

## Council Development Matrix

Council Development Matrix						
						<b>501(c) 3</b>
	<b>Current Status</b>	<b>Personnel Services</b>	<b>Cascade Pacific RCD</b>	<b>Benton/ E.Lane SWCD</b>	<b>"Friends of"</b>	<b>Steering as Board/ Executive Council</b>
<b><u>Stature Independence Growth</u></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Council has done well with current structure to this point</li> <li>*Relatively independent</li> <li>*May not be able to continue to grow as much - projects &amp; funding issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Not clear how this would affect the Council's stature/independence/growth.</li> <li>*Who or what would the "staff" ultimately be responsible to?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*May provide limited growth but doesn't address the outstanding issue of funding</li> <li>*May affect the independence of the Council - employees would be answering to Cascade Pacific</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*May affect the independence of the Council - employees would be answering to SWCD</li> <li>*Could affect access to landowners because of closer relationship to the government</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*The Council would maintain or increase its independence, as well as its potential for growth.</li> <li>*Staff would be directly responsible to the council.</li> <li>* Stature: this structure may not look as strong or influential as other options</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*The Council would maintain or increase its independence, as well as its potential for growth.</li> <li>*Staff would be directly responsible to the council.</li> </ul>
<b><u>"Board" Liability</u></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Steering is currently covered under DAS Insurance</li> <li>*Coverage is weak</li> <li>*Council cannot purchase additional insurance</li> </ul>	same	same	same	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Uncertain liability - offers no extra protection for Steering Committee</li> <li>*The group could purchase additional insurance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*The board would be covered by the DAS insurance and could purchase additional insurance</li> <li>*Liability for projects would be limited to gross negligence</li> <li>* Would increase liability risks if the organization chose to have employees</li> </ul>
<b><u>Staff Liability</u></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Council Coordinator is covered by DAS insurance</li> <li>*Uncertain as to whether Projects Coordinator is covered</li> <li>*Coverage is potentially very weak - project implementation is not covered</li> <li>*Contractors currently not charging full cost of liability in perpetuity</li> <li>*Not clear as to whether Projects Coordinator is covered</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*The personnel service would be responsible for staff</li> <li>*The Council would assume all costs for liability coverage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Currently, CPRCD's umbrella policy would cover staff, but not projects</li> <li>* The Council would assume all costs for liability coverage.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*SWCD could possibly hold liability for staff, but don't know whether liability for projects would be covered.</li> <li>*The Council would assume all costs for liability coverage.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Liability would cost the Council more, but there would be better coverage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Available coverage from DAS.</li> <li>*Having an "insurable organization" and purchasing insurance would greatly reduce the legal risks for staff.</li> <li>*Liability would cost the Council more, but there would be better coverage</li> </ul>
<b><u>Retaining Staff</u></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Independent contractors doing the work of the council are not provided with health insurance, retirement, workman's comp or unemployment benefits.</li> <li>*Contractors are responsible only for work outlined in contract.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* This option is really more of an administrative tool, as opposed to an organizational structure</li> <li>*This situation would probably not be conducive to retaining staff, as there would be less loyalty to the Council.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*not clear what effect this structure would have on retaining staff</li> <li>*might provide better benefits for staff</li> <li>*potentially creates "two bosses" for staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*not clear what effect this structure would have on retaining staff</li> <li>*might provide better benefits for staff</li> <li>*potentially creates "two bosses" for staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Having employees of the Council would create a more competitive employment situation in terms of benefits and direction as well as liability issues.</li> <li>*potentially creates "two bosses" for staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Having employees of the Council would create a more competitive employment situation in terms of benefits and direction as well as liability issues.</li> </ul>

## Council Development Matrix

<b>501(c) 3</b>						
	<b>Current Status</b>	<b>Personnel Services</b>	<b>Cascade Pacific RCD</b>	<b>Benton/ E.Lane SWCD</b>	<b>"Friends of"</b>	<b>Steering as Board/ Executive Council</b>
<b><u>Funding Sources</u></b>	<p>*DEQ has also stated that they will not provide money for future monitoring, without the Council becoming its own non-profit.</p> <p>*Council needs to diversify sources of revenue.</p> <p>*Some Foundations will not grant money to organizations that are not 501(c)3.</p>	same	<p>*Having Cascade Pacific as the Council's fiscal agent, may not satisfy requirements for some foundation grants; it does not satisfy requirements for DEQ funding.</p>	<p>*May not satisfy requirements for foundation grants or DEQ funding.</p> <p>*Potential for synergies with grants and projects</p>	<p>*The "Friends of" organization would be responsible for fundraising for the Council.</p>	<p>*Having a non-profit status would resolve any questions over the Council's eligibility for foundation grants or money from DEQ</p>
<b><u>Status of Members</u></b>	<p>*Membership to the council is inclusive and all members have the right to vote on decisions</p> <p>*Decision making is guided carefully</p> <p>*Membership is somewhat unclear</p>	This would not affect the status of members.	<p>*less independence could affect range of decision making</p>	same	<p>*Would probably not otherwise affect the membership of the Council itself</p>	<p>*Membership must be defined</p> <p>*Council would have to chose to be either a membership or non-membership corporation</p> <p>* However, this structure does offer considerable flexibility; by-laws could be written broadly to accommodate the inclusive nature of the Council.</p>
<b><u>Maintenance of Council Culture</u></b>	<p>*The council has developed a unique culture. There is a broad, grassroots feel.</p>	<p>* has potential to weaken the strength and cohesiveness of Council Culture</p>	<p>*feeling of independence may be affected</p> <p>* has potential to weaken the strength and cohesiveness of Council Culture</p>	same	<p>*Would probably not otherwise affect the structure of the Council itself</p>	<p>*There is some uncertainty as to what effect this structure would have on council culture.</p> <p>*Structure would be more formal, and there would be increased responsibility for the Board.</p>
<b><u>Requirements</u></b>	<p>*If the council kept the current organizational structure, the issues of liability (esp. for projects) and for funding would have to be addressed.</p>		<p>To consider this option, a formal letter of inquiry must be submitted to CPRC&amp;D. It is not certain that they would agree to have employees for the Council.</p>	<p>Before a formal letter of inquiry could be submitted, the Council would have to work at developing a close relationship with the SWCD. A formal letter of inquiry must be submitted to SWCD. It is not certain that they would agree to have employees for the Council.</p>	<p>There are several requirements - up front and annually for a non-profit. Could increase the work load for board members of the "friends of " group.</p>	<p>There are several requirements - up front and annually for a non-profit. Could increase the work load for Steering Committe.</p>