

**Long Tom Watershed Council  
Board of Directors Meeting  
Thursday, November 1, 2012  
751 S. Danebo Ave., Eugene, OR 97402**

Present: Sue Kacskos, Jim Pendergrass, Lindsay Reaves, Charles Ruff, Deborah Saunders Evans (5:45), David Turner (6)

Absent: Mike Brinkley, Steve Cole, Jason Hunton, Beth Krisko, Max Nielsen-Pincus, David Ponder, Chad Stroda, Therese Walch (8)

Staff: Dana Dedrick, Rob Hoshaw, Katie MacKendrick

Meeting called to order at 5:37 p.m. by Acting Chair Jim Pendergrass

**Business**

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

Dave reviews action items, which are primarily related to Annual Meeting.

**Charles** corrects that the Action Item to put together a playlist for the Annual Meeting is for Beth & David P, not he.

**MOTION TO APPROVE OCTOBER 2012 BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
MINUTES by D. Turner, seconded by L. Reaves. Approved unanimously  
as amended.**

**B. Approve September 2012 Financial Reports & Quarter 1 Budget vs. Actual -  
Treasurer Kacskos**

**Profit & Loss Report** – We have a total income of \$32,260 for September and \$55,587 in expenses. Our net ordinary income was negative \$23,000.

**Statement of Cash Flows** – With the adjustments to the net ordinary income, the Net cash came to negative \$25,700. The total cash at the end of September was \$253,450.

**Balance sheet** – Notes that accounts receivable is up slightly. Sue comments that one entry is named “undeposited funds,” which is just a matter of timing and is an amount that would have normally been included in the checking or money market account. Because of timing, we have an “undeposited funds” line item that is normally not there. We have slightly less money than in August (\$312,000 in August vs. \$289,000 in September). Again, this is a matter of timing for when we do much of the instream and work and hire contractors. This decrease is expected this time of year because this is when most of the restoration project work happens. Sue feels that everything looks good.

**Jim** – notes that everything will start to wind down for the work season. **Dana** – adds that we still may see several expenses through the end of the year. May

expect to see a net loss each month for the next couple of months because of all the work we're doing.

(Passed out Quarter 1 Budget vs. Actual report)

**Budget to Actual** – Dana notes that everything appears on track. There are a couple things that varied over 10% or \$10,000, but not many. We may overspend our occupancy line item. We're currently trying to figure out how to wire our LTWC network computers together for the best cost; it still may cost us between \$1-2 thousand.

**Jim** – adds that we're down on income because grants are billed but not received yet. **Dana** – The budget vs. actual is not accurately predicted because it takes ever grant that comes in and divides by 4. We don't equally spend on a project throughout all 4 quarters.

**Dana** also adds that spending for materials & services and contracted services may items may be too high. We are considering the benefits and costs of using Dave Wobbe to help push projects forward, or to delay them and make sure we have personnel funds available. We're more likely to experience a downturn in grants next year. We're also anticipating grants will be harder to get from OWEB. We did receive an extra \$20,000 from Meyer Memorial Trust this year, but that is a one-time addition that is not likely to happen again. We also did a lot of grant writing this past year.

**Sue** sums up that this year we did well with funding, and next year we may have less. **Dana** adds that we may need to reduce our workload next year. Looking at the big picture, she doesn't want people to get the idea the idea that LTWC is flush with funds, and hopefully we'll have time to adjust to the changing grant landscape.

**David T.** asks about the far right column noting the annual budget percentages. It looks like we took in \$100,000 for the period, but the percent received shows 0. Is this correct? **Jim** – No, 0% is not correct. The formula in Excel did not calculate correctly. Should be approximately 14%.

**MOTION TO APPROVE SEPTEMBER 2012 FINANCIAL REPORTS & Budget vs. Actual Quarter 1 AS AMENDED by C. Ruff, seconded by D. Turner. Approved unanimously.**

**C. Document Retention Policy – Rob**

We created a Document Retention Policy that staff will sign to agree to keep certain important documents for a minimum amount of time. This will help staff understand which documents need to be kept for legal or financial reasons and for how long. A draft Document Retention Policy was provided in the Board packet.

Several Board members question the logic of keeping certain records permanently as indicated on the draft policy, such as press releases and financial statements.

