

**Long Tom Watershed Council
Board of Directors Meeting
Thursday, March 5, 2015
751 S. Danebo Ave.
Eugene, OR 97402**

Present: Mike Brinkley (until 6:30), Alan Dickman, Steve Horning, Jim Pendergrass (arrived 6 p.m.), Lindsay Reaves, Charles Ruff, Deborah Saunders Evans, David Turner, Therese Walch (10)

Absent: Cary Hart, John Reerslev (2)

Staff: Dana Dedrick, Rob Hoshaw, Sarah Whitney

Meeting called to order at 5:43 p.m. by Charles Ruff

Business

- A. Approve February 2015 Board Meeting Minutes** – *Secretary Walch*
Call for any comments or corrections. It's noted that there's one open parentheses and Mary Rellergert was misspelled (the name of the award Lindsay received).

MOTION TO APPROVE February Board of Directors Meeting Minutes with amendments by M. Brinkley, seconded by A. Dickman. Approved unanimously.

- B. Approve January 2015 Financial Reports** – *Treasurer Brinkley*
Notes that the Council is starting to see some positive cash flow as accounts receivable for grants are coming in. Nothing unusual or of particular note to report on this month.

MOTION TO APPROVE January 2015 Financial Reports by S. Horning, seconded by D. Turner. Approved unanimously.

- C. Committee Reports**
Resource Development – *David & Deborah*

- The board is invited to think about people they meet who enjoy LTWC and our work - folks that we can cultivate for donations.
- There was also a short discussion about an associated sub-group of some nonprofits that focuses on fundraising only; this was posited as a potential idea for down the road.

- It was noted that this is our 4th year of fundraising, and this is a transition year for fundraising because we're hiring the Development & Communications Director.
- The goal is to send out the Spring Appeal Letter by early May.
- RDC met just before the Board Meeting to assign a list of people to ask for donations and to talk about the appeal letter.
- Dana passed out a draft list of project descriptions that note an amount that would be needed to make the restoration project fully funded. It was noted by board members that this type of document makes fundraising more fully tied to work on the ground and supported the idea of having a snapshot of real projects and how donors can support program work.
- It was clarified that the goal of this handout of project descriptions is not to start having designated funds.
- Board members were encouraged to give so LTWC can say it has 100% board giving.

D. Paperwork Moment

Board members turned in their match forms for volunteer hours, and picked up new Board materials for binders.

Council Self Evaluation (6:15) – *facilitated by Chair Jim Pendergrass*

** For a complete list of topic rankings & voting results, please see attached documents.*

Board members voted on their top 3 topic areas that they wanted to discuss (results in Attachment B). The top results were:

1. Watershed Planning & Projects
2. Meetings
3. Citizen Involvement and 4) Participation (Participation was also talked about because the voting results were close to the top 3, and folks thought it went well with the discussion on Citizen Involvement).

E. Brief Discussion of Non-Priority Topics

Jim asked Board members to share key comments on topic areas that weren't voted on as one of the top 3 for discussion.

9 Council reports progress to all stakeholders (and also comments on public meetings and citizen engagement).

- **Therese** feels that we do a good job of creating and sharing our Annual Report, and summarizing accomplishments and the year's expenses.
- **Mike** – thought we should do better on item #9. Notes that people in his circles do know about watershed councils, but they don't really know what LTWC is doing specifically. Public meetings are opportunities to engage our stakeholders, but he feels we don't get as good of participation as we could. Suggests using local TV, radio, print media, and local businesses to promote our event. Also feels we could share info about key program areas, for instance posting information about our Cutthroat Trout Migration Study at Diamond Woods Golf Course in Monroe (where we have a trap set). Also suggests giving talks at area high schools, inviting students to go out in the field (feels they're our future volunteers and donors), and he would also like to see more promotion of our Urban Waters stormwater projects.
- **Deborah** suggests that we revisit how we structure council meetings, where we have them, and topics. Feels that we've been holding the same type of meeting for over 15 years.
- There was some discussion about the difficulty of getting council members to come out to Monroe, though people also noted how important it is to engage this community since the people we want to work with on the mainstem Long Tom and Willamette live in and around the Monroe area.
- **Jim** feels that the public meeting content has been good, but it would be nice to have 100 people attend rather than 40. Offers that perhaps attendees could contribute a small fee.
- **Steve** would like to see a signature project that could act as a "flagship" moment of LTWC's achievement to brag about to the community
- **Lindsay** feels we have 3 major community groups: agriculture, forestry, and urban.
- There was a lot of agreement and discussion about the need to get more people engaged and know what LTWC does as an organization, but there was recognition that with the hiring of the Development & Communications Director and Outreach & Education staff that there would be an opportunity to consider a broader strategy of citizen involvement. The key point is people felt we needed to generate a deeper awareness and increase our community engagement. People felt teaching that "we all live in a watershed" is a great message.

