

**Final Report – OWEB Grant # 201-030**  
**Long Tom Watershed Council**  
**Watershed Council Support**  
**July 1, 2001 – June 30, 2003**

*Report prepared in accordance with Exhibit B of the Council Support Grant Agreement*

**1) General description of the work activities of the coordinator and the Council and the projects completed during the time period.**

The Watershed Coordinator is responsible for overseeing both the ongoing and discrete tasks the watershed council set out to accomplish during the grant period. The Coordinator completes much of the work, as well as overseeing volunteers for part of the work. This oversight and volunteer coordination includes: communicating between groups; recruiting, training, organizing and supervising volunteers; keeping members motivated and appreciated, focused and on time for tasks; and filling in gaps when volunteers are unavailable or unwilling.

The primary objectives the Council worked to accomplish during this first part of the grant period were: 1) Maintaining consistent activity and leveraging volunteer hours in the working committees (Steering, Program/Meeting Planning, Technical, Finance/Fundraising, Projects & Monitoring Contract Review and other Ad-hoc such as Search, Annual Celebration); 2) Assisting people from diverse perspectives communicating and working together toward watershed health at regular meetings, workshops, and forums; 3) Overseeing and integrating the multiple phases of the Watershed Action Plan, Water Quality Monitoring Program, Restoration Project Prioritization project, and others; 5) Leveraging funds and in-kind service from private sectors of the watershed community as well as the public sector; and 6) Keeping the public-at-large informed and aware through the newsletter, speaking engagements, the list-serv and web page.

The Long Tom Watershed Council and its Coordinator have accomplished the core substantive items proposed in the original grant application even as funding was reduced from the original proposal. We were able to retain additional items as well, especially the pilot Sub-watershed Enhancement Program. No distinction will be made in this report between what was originally proposed in the grant application and the extra activities. The following attachments outline the accomplishments to date:

- Attachment 1a. Overview of Activities & Projects*
- Attachment 1b. Council Meeting and Business topics*
- Attachment 1c. Coordinator's Accomplishments*

**2) The results and work plan resulting from the self evaluation process**

Please see attachment.

*Attachment 2a. Results of Self-Evaluation, September 2002*

**3) The number of volunteers who participated in the project, the work accomplished and the total hours worked.**

The Coordinator's time leveraged at least 5,941 hours from Council members, interns and volunteers in discrete or ongoing projects led by the Council, and this is valued at \$173,990. There are many informal efforts for which we cannot know how many hours are donated. Attachment 3a presents a list of the volunteer efforts we have been able to capture and record, and values that donation.

Valuing volunteer time is difficult, but we took into account whether or not people were volunteering due to their professional skills as well as personal interest, what type of activity they were helping us with, and the value of that on the open market. From there, we chose what we thought were minimum hourly rate valuations, the minimum we'd need to pay to hire for that activity.

We did not count time that members and the general citizenry spent attending council meetings. They attended 20 council meetings to participate in the watershed council, educate themselves, and further the goals of watershed improvement. Average attendance is about 28, and fluctuates from 20 to 42 people.

We also did not include the hours or value of the Technical Team, as that is shown in the match funding total already, and detailed in Attachment 4b.

*Attachment 3a. Volunteer Tracking 2001-03*

**4) An accounting of the other funds and in-kind resources committed to the project**

With OWEB seed money, we were able to leverage cash, in-kind services such as technical team, in-kind products such as office space, and in-kind donations of volunteer time. As you will see below, just our cash match is greater than the 25% required. We are proud of the support, hard work and deep commitment of the people and organizations in the Long Tom Basin. Please keep that seed money coming to us; we are able to stretch it quite far.

Match required to OWEB's \$81,000:	\$ 20,250, 25%
Total Match delivered:	\$ 331,998, 410%
Cash Match	\$ 36,015
In-kind services Match	\$ 121,993
Volunteer Time Match	\$ 173,990

*Attachment 4a. Accounting of OWEB and local match funds used during the grant period.*

*Attachment 4b. Partners and Match Funds Overview*

*Please note the columns for the 2001-03 time period, as the Coordinator is the main force in gaining match funding for all Council activities.*

## **5) Other such information as would be helpful in evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of project methods, materials, or assumptions**

The Long Tom Watershed Council has maintained an active schedule and a good reputation with area residents. The Council includes a diverse group of stakeholders from the watershed, 92% of which is in private ownership. By land-use the watershed is 46% forestry, 31% agriculture, 9% rural residential, and 8% urban. The success of the Council indicates it is filling a valuable niche in these communities and a diverse mix of people and new members are consistently present at every meeting as we rotate throughout the watershed. We also continue to see ranching, timber, and agricultural landowners be active participants in our Council. This was initially hard to gain, and may continue to be so, because of the divisive factors at work in our society on issues concerning land and water. The Council provides a place where people may feel safe in discussing land and water issues that are otherwise contentious.

One measure of our success can be the many donations, letters and thank-you notes we receive from landowners and agency personnel. We also are thankful to see the dedication to the group that landowners will voice in public, such as those speaking out in support of the watershed council and the Oregon Plan in public forums. This is something OWEB representatives have seen and heard. This is a testament to the inclusiveness of the Council and the fact that landowners and residents feel ownership of and responsibility toward the group.

Probably the single greatest weakness of our watershed council, and many others, is the instability and uncertain future of funding, and the lack of support in building capacity. Paid staff for a watershed council can leverage large amounts of volunteer hours and donations, and those people in turn inspire their neighbors and community members to act in better stewardship. A crucial part of the Coordinator's role is maintaining the trust and consistency with landowners, such that they are motivated to improve their stewardship practices, volunteer with the council, and communicate honestly about the barriers they face in doing either one.

Unfortunately, the backdrop for these local efforts is a changing political scene regionally, statewide, and nationally. With this comes change in funding and the latest trend is decreased funding yet increasing administrative. Council members voice how this affects them - it undermines the hard work they have done to build community and trust, and to motivate people to do active restoration and stay with them while they learn to do so. It also decreases the assistance available to landowners by adding "red-tape", delays, and administrative pieces that all serve as impediments to learning better stewardship. As the Council gains in reputation, we are receiving requests for services far past what the staff and volunteers can give.

We continually work to garner local support to increase our capacity but also greatly need OWEB to deliver some major capacity-building assistance. Thank you OWEB Board members, staff, review teams and supporters for all your assistance thus far in adding a strong local dimension to watershed stewardship. The people we have worked with in the Long Tom Watershed appreciate it, and even the most cautious see it frankly as the "best option" for approaching these issues and so are making the effort. The longer we're around, and the more stable we are for them, the more likely this effort will come to fruition and make long-term substantive change in watershed health.

*Attachment 5a. "In Pursuit of Pure Water", article in Tri-County News*

*Attachment 5b. Copies of regular news columns in West Lane News and Tri-County News*

*Attachment 5c. Pictures of display board*