**Dana** notes that for press releases, the source was probably thinking of agencies and not nonprofits.

**Rob** notes that the primary source of information on how long to keep materials came from the Oregon Nonprofit Corporation Handbook. There was confusion in the manual about how long to keep financial records because it appeared in two separate lists, one of 7 years and one for permanent.

**Dana** explains that “permanently” probably means “through life of organization.” Sue recommends changing the document to reflect this.

**Charles** (in response to archiving old documents digitally). Cautions that external hard drives can fail, and paper is still the best method for permanent document retention.

**ACTION ITEM: Change the Document retention policy for these items:**

- **Item G: change from permanent to 7 years.**
- **Item I: Change “expense reports” to just “expenses”**
- **Item L: retain paper copies of permits/licenses if grantors do not have a copy.**
- **Item M: change from permanent to 7 years.**

**MOTION TO APPROVE LTWC DOCUMENT RETENTION POLICY AS AMENDED by D. Saunders Evans, seconded by C. Ruff. Approved unanimously.**

**D. Committee Proposals –Dana & Jim**

Dana talked with staff at a recent staff meeting to discuss where staff felt committee support would be most beneficial to their work. Dana drafted up a list of 6 existing and potential committees.

1. **Resource Development** – will continue, of course, as there has been a lot of momentum in fundraising this past year.
2. **Personnel** – conducts Dana’s review/provides an option for staff if they don’t feel comfortable going to Dana with an issue for whatever reason.
3. **Technical Team** – a committee that will meet more frequently to help with our Restoration Program.
4. **Operations** – hasn’t met recently, but meets as needed. Steve and Dana think this committee can help with restoration projects issues as needed also.
5. **Amazon Outreach & Communication Team** – a potential new committee that emerged from the staff meeting discussion.
6. **Rural Landowner Outreach Team** – another potential new committee that emerged from the staff meeting discussion.

### Discussion on Specific Committees & their direction

**Dana** notes that Steve would like to see Operations meet more frequently and be more projects related. Dana and Steve are going to meet and brainstorm what seems necessary and helpful. The idea for an outreach team came from the staff discussion and learning where staff felt committee input would be most helpful. We've been struggling with the purpose of the Education & Involvement Committee most, and within the E&O subject, we decided that where we most need help is with the Amazon Initiative, communication, and landowner outreach and feedback. These committees would have both Board and Council members.

Dana notes that she is willing to talk to each board member individually. So far, Steve is likely willing to help with landowner outreach. That committee may just meet quarterly. The goal is for Board members to help us see the bigger picture in ways that we may not.

Directs the Board to look at her summary in the Board packet, where she included 2-3 priorities per committee and included staff leads.

**David T.** summarizes that Dana is proposing 2 new committees and we no longer have Education & Involvement.

**Jim** notes that the personnel committee meets as needed (about once/year).

**Deborah** – follows up by asking if the executive officers make up the personnel committee. **Dana** – this committee is typically comprised of ad hoc members, particularly people with HR experience.

**David T.** asks if the bylaws set up committees or rules. **Dana** – states she will cross check the bylaws to double check. **Jim** believes that Tech Team and Operations Committee are the only two specifically referred to in the bylaws. He believes that other committees can be established and de-established as needed.

**Dana** (after checking in bylaws) clarifies that no committee is necessitated in the bylaws.

**Lindsay** notes that she likes the idea of bringing in council members. Feels it's a good way to bring in the community and spread out talents and perspectives so people get more involved. It also helps to lessen the workload on staff and Board members.

**Dana** notes that LTWC used to have a lot of committees with lots of council members, but people start not having as much time to dedicate. As a result, staff spend a lot of time trying to think of what to talk about at the meetings to ensure that they're meaningful.

**David T.** – likes the idea of having staff meet to discuss areas where they feel there is a need for assistance and then bring those results to the Board.

**Lindsay** feels like the committee is the glue that holds everything together. While it is challenging for community members to find time, without participation from the active, working community, it doesn't work as well as a holistic whole. Notes that Forests Today & Forever has huge committees, and trying to get the Board involved at the committee level is challenging but necessary.

**Jim** feels the challenge is to engage people at level they want to participate without burning them out. If you don't ask someone, you don't know if they are willing to help out or not.

