

**Long Tom Watershed Council
Board of Directors Meeting
Thursday, September 6, 2012
751 S. Danebo Ave., Eugene, OR 97402**

Present: Mike Brinkley, Steve Cole, Sue Kacskos, Jim Pendergrass, David Ponder, Deborah Saunders Evans (late), David Turner, Therese Walch (9)

Absent: Jason Hunton, Beth Krisko, Max Nielsen-Pincus, Lindsay Reaves, Charles Ruff, Chad Stroda (6)

Staff: Dana Dedrick, Rob Hoshaw, Jason Schmidt

Meeting called to order at 5:40 p.m. by acting Chair Jim Pendergrass

Business

A. Approve July Board of Directors Meeting Minutes – Secretary Turner

Asked for comments or corrections.

David P – asked if the final budget will still be available for October’s Board Meeting. Yes. **Dana** – adds that we had a successful run of grants this year, and Meyer Memorial Trust funded us for another \$20,000 for one year only. **Jim** – notes that we also had a successful fundraising campaign.

**MOTION TO APPROVE JULY 2012 BOARD OF DIRECTORS MINUTES
BY D. Turner, seconded by M. Brinkley. Approved unanimously.**

B. Approve June & July 2012 Financial Reports - Treasurers Kacskos

July Profit & Loss – July began a new fiscal year. The total income for the month was \$5,119 and the net ordinary income was negative \$15,192.

Statement of Cash Flows – This report starts with the net ordinary income from the Profit & Loss report, and after adjustments, the net cash decreased to negative \$22,984. We ended up with a cash balance of \$25,496, which still leaves us in good shape.

Balance Sheet – shows both June and July. There was no accrued wages or credit card expenses. **Jim** explains that this is because we pay the June payroll in July, but in June we have to account for the fact that we have to pay it. One of the rare times that accrued expenses shows as 0.

Sue continues by explaining that retained earnings for July were \$298,930, which has increased with the beginning of the fiscal year. We seem to be in a good position. Actually, retained earnings have increased starting this new fiscal year, which is a good thing. We seem to be in a good position to start the new year.

Jim notes that we ended up with a \$70,000 accrual profit for year, and we performed very well.

MOTION TO APPROVE JUNE & JULY 2012 FINANCIAL REPORTS by D. Ponder, seconded by D. Turner. Approved unanimously.

C. Board member status and new member search – Dana

Included in background. On the last page of the packet is the list of all the alumni since 2004 and total alumni since inception. Dana notes that she's unsure if Chad will choose to remain on the Board. If he wishes to rotate off, Matt Crocker contacted us a couple years ago and is interested in Board service. He would bring an agricultural perspective. She's not sure about Jason Hunton's intentions either, who is currently out of town. Dana feels Jason will likely want to stay because he finds his service rewarding and he's active with the Amazon Creek Initiative. Beth is also continuing. Lindsay Reaves is unable to renew because of her commitments to Forests Today & Forever, which means the Council will need to think of other forestry contacts. Possibly Cary Hart.

Therese – asks about the totals on the printout in the packet. That is the number of Board alumni (77).

Dana notes that we started a 4-year rotation fairly recently, which used to be 3. We recruit for 4 years unless there is some exception people need. There's no term limit *per se*, however our default is to rotate folks after one term. Sometimes we extend a term by asking for another year, or ask people to serve another term. We try to vary exposure to the Board and create the diversity and skill set we need at any given time.

Jim summarizes that the only unknowns would be to contact Cary Hart, and to contact either Chad or Matt.

Dana wants someone would be on the Board feedback team. Suggests Steve Cole because of his forestry connection. Steve agrees.

ACTION ITEM: Steve Cole agrees to serve on the Board Member Feedback Team

Dana asks about adding another Board member, possible an Amazon Creek champion. For instance, she was thinking of Lee Davis, the property owner at 27th & Willamette who is doing a project with us. He's had a stroke, however, and his son, who's now in charge of the business, lives in Washington D.C.

David P asks if we should consider a Resource Development angle. **Dana** has thought of possibly asking Dolly Woolley to serve.

Jim feels expanding the Board makes sense if we do it for the right person.