#19 Board members understand their role with staff and relationship with staff:

- Jim notes that this seems very important, but some people felt we aren't doing enough or could do better.
- **Alan** feels he understands the staff/board relationship somewhat, though he's still relatively new. Feels he doesn't need to know all the intricate details yet.
- **Charles** notes that it's very important and feels staff does a great job informing board members what it is that they're supposed to do. One gray area, though, is understanding the direct role of working with individual staff.
- **Dana** clarifies that the E.D. runs the organization; the staff work under the E.D.; the board gives guidance and directs policy to the E.D. to run the organization. The reason the relationship is this way is so staff don't become confused. Notes that the board/staff relationship has had a very respectful and positive history.
- **Charles** notes that there are problems in some organizations when the board oversteps and feels they're in charge of all staff.
- **Therese** notes that her relationship with Sarah has been very collaborative and positive as partner representatives.

F. Discussion of Priority Topic Areas.

1) Watershed Planning & Projects

- **Deborah** – this area is one of the most important pieces that we do as a Council; it makes us effective and defines us in terms of what we can contribute. We're doing important work, and working alongside partners all with the same Willamette Basin-wide goal.
- **Steve** emphasizes that perspective is very important. Wonders if we overly identifying limiting factors without finding ways to make limiting factors less of a limiting factor over time. For example, with fundraising, when do we change our perspective to feel like a bigger goal than \$40,000 is achievable? Notes that he feels we're doing well overall in this area, but perhaps as we grow our goals should also grow and shift, and the Council should aim to do better as we grow.
- **Charles** points out that he feels vision and efficacy is the key. The Council needs to be the most effective with resources it has and continue to build on successes.
- **David** feels that the strategy to focus on certain areas of the watershed (e.g. the Model sub-watersheds) as a high priority has helped a great deal to reach meaningful outcomes. This focus has led to real successes; the downside is that perhaps people in the other sub-basins may feel left out.

- **Therese** adds that the Council has grown a lot (e.g. the urban and Willamette boundary expansions, the growth of the Urban Waters & Wildlife Program, and the new office space). Notes that with so much growth, the long-term plan and priorities for the watershed may be outdated and the vision could become diluted or shortsighted. Feels there's a need for updating the Strategic Plan.
- **Deborah** feels that we've stayed true to our mission statement over the years. Perhaps it's time to explore different kinds of outreach methods or conduct our public meetings differently.
- **Jim** adds that we may not be as visible some years when our work plan is focused in such a way where we're working more behind the scenes. With the addition of the Development & Communications Director, we'll have more money and capacity to move steadily across all fronts.

#34 Council's projects are monitored for effectiveness – Votes were split on doing enough / doing great.

- **Jim** – it appears like folks feel it would be nice if we could do more and lend more long-term credibility to our work.
- **Therese** – monitoring is a level of detail that the board isn't always exposed to; makes this question challenging to evaluate.
- **Steve** feels like staff have all done well with their presentations to the board about how habitat projects are going.
- **Alan** adds that most of those presentations are focused more on implementation than on post-project monitoring, however. Doesn't have a sense of which projects we need to monitor more intensively than others.
- **Dana** notes that it's a fundamentally a funding issue. In the past, funders wouldn't fund project effectiveness; then they started doing funding it, though they aren't doing much with the data. At the moment they aren't funding project effectiveness much at all.
- **Charles** adds that there is a different set of internal metrics within the council for project effectiveness than what the board sees.
- **Dana** – maybe it's more important to show the board what types of parameters we're monitoring for, where we're monitoring in the watershed, and why.