**Dana** admits that the Council does struggle with people's time. Feels it helps that the Technical Team is not a standing committee, and believes that's a wise decision.

**Deborah** notes that it takes a lot of time to manage committees.

**Lindsay** asks if Dana is looking for approval on the proposed committees or feedback. **Dana** – feedback.

**Jim** adds that involvement in committees will be more specifically defined at the January Board meeting.

**Lindsay** is happy to help with on a landowner outreach committee. Feels that would be a good way to stay involved when not on the Board.

**Deborah** feels comfortable setting Education & Involvement committee aside because of the progress on web design and the abundance of materials produced this past year for RDC. Education is implied with what we do – it's across the board. The E&I committee isn't really necessary unless there's a specific education & outreach opportunity, such as with Amazon, and it appears as though Dana has already considered that with new committee proposals.

**Dana's** goal is to form a more mission-centered committee that is not endless & broad. Volunteers could help, and we want to start integrating people.

**E. January Board Meeting date – Dana**

Will be Jan 3 unless people would rather have the 10<sup>th</sup> because the 3<sup>rd</sup> is too close to New Year's. An informal agreement was made to keep the meeting scheduled on January 3. Also adds that there will be no Board meeting in December.

**F. Paperwork Moment – Secretary Turner**

Collected Board volunteer match hours forms.

**G. Website login for Board members – Rob**

The Board member content on the website is available. You can use this feature to access Board packets, minutes, meeting topics history, and much of the information that's in your Board member notebook. To access this site, you'll need to register with a username and password. (Rob demonstrated how to register on our website with the projector).

1. Go to [www.longtom.org](http://www.longtom.org)
2. Scroll down to the bottom. In the right hand bottom of the footer (the green area), you'll see the "Board Members" heading
3. Click on the link for "Board members page"

4. Click the “Register” link & create a username, password, and select the email address you want to have on file. I recommend choosing something easy to remember such as “rhoshaw” and “ltwc##” with the numbers being something memorable – like your birth year.

Once you’ve registered, Rob will send an email letting you know that I’ve activated your login. To login, go back to that “Board members page” link at the bottom, and this time, click “login” and you’ll be able to access your materials.

## Program Topics

### H. Project Presentation on Oak & Prairie Habitat – *Katie*

Katie presents a slideshow on oak habitat in the watershed and potential ways to connect with landowners. Her slideshow is available on the Board member content page of the LTWC website.

**Katie** notes that the purpose of the presentation is not projects-based but to look for Board feedback. Is specifically interested in ideas for connecting projects with our partners and opportunities to engage landowners.

**Deborah** asks if wildlife is seen as one of those connections. **Katie** wildlife is definitely more of a rallying point for terrestrial habitat than plants.

**Dana** notes that Steve Smith has said that will not be able to recover listed species without the anchor areas for oak and prairie habitat that exist in the watershed and greater Willamette Valley.

**Jim & David T.** would like a copy of Ed Alverson’s slide that show which bird species use what types of upland habitats.

Question – what is “NFTP?” – **Lindsay** - Non Timber Forest Product, or anything that isn’t timber that can create revenue (mushrooms, for instance).

**David T.** asks what defines “upland?” **Katie** – anything that isn’t “wetland.” **Lindsay** – also generally classed apart from forest and riparian habitats. Idea that maybe “terrestrial” is more appropriate, because it encapsulates everything that’s not aquatic.

**Dana** notes that it’s tough to get funding for these projects because OWEB has traditionally been focused on rivers and salmon.

**Deborah** feels that these upland habitats are obviously important at a species level.

#### Questions brought up

- How to connect these habitat areas so they’re not isolated?
- How to expand what we’re doing to improve these habitats given the funding limitations?
- Would it be helpful to landowners to provide them a calendar of when to do certain management activities?

Potential speakers for November public meeting

**David T** – Whitey Lueck talks about the change of the original landscape in the Willamette Valley. He’s a good, casual speaker. Answers questions well. **Jim** adds that Whitey can be a good speaker if the program is placed-based. He loves Google Maps.

**Charles** suggests Glenn Johnson, who could share tangible ideas for people about how the Oregon Country Fair has managed its property for bird habitat.