Deborah feels that having a good business connection from Eugene would be good. Dolly would bring philanthropic connections.

Jason is in contact with a commercial property realtor for Windermere Real Estate.

Dana – in addition to a potential business and resource development angle, we also need to confirm a farmer.

Jim clarifies that we need to confirm the new member(s) for election at the October Annual Meeting. The Board could appoint someone to serve after the Annual meeting until next year's Annual Meeting, at which point they'd need to be elected to continue. Our bylaws authorize a 20 person Board. **Dana** – We'll make the number of Board members work for our slate, and we'll decide how to approach it. We'll explain our approach at the Annual Meeting.

D. Card & Collection for Amanda's daughter – Dana

Sent around a card and collection for Amanda's daughter, who is undergoing treatment for cancer.

E. Committee Reports – Committee Reps

Dana notes that we haven't had much committee activity this summer, and asks the Board to let her know if there are topics that should be discussed or committees they feel should be convening. Adds that the Technical Team will probably meet more frequently now because the new hire won't have quite the experience.

Deborah – RDC will be meeting again soon to de brief the process for the campaign we laid out. Also wants to share the consultant's final report with the Board, possibly in the November Board Meeting. RDC will likely meet in October.

Personnel Committee – Dana notes that she needs to have a review. Max will be unable to serve Board duties for a few months. She suggests appointing Jim as Acting Chair. **Jim** agrees to serve as Acting Chair, and feels since he was the Past Chair it makes sense.

**MOTION TO APPOINT JIM PENDERGRASS AS ACTING CHAIR OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS UNTIL MAX NIELSEN-PINCUS IS ABLE TO RESUME DUTIES BY D. Saunders Evans, seconded by T. Walch.
Approved unanimously.**

F. Paperwork Moment – Secretary Turner

Collected Board volunteer match hours forms.

Program Topics

G. Brief Update on Model Watershed Progress – Dana

Maps were provided as handouts. The maps show our riparian restoration work in Ferguson, Bear, and Coyote Creeks. We used these maps as part of our update to Meyer Memorial Trust on our progress. Map colors show:

- Red: stream reaches need outreach/funding.
- Yellow: funded & we've done planting, but requires maintenance
- Green: reaches that have good riparian conditions and don't require work.

Jed will overlay fish passage improvement work on these maps, and overtime, we'll be able to see water quality improvement.

Deborah – asks what the numbers in the pie charts mean. We're the furthest along in Ferguson Creek. For example, there we've completed 6.7 miles of restoration with 4.9 miles left to complete. Eighteen miles don't require work.

Jim asks where the Thomson's live. On a section of Eber Creek and mainstem Ferguson Creek.

Therese asks what "needs funding/outreach" means. We just haven't started work there yet, or we haven't developed a relationship with the landowner and need to do outreach.

Dana announces that we have a grant for outreach in Bear Creek.

David P. suggests that instead of a pie chart, we show the stream miles with a stacked bar chart showing real scale. People seem to think about percentages. We could show a series of bar charts comparing Bear, Ferguson and Coyote. The length of the bar is the distance of stream miles. This would be more intuitive and easily comparable.

Dana notes that we were the only ones who presented information this clearly to Kendra and she really liked our maps as a template for other councils to use.

The handout with the numbers shows the totals of restoration metrics per project type, and shows actual numbers as well as projected numbers through 2017. All of this work is kept and produced in GIS.

Mike asks why large wood placement expressed in miles. **Dana** – it refers to how many stream miles are being treated with wood placements.

Jim notes that Ferguson Creek looks good, but asks what impact we'll have on lower Bear Creek in 2013? **Dana** explains that the outreach grant for Bear Creek is funded for 2013. That area has a lot of bigger ranches and these people aren't quite as easy to reach out to. We're using the technical assistance grant to help us perform a concerted effort in Bear Creek.

Therese notes that Spencer Creek is a potential Eugene UGB expansion area. Do we do monitoring there? **Dana** Not anymore, but we do have good baseline data for at least 3-4 sites on that creek.

Board seemed really intrigued by maps and liked this as a visual aid. Would like to see them larger, maybe on 11x17. Jim can see his pasture already on 8.5 x 11.