2) Meetings

- **Jim** notes that collectively, the board thought this area is very important and we're mostly doing well.
- **Therese** notes that the Annual Meeting is well attended and has a formalized agenda. Suggests that there could be a public forum

opportunity for people to come up and say what's important to them in the watershed (e.g. like the "open-mic" nights at the Siuslaw Watershed Council)

- **Dana** notes that those type of events need to be facilitated well.
- **Charles** offers that we could frame it as seeking input from general membership and limit people to a maximum of 2 minutes at the open mic.
- **Jim** – as long as people are constructive and respectful, it's valuable.
- **Steve** feels that this could be a good starting place to seek general input. Offers that the Council could openly advertise the events as a forum for folks to share what they're interested in and how to improve as a council.
- **Dana** notes that we used to have similar events that in our early years.
- **Lindsay** suggests tailoring meetings towards the specific audiences and to engage different audiences in different ways.
- **Therese** (in respect to Board Mtgs) notes that it would be nice to have the final approved policies to stick in the board binder (e.g. final Herbicide Use and Social Media policies). The board is queried in regards to posting these policies on the board login of the LTWC website.

Action Item: the final Herbicide Use Policy & Social Media Policies will be posted on the board login of the LTWC website with a reminder in the next board packet.

- **Charles** believes there are 2 mechanisms being discussed: 1) a genuine, wide-open member input event, and 2) a topic-driven discussion seeking feedback on a range of topics). The latter may fit better at some of the regional meetings to seek feedback. The former may work better at the Annual Meeting.
- **Lindsay** suggests having an informational meeting followed up with a public work session afterward. The first meeting would be for info-sharing and learning; the 2nd meeting could be more of a structured, neighborhood sharing meeting held to discuss ideas and opinions based on 1st meeting. This 2nd meeting could be held a month or so later to engage the watershed community.

3) Citizen Involvement & Support

- **Jim** notes that this category received the widest diversity of responses. Three of the questions had respondents answer "let's do better." Personally, he feels improvement directly correlates to a more sustainable future revenue stream. He feels that we're currently doing great in most areas, though there will be a need to do better as our organization

evolves. Feels that are primary stakeholders are local people, industry/business owners, and rural landowners. As we think about involving citizens, these are the people we need to carefully consider how to engage. Right now, we're doing great, but as we move forward, we're going to have to continually improve.

- **Deborah** feels we can do better with local people and groups; this view comes from a fundraising perspective because lots of people she's spoken with about LTWC don't know what we do. Feels that we're in the transition period with an opportunity to increase our visibility.
- **Steve** feels that an important message is that LTWC has been able to have success doing our unique work in our unique way whereas another organization wouldn't have been able to duplicate those same successes. Our ability alone to accomplish what we do and how we do it makes us unique. If we can tie that message into showing that we were able to develop relationships with certain businesses and landowners and get them to work with us, that holds a lot of clout with the public.
- **Deborah** wants people to know that money can go to all sorts of projects and programs; wonders what the best way is to communicate that.
- **Charles** feels this discussion goes back to branding and visibility – that signature project that Steve mentioned earlier. Having an engaging story that people identify with is important to have. He sees 3 groups: clients, partners, and supporters. The supporters support the broader vision and mission but don't have the same vested interest in the projects like the clients do. There should be a goal to move people from one group to the other (e.g. clients to supporters; supporters to clients)
- **Sarah (reading Mike's notes)** – mentions there are big names in the conservation world with highly publicized projects, but these groups don't necessarily know what we're doing, and they don't realize that success isn't all about changing regulations and legislation. Feels that we should talk with them about how to work collaboratively rather than in a more regulatory way. People think regulations really do protect us, though the impact is actually minimized. Feels we could do more to engage these conservation groups.
- **Sarah** adds that we hired Kathryn as the Outreach & Education Specialist, who will start near the end of March/beginning of April.
- **David** – Could we get several clients or landowners together that we've worked with in the past and could they evaluate us too? Perhaps we could do a similar evaluation with partners (e.g. government, community groups) through a public input/forum setting. Feels this would be a step toward greater communication and add to our evaluative process.

