board members file the minutes with their fundraising or branding notes. Reminds them of the ACER and TOMA acronyms. ACER are steps in donor relationships.

A – Awareness C – Consideration E – Engagement R – Repeat

TOMA is "Top of Mind Awareness" – a way of thinking about community-wide visibility. See January notes for more info.

The one action item was to send reminders of upcoming meetings, and that was taken care of. Motions included agreeing to work with Dan Calvert and giving Dana permission to transfer bank accounts. Asks for any corrections or additions. None.

MOTION TO APPROVE JANUARY 2012 BOARD OF DIRECTORS MINUTES by J. Pendergrass, seconded by D. Turner. Approved unanimously.

D. Approve November 2011 Financial Reports – *Treasurer Kacskos*

Profit & Loss Report – Total income for December 2011 was just over \$63,000. Total expenses were just under \$24,000. The net income was around \$34,000.

Statement of Cash Flow Report – notes adjustments to net income by accounts receivable and payroll liabilities. Accounts receivable was about \$195,000, which causes our cash flow to increase. Net cash increase of \$223,000 for the month.

Balance Sheet – Assets between Nov & Dec went up significantly – from about \$282,000 to \$318,000. Sue feels that we're doing well financially. Asks for questions. None.

Budget vs. Actual Report for Quarter 2 – **Dana** reminds the Board that she will note if the variance between the planned and actually budget (the first two columns) is over 10% or \$1,000. Pretty much everything is on track, and there are no red flags. Points the Board to the adjusted view for real time budget where she made adjustments for reflected contracts for full picture that the board requested last time.

David T. – Notes that we brought in 59%, spent 51%. **Dana** – We're still on course for 100% received and 100% spent that we planned. We always try to deliver less on expenses and more on revenue.

Max asks if we have really spent half our planned expenses and if that was because much of the work comes during the summer and fall.

Jim – asks if our budget for the Annual Meeting was \$1,500 for the whole year, how can the planned amount be \$2,220? **Dana** notes that she will go back and double check that. It also looked like that on the Quarter 1 Budget vs. Actual. We may have updated the planned or just not caught it before.

Jim – Points to the bottom right corner with approximately \$7,000 for an adjusted available balance. Adds that we still have new reserves of \$10,000.

Dana – The view shows how close we are for contingencies that could go wrong – office space, computers, etc.

MOTION TO APPROVE DECEMBER 2011 TREASURER'S REPORTS AND QUARTER 2 BUDGET vs. ACTUAL by J. Pendergrass, seconded by M. Brinkley. Approved unanimously.

Jim mentions that the Council had its annual review, which is one step below an audit. The review will look through June 30, 2011, and will only look at some entries (unlike an audit which looks at everything). The accountants (Mueller, Osterman,

Larson, Yuma LLP) came back and said that everything looks good. We signed off for them to go forward and produce review and get our taxes done. We do a review every year. Next audit is in 2012, which is more expensive.

E. **Committee Reports**

Resource Development – Dana & Deborah

RDC met in January and will meet again on February 16. Deborah thanks everyone for their efforts on the committee. Fundraising Leadership Team meets every Friday. Invitations to the Kick Off Event went out last week, and we have planned the agenda for the event.

Dana – hand out the Board fundraising forms for what they're willing to pledge and how they would like to contribute to the campaign. When she gets those forms back, each person will receive a fish pin.

Education & Involvement – N/A

Operations Committee – N/A

Tech Team – N/A

F. **Paperwork Moment** – *Secretary Turner*

Collected volunteer match hours forms.

Reports & Announcements

G. **Staff Reports** – see background.

H. **Liaison Reports** -

I. **Action Items Summary** -

- We'll send out key talking point for the Board to use to augment their fundraising stories.
- We're very close to our 100% board giving!

Jason H. thanks all the people who attended the Camas Country Mill open house.

Meeting adjourned at 7:38 p.m. by Chair Max Nielsen-Pincus

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