H. Presentation on Amazon Creek Initiative progress – Jason

This July, we completed our second year of pesticide sampling. We had a longer monitoring season this year because ODA provided additional funding. We're able to do monitoring through the end of July with this funding. DEQ is doing the pesticide analysis. They tweaked their methods to track lower thresholds of urban pesticides, which may be at really low detection levels. The process has been mostly agricultural focused, and DEQ realized they needed to adjust their protocol to look for more urban chemicals. Once the data is available, we plan on meeting with local growers again and schedule trainings for agricultural users of pesticides.

We're also doing outreach to landscapers & landscape companies that do maintenance around town. Conducted phone surveys to find out what local landscapers' practices are and what challenges they face. Jason was surprised to find out that one of the biggest hurdles for landscapers is that customers expect to see them physically spraying chemicals. If they don't see that, they assume the landscaper is "not working." This is a hurdle for these businesses because they're expected to use chemicals even though they have the ability to use alternative methods. This puts an interesting perspective on how we can do outreach to the community and encourage customers to ask for less toxic options and services.

Mike clarifies that the issue is that the client wants to see them actually spraying. Yes. Asks why they can't spray more environmentally friendly chemicals. **Jason** notes that those produces often cost more and require more time.

Mike feels this is more of a public education moment and advocates a campaign to educate the public to do the right thing in the interest of the community. Campaign to educate that this is in the best interest of the community.

Jason adds that we're continuing outreach efforts to local businesses. He presented to the South Towne Business Association, which contains about 40 businesses around south Willamette. Their board agreed to communicate our program and services to those members. Our message is about stormwater management, landscape alternatives, and pesticide reductions. Will present a similar presentation in October to the Chamber of Commerce. We're looking for businesses who are interested in technical assistance that we can provide.

Our first identified project is on 27th Ave and Willamette. (Jason passed out a project profile and map of site. The owner, Lee Davis, received an outreach flyer from tenant and was enthusiastic about what we could offer. He had already set aside a budget for landscaping and decided to work with us. The project involves stormwater BMPs such as planter boxes, rain gardens, and a bike shelter with an eco-roof. On the Oak Street right of way, we're going to remove asphalt and put in a bioswale to treat both the parking lot and part of the street. This is a very innovative practice. The businesses included in this site include In Shape Fitness, Agate Alley Laboratory, American Insurance, and a couple engineering firms. All the tenants are really excited about this project. This project is funded privately so there are no granting restrictions or deadlines. An ideal first project.

Dana notes that one key point is landscapers are looking to beautify, and if they use their landscape budget in concert with us, it may not cost that much to incorporate some of our concepts. Since they're already setting aside landscaping money, these projects feel more doable from a capital funding standpoint.

Jason - after consultation with Therese, the City of Eugene will fund \$50,000 toward projects like this. We're able to offer up to \$5,000 cash match for actual construction. The match is 1:1, and a lot of work can be done for \$10,000. Currently determining what our high priorities are along the commercial/industrial areas of West Eugene – areas with large impervious surfaces and lots of pesticide spraying. We'll develop a priority matrix list and score for how we would evaluate water quality. This way we can tell the property owner why they're in such an important location.

Therese is working with Billy Curtiss so we can work alongside business owners to not make the process too complicated or onerous. We want to be flexible while also meeting the standards for what we must do to meet drainage and structural integrity. We want these projects to be a worthwhile investment for everyone.

Deborah likes that the project is in such a busy commercial area.

Therese adds that the City is also doing design work on what new streetscape will look like. By having this in the ground first, it may help to inform what that looks like.

Dana thanks Therese for laying the groundwork and getting us the meeting with Eugene's Stormwater Policy Team.

Therese feels there's a lot of potential and learning. The team was interested in how much time it takes to work all through this. Will be interested to see if we gain some efficiency and develop more ideas to provide incentives to businesses to do the right thing.

Dana (to Jason) – Will add a sub-job in QuickBooks to reclassify each project as a sub-job of a grant for Jason to bill his time to. This way, he can track how much time he's spending on each individual project.

Jason – the property owner is giving us Willamette Street signage space to us, and they'll pay for it. It should take about 2 months to finish the project on the ground.