- **Jim** agrees that we could hear from project landowners what they feel has gone well and what could be improved.
- **Steve** notes that public meetings are an odd setting to encourage people to do things with their land. It can be challenging and a bit awkward for folks who are reticent with all the other people in attendance, and it's difficult to have one-on-one, private conversations.
- **David** offers that if we defined the specific group, the discussion could be by invitation only.
- **Alan** adds that if you look at each group of stakeholders separately, it would seem that most people don't know who LTWC is. Adds that he likes the idea of posting project signs.
- **Steve** agrees with posting project signs. For instance, there are simple signs in fields along Hwy 99 that announce what type of crop is being grown and what the crop is used for. It's a great learning moment. Lots of board members echo liking project signs.
- **Alan** asks how much it costs to underwrite radio.
- **Charles** notes that KLCC is a little expensive and Eugene Area Radio Stations (EARS) is about \$1,000. However, he feels it would pay for itself within a year and it would really go a long way to promoting the Council and giving us publicity.
- **Steve** wonders about cost for billboard at Eugene Emeralds for a year.
- **Alan** adds that people have often commented on his fish pin. Feels that hats with our logo would go a long ways and would be a good conversation starter.
- **David** feels that bumper stickers are reasonable.
- **Therese** also likes Charles' grouping of clients, partners, and supporters; agrees that messaging for each group would be slightly different. For instance, in the urban area, it's important to know who the partners are and what they need. It's important to know that City of Eugene and LTWC are working as partners; that we're not duplicating work but rather being efficient.
- **Lindsay** feels we need to identify what the buy in is. For example, landowners have a vested interest in doing a project; for community groups, there's an opportunity to partner on collaborative efforts that broadens visibility.
- **Steve** reiterates that he thinks projects signs are a great idea.
- **Lindsay** mentions technology where you can scan an ID sign on a tree and get information to come up on your phone.

4) Participation

- **Jim** notes that Participation has been discussed to a degree under Citizen Involvement. Adds that all voted that the council is doing either great or enough in this category.
- **David** sometimes feels there's a divide between how the board and council thinks about a project. Unsure if we consistently explain at public meetings why we do the type of work and activities we do, and what the benefits are. Unsure if we're also consistent in articulating the big picture (e.g. with last year's beaver public meeting, it was a great learning opportunity, but it would be great to understand why the council is concerned about beavers).
- **Alan** (regarding #6 – “Our council and board members share a common vision and purpose”) feels it's natural for different groups to have a different vision because they're different stakeholders with varying perspectives.
- **Steve** – big picture, most people have broad, large-scale shared visions; it's the smaller-scale visions that tend to vary more widely.
- **Deborah** feels that we're the best watershed council in the state, but that doesn't mean we can't improve. (Regarding #8 “the council reports progress and results to our county governing body”) She feels we're a bit out of touch with our county commissioners and wonders if we could leverage more support out of the county.
- **Charles** notes that there is a short duration of what's considered voting membership (those who sign in for the duration of the Annual Meeting). There was some discussion and clarification about what it means to be a “member” of the watershed council, and the difference between the technical definition of signing in at the Annual Meeting, and the spirit of membership which is open and inclusive to anyone who holds a stake in the health of the watershed.

G. Wrapping Up

- **Jim** suggests sending out notes to the board before the next meeting, and then people can think about action items that come out of this discussion at the next board meeting.
- **Dana** encourages people to pay particular attention to these board minutes, to read them, and make sure we've captured the essence of what you articulated. Let us know if there are any additions or corrections.
- **Steve** feels that we need a brand; hopes that the Development & Communications Director will focus in part on branding our organization.

Reports & Announcements

E. Staff Reports

In background.

F. Liaison Reports

None given.

G. Action Items Report:

- The final Herbicide Use Policy & Social Media Policies will be posted on the board login of the LTWC website with a reminder in the next board packet.

Meeting adjourned at 7:38 p.m. by Jim Pendergrass, Chair

Discussion after the Meeting:

- **Charles** notes that it's the emotional connection of the work that's important - what's the value that we bring and the visual connection that we could bring to help the community make the connection to why our work is important and why this organization is unique. Echoes Steve's sentiment that there is a strong need for branding. Adds that the biggest challenge is that our best work is largely invisible and difficult to show graphically.
- **Steve** reiterates the need to have a signature project that will resonate with people.
- **Jim** suggests taking supporters out to show them a tour of a project (such as higher level donors)
- **Alan** feels that the project tour is something that we do well.
- **Charles** would like the end result to be that we can share in concise ways the good work we're doing and the result it's having; need to have easily digestible examples of that. If you're talking about lowering water temperature for fish habitat, people probably glaze over because it doesn't connect as well.