**Lindsay** supports the idea of having a panel of speakers with multiple topics on the idea of oak landscapes. For instance, pollinators, project landowners, wildlife, and landowner management techniques.

**Dana & Katie** note that the challenge for oak habitat projects is that oaks grow slow. There isn’t the visible “bang for buck” that other restoration projects have. It’s harder for people to see results.

**Jim** feels that the bird slide is a great takeaway for anyone in the watershed.

**Deborah** feels this conversation plays into the need for an inspirational story to understand the watershed context (e.g. bearing trees). History captures people’s imaginations, and this habitat is even rarer than old growth.

**Dana** asks that if Board members think of someone who would be a good speaker or expert in this field after the meeting to let her know.

I. Annual Meeting – final review of evening – everyone

The Board reviewed the handout of the updated Annual Meeting agenda, including who would be helping with what and when.

**Charles** notes that Deborah & Pete Noble may be interested in attending. He will call them and invite them.

**Action Item: Lindsay is willing to help present awards.**

**Jim** feels we should point out key staff, such as Jason for the Amazon Initiative. Suggests introducing staff at the beginning and have the Board members in attendance raise their hands when we’re electing Cary Hart.

**Dana** recommends recognizing staff right at the end before they break for the evening so people know who to go to. Another idea is to ask people at the beginning to raise their hands: landowners, partners, agency, NGOs, do you live in the Amazon? People won’t get to meet everyone, so this is a good introduction to the diversity of people involved in the watershed council.

Note to change agenda to end program closer to 6:45 p.m.

Another recommendation was made to recognize people who were Celebration Sponsors, such as make a small poster. **Deborah** recommends putting their names in the newsletter. **Charles** would like a list of how many total people gave and the total amount of money. He could mention that as emcee.

The food will come out between 5 and 5:30.

**Dana** asks when people would like to look at the poster talking points. Tuesday works fine for people.

Board had an opportunity to view two of the draft posters.

**J. Proposed Council Support Grant Policy – Dana**

(Background notes from Dana are included in agenda packet).

OWEB is preliminarily looking to constrain watershed councils to 45 areas using hydrologic unit codes, which would combine LTWC with several other Willamette watershed councils. This would significantly reduce our funding and give larger watershed councils, some of which do much less work than in the Willamette, as much money as combined watershed councils in the valley. The main issue is the OWEB has less funding overall, and they want to reduce the grant review process. OWEB feels that the merit-based allocation of funds isn't working, and their proposal is to streamline watershed councils and the funding process. Under this proposal, each council would get the same amount of money based on a lower threshold than the current allocation. Right now, there are 62 watershed councils receiving funding, and 90 councils are authorized statewide.

OWEB will start rulemaking in the spring already. There is a listening session on December 4<sup>th</sup>. Deborah and Jim will likely attend with Dana.

**Dana** – what OWEB is looking for is not arguments for what's wrong with their proposal, but rather a better solution. The current proposal does not take into account past performance and efficiency.

**Charles** – so what they're really looking for is a proposal for a better solution statewide.

**Deborah** feels this proposal could create an accountability problem for OWEB in the future.

**Dana** needs people with a larger perspective to say something. It really is helpful when Board members attend. Iterates that the current proposal is not based on real science. Wonders why OWEB isn't holding a public comment period. And now watershed councils who have never performed well are now all on the same level playing field. It also doesn't take into account private land and complexity.

## **Reports & Announcements**

**K. Staff Reports**

(see Agenda background).

**Dana** – provides an update on the Fern Ridge Library donation. LTWC has decided to donate to the library, and we will receive another shelf for our materials.



Dana & Charles were tour bus guides for Veneta tour for the Grantors of Oregon and Southwest Washington visit. People are impressed with Veneta; it has a lot going on and a great body of work. Several people from Meyer Memorial Trust were in attendance.

**L. Board Member Reports**

None given.

**M. Action Items Summary**

- **Lindsay will help with awards at the Annual Meeting.**
- **Staff will email Board members talking points for their posters by no later than Tuesday.**
- **Beth and David P. will connect for the music playlist for the Annual Meeting.**
- **Dana will confirm the January 3 Board meeting date via email.**
- **Rob will put Katie's presentation on Board website.**

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

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