I. **Annual Meeting** – All

Dana provided a few Annual Meeting ideas in the background. **Jim** notes that he's predisposed to the Amazon Creek idea because during his tenure, we've mostly held rural events. We have an Amazon Initiative project on the docket, even though it's not complete. This could jump start engagement and enthusiasm and involve a population that doesn't always come to the Annual Meetings

Jim suggests the Vet's Club for a location. The Eugene Skin Divers held an event there. It's about \$50 for a room, held 90 people, and they customized the menu for them. Offered meals off the menu, but they could probably also do a fixed plate. The building had good acoustics. The room is downstairs on the left. David P and Mike have also been there and vouch for the room.

Jim notes that parking isn't the best for 90 people, but there are enough options.

Dana summarizes the recommendations from the fundraising consultants, who feel the Annual Meeting should be held separately and kept at a low cost (such as through in-kind donations). The Annual Meeting is a good way to introduce new members to our mission and get potential donors interested in giving. The event could include all the people we've included in past, but also invite potential donors. Also a program component or highlight a particular project without a raffle or fundraising component.

Deborah doesn't feel the Annual Meeting should be our premier fundraising focus. It's a great opportunity to host people that are not as familiar with us, celebrate what we do and showcase a project.

Therese asks if we have had an Annual Meeting in the urban area. Yes, we've held an event at Willamette High School as well as one here at the yurt. Had 70 people attend the High School.

Jim suggests a dinner instead of picnic. **Dana** clarifies that we can't do outdoor this year in because it's October.

David P – we may not need full dinner. Suggests appetizers and drinks. Felt dinner zapped the momentum of networking at Diamond Woods.

Someone suggesting getting Ninkasi to sponsor event.

Dana - We're targeting a weekday for the event, depends on availability and the speaker. Feels it may be a little too early for an Amazon focus – may be more appropriate when there's a project to showcase.

Deborah suggests focusing on our work with the Model Watershed Program.

Therese – for the Amazon, we could showcase properties we want to retrofit as an example and get people excited about what to watch for in the program

Deborah suggests a program that focuses on the partnership aspect and finds a way to showcase the private/nonprofit/private cooperation. **Therese** agrees that it's important to show people how partnerships work; otherwise they may not be convinced that this is a coordinated, efficient effort.

Jim – We had the Amazon Initiative meeting in January at the Peterson Center with a great attendance. Feels if any part of the watershed is underexposed, it is the urban area of Eugene. Focusing the Annual Meeting on our work in Amazon Creek could be an opportunity to leverage the work that LTWC and the partnership is doing and raise our visibility; could be used as a stair step to a fundraising event in the spring. Also likes David P's idea of lighter finger food. If there's a chance to begin leverage the work that Jason is doing and partnership. Likes DP's idea of lighter finger food. Acknowledges that we have more work to do in rural areas, but we can address that with our public meetings.

Mike notes that our public meetings are mostly in rural areas.

Jim – We'll likely still have rural folks coming to an Annual Meeting in Eugene. We've spent a lot of energy developing relationships with about 15% of the

watershed's population. This is an opportunity to become more visibly exposed with a larger group.

David P notes that many people in Eugene don't understand that they're connected to the larger watershed. Not only an opportunity to make our work in Amazon Creek visible, but emphasize that people are connected to a larger watershed. It provides an opportunity to talk about the Council's work overall in other parts of the watershed; a holistic connection and help them visualize the bigger picture.

Jim notes that a lot of people really care about Fern Ridge. **Deborah** adds that people really value the wildlife in Fern Ridge. Summarizes that it sounds like everyone is comfortable with an urban destination.

Dana – There are a couple of different themes being discussed. 1) Talking about the Amazon Initiative program even though the project at South Willamette is not done yet. However, it people seem ok with that because it could tie into a fundraising event and show what we're doing in the rest of the watershed. 2) We could focus on the oak, prairie, and wildlife work that we also do.

David P suggests that there might be someone like a Bruce Newhouse who can knit the themes together and talk about how all parts support the watershed. **Deborah** adds that what makes us unique is that we do what all the other partners don't do.

Jim feels that oak and prairie restoration work resonates with urban residents because of the Rivers to Ridges connection because people are aware of R2R. Agrees with emphasizing how Amazon Creek is connected to the larger watershed and why the larger watershed is important.