Attachment A: Comment submitted by email from Mike Brinkley

9. Stakeholders are all the people in our watershed, not just our members. When I tell people about my work with the council, they know we are a watershed council, but they don't really know specifics about what we do. Of course, I tell them how wonderful we are, but it shows me that we need to do a better job of communicating. Our public meetings are our chance to talk to the stakeholders. Maybe we could get the word out more effectively about our public meetings through radio (NPR?) and local TV. Could we use the print media more effectively to advertise our public meetings (the Guard and the Weekly)? Could we work with our business supporters to encourage them to communicate with their customers about our projects? How about posting information about our cutthroat project at the Diamond Woods clubhouse (I'm sure the golfers wonder what we are doing out there)? Give talks at area high schools and/or invite students on outings (they are our future stakeholders)? How about more noise to the public about our Amazon Initiative – highly visible posted signs at ongoing and completed projects?

34. Projects often are not monitored effectively, and we know this is a problem. We don't have the resources to do all the required monitoring and so we depend on the landowner to do it. They often neglect this responsibility and the hard work we do to restore stream vegetation is degraded due to lack of care. I've seen lots of dead plants and invasive grass. We should try to put more emphasis on the importance this problem and the responsibility of the landowner to follow up on sustaining the improvements. Otherwise we see too much hard work go to weeds.

36. Conservation interests don't know and appreciate the great progress we are making on a local level to solve problems that are important to them. I think they are often unaware of the hard work that watershed councils are doing all the time, working with private landowners in the local conservation arena. I think we could teach people in other conservation organizations how to work more collaboratively. How? Subject for discussion?

Attachment B: Discussion Categories Votes

From March 5, 2015 Board Meeting

Membership 2

Participation 5

Accountability 1

Decision Making 1

Meetings 5

Staff Management 0

Fiscal & Project Management 1

Watershed Planning & Projects 4

Citizen Involvement & Support 7

Attachment C: Board Voting Results for Each Category

WATERSHED COUNCIL SELF-EVALUATION - Board Results						
PURPOSE: The self-evaluation tool is a means for watershed councils to assess their organizational capacity. OWEB has asked each council support grant recipient to complete a self-assessment and to address the results of the evaluation in a program action or work plan for the council. Once the evaluation is complete, your council will need to report the results and a plan of work to OWEB.						
INSTRUCTIONS: Each council member should fill out this form on their own. Please give your honest opinion - the form will not be turned in. You will use the checklist in a facilitated session with the whole group to identify shared concerns and items to address. If you are unsure about a specific question, please leave the question blank.						
<i>Oregon Revised Statutes (541.351 to .415) define a watershed council, the interests that shall be represented on a watershed council, and a reporting requirement to a county governing body. The following sets of questions were designed to help council members evaluate how they are addressing and meeting these requirements.</i>						
				How important is this to the Council's effectiveness?		How is the Council doing?
A. MEMBERSHIP				Very	Somewhat	Not really
				Great	Doing enough	Let's do better
1	Our council has a broad, diverse membership which represents most interests in the watershed.			7		
2	Our membership requirements are clearly defined and communicated.			5	3	
3	Board Members understand their responsibilities and roles. (Council members only vote at Annual Meeting)			7	1	
4	New Board members are provided orientation and materials. (Council membership only exists at Annual			7	1	
				How important is this to the Council's effectiveness?		How is the Council doing?
B. PARTICIPATION				Very	Somewhat	Not really
				Great	Doing enough	Let's do better
5	Our council actively involves key people and community leaders in projects and/or activities.			8		
6	Our council members share a common vision and purpose. (Board and Council members)			4	4	
7	Members are aware of and involved in projects and/or activities. (Council members)			5	3	
				How important is this to the Council's effectiveness?		How is the Council doing?
C. ACCOUNTABILITY				Very	Somewhat	Not really
				Great	Doing enough	Let's do better
8	The council reports progress and results to our county governing body.			3	3	
9	The council reports progress and results to all stakeholders.			7	1	
10	Community members know how to contact our group.			5	3	

WATERSHED COUNCIL SELF-EVALUATION - Page 2

Watershed Councils generally have bylaws and a mission-statement to guide their operations. Operations generally include meetings, relationships to staff and decision-making policies. The following sets of questions are intended to help your group review its operational procedures.