David P - "Feels (the program theme) is more at the 30,000 feet level than in the weeds about the Amazon Initiative." We know that people aren't aware of the connections to the greater watershed. To many people, Amazon Creek is this swampy thing that runs through town. **Deborah** adds that the missing piece is why people are part of a bigger watershed. **Jim** agrees that people need to understand that Amazon Creek is a part of the Long Tom watershed. Work in the Amazon basin is not just contributing to Amazon Creek.

Deborah – It becomes more detailed as you think about putting it all together, but it will be challenging to make it a clearly messaged program. Asks if there might be anyone at OWEB who could speak about why this watershed is important and what watershed councils are and why they're important. This could provide a larger, state-wide picture. It could emphasize what every watershed council is about – the community members who support it, volunteer for it, and run it.

Therese agrees that this theme could be used to facilitate an identity or awareness in the urban area. **David P** advises not to make the theme overly beaurocratic.

Dana notes that Peg Boulay is a good speaker. She's married to Bruce Newhouse, on the OWEB Board and works at the UO. She was also on LTWC's Board, and could be the person who makes that "30,000 foot level" connection.

Deborah – asks if the program should be within the 40-45 minute range. Could condense the program time and save more time for people to socialize. The energy was good at the fundraising event in February, and there was plenty of opportunity for people to walk around and talk about LTWC. Would be nice to try to duplicate that energy.

Mike likes the idea of holding the Annual Meeting in Eugene and tying it into Amazon Initiative project. When he talks to people in Eugene about the Amazon Initiative, they are very positive about it. Agrees that we should have a simpler Annual Meeting without the fundraising component; can just have a good program where people get together and talk to each other and have a couple presentations. Feels that we need to focus on the urban area right now and can focus on rural people at our public meetings. Thinks this will lead into better fundraising. The more connections we have in town, the more fundraising opportunities we'll have.

Steve is anxious to increase our visibility in Eugene and tie in the Amazon Creek focus. However, he wonders if we're better off waiting to see if we have more to present the following year. If we end up having more to present on Amazon next year, we don't want to end up having similar programs two years in a row. He also likes the OWEB idea. Next year we may have more projects on the ground as examples to showcase. Feels that timing is important. **Dana** notes that we would want to keep in mind what we would present this year vs. future years and consider how to handle that moving forward.

Jim suggests using the 27th and Willamette project as a kickoff for the fundraising event.

Mike adds that if ground is broken by October, there would be something to show this year.

David T notes that the amazing thing at (the January meeting) at Petersen barn was the large overview maps that showed where Amazon Creek flowed. We already launched the program idea at Peterson Barn, and the meeting could help build anticipating for spring work and our fundraising event. Adds that what happens in Amazon Creek impacts Fern Ridge and the Long Tom further downstream. The meeting could look at the work we've done and where we've done it in the rural areas connected by this watershed to Eugene.

Jim suggests using the fundraising event to highlight the 27th & Willamette project. **David P** feels that a fundraising event should not focus on a specific project. It's more important that it be much broader.

Deborah kind of agrees with Steve that we'd have much more info next year. This year, the program could include education about what a watershed and watershed council is and the different parts of it; provide an overview in terms of OWEB; and describe our watershed and the kinds of projects we do in a general way rather than showcasing more specific projects. Feels we could do that effectively because we have the visual aids to do it. She's more concerned about finding a guest speaker that could inspire people on that concept. Feels a simpler event will be better attended.

Jim feels that being in Eugene is more about accessing a stakeholder group. Last year's Annual Meeting at the Huntons' was cool, but it could be daunting for someone in south Eugene to find it. He was blown away by all the people he didn't know at the January Petersen Barn meeting. He knows most of the people at the rural public meetings.

Sue – suggests talking about our most recent accomplishments and where we're going. Feels having a meeting in town makes sense. Agrees that finger food would be good – chocolate! Likes Deborah's speaker idea and honing the theme down to what's happening in the watershed. Opportunity to educate people about where they live, what we're doing to improve their lives, and how they could participate to further those efforts.

Therese suggests Steve Gordon as a speaker. **Deborah** adds that Steve loves speaking. **Dana** was thinking of Dave Hulse as a possibility.

Dana adds that cool maps that focus on education would be an important component. She wants to visually show the context of Amazon Creek within the Willamette. Illustrate how our work in the rural area relates. For example, we removed a dam at David Turner's and he is connected to Eugene through his work at the UO. We could have hardcopy maps on the walls without too much detail but enough context.

Dana requests a feedback and design team for the Annual Meeting. Asks what the Board thinks of asking David Funk to create a brand for us. Poses the question of how we are going to explain who we are to the watershed?

ACTION ITEM: The Board agrees that Dana should contact Dave Funk about creating a brand for us to help us explain the message of who the Long Tom Watershed Council is at our Annual Meeting.

Jim feels that Steve is right that the Annual Meeting needs to incorporate the broader picture and not focus solely on Amazon Creek.

Dana points out that there is the opportunity to focus on Willamette River outreach too, which is a new endeavor for LTWC.

Deborah recommends inviting anyone who donated or anyone we solicited a donation from, particularly in the urban area. Also suggests inviting the Chamber of Commerce.

ACTION ITEM: Annual Meeting Feedback Team: Jim, David P. (with a focus on outreach), Therese (focus on planning), and Charles (who agreed to be on the team with Dana earlier). David T. is willing to provide feedback via email.

Finger food – several people feel we could charge \$12 – 15 per ticket.

Deborah feels it makes sense for the Annual Meeting to fall under the scope of the Resource Development Committee. **Dana** wants to avoid RDC members from feeling overwhelmed with the burden of an Annual Meeting when it requires a lot of energy to fundraise already.

Ed Alverson is suggested as a person who could create cool, educational maps.

J. Topic ideas for Public Council Meetings this year – Dana

Dana asks for people to suggest topics.

Steve is interested in groundwater implications because he hasn't heard much about it.

David T asks if Jed will have more info to present on fisheries. Yes, an update on fisheries in the Long Tom is on the list. We are checking with Karen Hans, our ODFW biologist contact, on when data analysis will be complete enough to present on this topic. **Mike** would like to see fish passage included in this theme.

David T. – Fern Ridge. **Dana** – we could blend Fern Ridge with oak and prairie restoration work done with an ODFW grant in conjunction with City work.

Sue liked the invasive species workshop from 2011. Suggests a twist to talk about chemicals in the environment and provide people with the alternatives to using chemicals.

Dana suggests how to do a stormwater project.

Deborah suggests proper landscaping with native plants.

Steve suggests tying the invasives focus in with pet stores and nurseries and what invasives they can or cannot sell so people can recognize them. Notes that there is some legislation on this topic now. **Dana** suggests discussing where we are with invasive species overall and talking about what people can do.

Other suggestions: Willamette River, Model Watershed progress report (in Monroe)

Reports & Announcements

K. Staff Reports

Dana – shows the Board the new logo. Several comment that they like the way it looks.

Hiring – Dana will be calling references on Monday. The Thomsons, project landowners in Ferguson Creek, graciously agreed to interview the top three candidates. Those candidates then walked the project site at the Thomsons with Jed and had lunch with Jim in Junction City. It's been a rigorous process but we want to make sure that we get it right.

L. Board Member Reports

Therese mentions an MOU potential between the City of Eugene and the Junction City Water Control District regarding drainage issues in district managed waterways. Feels they are a significant player in the watershed and wants us to be aware that the City is approaching the MOU based on drainage quantity, quality of

urban runoff, and the maintenance of waterways of district easements annexed by the City. Therese is coordinating the MOU and working with Steve Cornocchia at the Junction City Water Control District.

M. Action Items Summary

- Steve Cole agrees to serve on the Board Member Feedback Team
- The Board agrees that Dana should contact Dave Funk about creating a brand for us to help us explain the message of who the Long Tom Watershed Council is at our Annual Meeting.
- Annual Meeting Feedback Team: Jim, David P. (with a focus on outreach), Therese (focus on planning), and Charles (who agreed to be on the team with Dana earlier). David T. is willing to provide feedback via email.

Meeting adjourned at 7:36 p.m. (acting Chair Jim Pendergrass departed at 7:30 p.m.).

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