		How important is this to the Council's effectiveness?			How is the Council doing?		
		Very	Somewhat	Not really	Doing Great	Doing enough	Let's do better
D. DECISION-MAKING							
11	Council members understand and use our chosen method of decision-making. (Board and Council	9			6	1	
12	Decisions are made fairly.	9			8		
13	Decisions are evaluated with regard to our mission and vision.	8	1		8	1	
14	Members know when a decision has been made. (Board members for Board decisions)	9			5	4	
E. MEETINGS							
		Very	Somewhat	Not really	Doing Great	Doing enough	Let's do better
15	Meetings are well-organized and productive.	9			9		
16	Our process is fair, open and honest.	9			9		
17	Members advocate for the group vision. (Board members)	8	1		8	1	
18	Members feel free to contribute in meetings and activities. (Council & Board members)	8	1		8	1	
F. STAFF MANAGEMENT							
		Very	Somewhat	Not really	Doing Great	Doing enough	Let's do better
19	Board members understand the role of staff and their relationship to staff.	7	1	1	6	3	1
20	The group has and uses an objective methodology for evaluating staff performance and compensation.	6	2		6	1	
21	Staff perform tasks and keep the Board informed through the Executive Director.	8	1		7	2	
22	Council staff work with members in a supportive and professional environment.	8			8		

WATERSHED COUNCIL SELF-EVALUATION - Page 3

Many watershed councils also implement or manage projects and grants. The following questions address how your group handles these responsibilities and allows you to assess your capabilities related to fiscal and project management.

		How important is this to the Council's effectiveness?			How is the Council doing?		
		Very	Somewhat	Not really	Doing Great	Doing enough	Let's do better
G. FISCAL & PROJECT MANAGEMENT							
23	Board members are aware of the council's contractual commitments and understand their responsibility.	8	1		4	4	
24	Board members are aware of recordkeeping procedures and have access to records.	6	3		6	3	
25	Our council has a process for tracking project implementation and performance.	8	1		7	1	
26	Our council effectively carries out projects within schedules and budgets.	8	1		8	1	
27	Our council practices open and fair competition for goods and services.	6	2		8		
28	Our council gets involved in grant writing and developing strategies for funding operations and projects.	9			7	2	

Comments/Ideas:

Watershed Councils address the goal of sustaining natural resource and watershed protection, restoration, and enhancement in a number of ways (ORS 541.351(15)). The following sets of questions focus on the tasks a council may do to accomplish this goal and is intended to help you evaluate how you are working to meet that goal.

		How important is this to the Council's effectiveness?			How is the Council doing?		
		Very	Somewhat	Not really	Doing Great	Doing enough	Let's do better
H. WATERSHED PLANNING & PROJECTS							
29	Our council identifies key issues, limiting factors, and/or watershed conditions (assessments).	9			9		
30	Our council identifies and evaluates the major restoration priorities in our watershed (action plans).	9			8	1	
31	Activities and projects address the concerns identified and move us towards our desired outcomes.	9			7	2	
32	Our council actively involves stakeholders in watershed-level planning and project development.	8	1		7	2	
33	Our council annually evaluates its priorities and plans.	8			8		
34	Projects implemented by the council are monitored for their effectiveness.	6	2		5	3	
35	Our plans identify outcomes for the next three to five years.	7	1		6	2	

WATERSHED COUNCIL SELF-EVALUATION - Page 4

Council tasks continued...

		How important is this to the Council's effectiveness?			How is the Council doing?		
		Very	Somewhat	Not really	Doing Great	Doing enough	Let's do better
I. CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT & SUPPORT							
36	Our council and its projects are actively supported overall	1					
	local people	3	6		2	4	3
	local government	5	4		3	4	
	industry and business	3	6		2	4	1
	community groups	4	5		2	5	
	landowners	6	3		3	3	1
	conservation interests	6	3		4	2	1
37	Citizens understand our organization's purpose.	3	6		2	5	1
38	Community members feel our council is successful and effective.	7	2		5	3	
39	Our council works to increase citizen understanding of watershed conditions and concerns.	6	3		3	3	2