

# Elk Creek Watershed Council

## Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

July 18, 2017

### Board Attendance

|                   |                  |                  |                |
|-------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|
| ✓ Susan Applegate | ✓ Joe Coons      | × John Kittelman | × Gene Vroman  |
| ✓ Nick Botner     | ✓ Kittie Coons   | ✓ James Mast     | ✓ Gene Zuiches |
| × Harold Burris   | ✓ Linda Galetti  | ✓ Rick Reinhart  |                |
| ✓ Brad Chapman    | ✓ Cindy Johnsrud | ✓ Bob Rundell    |                |

### Others in Attendance

Jen Bailey, Walt Barton, Lee Russell

### Meeting Minutes

The Board approved the minutes of the June 2017 board meeting (motion by Rick Reinhart, seconded by Cindy Johnsrud).

### Treasurer's Report

The Board approved the Treasurer's Report of July 10, 2017 and the Accounts Payable, with the following additions:

- \$10,000 to Jen Bailey for Council Support (March - June 2017)
- \$15,000 to Lee Russell for Council Support (January - June 2017)
- \$450 to Sunnydale Grange (rent)

(motion by Rick Reinhart, second by Brad Chapman)

|                                |               |             |
|--------------------------------|---------------|-------------|
| Beginning Balance: 1 June 2017 |               | \$78,232.33 |
| Deposits:                      | \$0.00        |             |
| Checks:                        | (\$7,145.00)  |             |
| <hr/>                          |               |             |
| Ending Balance: 30 June 2017   |               | \$71,087.33 |
| Deposits                       |               | \$6,529.91  |
| Outstanding Checks             |               | (\$500.00)  |
| <hr/>                          |               |             |
| Balance                        |               | \$77,117.24 |
| Accounts Receivable            | \$17,091.99   |             |
| Accounts Payable               | (\$41,837.74) |             |
| <hr/>                          |               |             |
| Fund Balance                   |               | \$52,371.49 |

## Executive Committee and Council Business

Jamie reported that he has been meeting with Lee and Jen to work out job responsibilities and compensation.

## Bureau of Land Management

Jeff McEnroe will provide technical assistance for new project development, along with the Swiftwater Area Hydrologist Dan Dammann.

## Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife

Eric Himmelreich still has his job! => He is back on track, handling 15 in-stream restoration projects, starting with Brian Jenkins on Smith River. He will consult on Buck Creek to assess the need for fish salvage during project construction.

## Douglas Soil and Water Conservation District

Walt Barton reported that he recently visited the Gilliland project, as Lee's two-year monitoring report is coming up. The project site is looking good, with no visible erosion.

Weed program updates:

- Spraying Portuguese broom is in progress. Lone Rock is logging along Cox Creek, which will stir up the seed, which is viable up to 80 years.
- ODOT has logged along the I-5 Oakland exit, and there's an infestation of spurge laurel. The site will be treated this fall.
- A new site of distaff thistle has been discovered, which took three days to treat last week.

Walt is coordinating delivery of the railcar bridge for the Yoncalla Creek project. Jamie suggested that Lee contact Leavitts about helping get the bridge over the railroad tracks.

## Executive Director and Council Coordinator

Lee Russell and Jen Bailey reviewed the Executive Director's report (*see attached*).

Highlights include:

- The Jack Creek project is on hold until we figure out what to do about the fencing component. The Executive Committee will be meeting with Mark Grenbemer to discuss OWEB's criteria for evaluating restoration projects on agricultural land. Walt Barton reviewed techniques to minimize livestock impact on riparian areas, without fencing.
- Bob Rundell noted that the landowner on lower Jack Creek is not opposed to fencing. Jen will follow up with him.
- Lee will get the Rapid Bioassessment Action Plans for Hardscrabble and Ellenburg Creeks to Jen.

- Susan Applegate reported that the ODFW Corvallis fish biologists were at her property last week, doing fish surveys.
- Lee reported that the rapid bioassessment survey work has been postponed until next summer, as we decide where to focus. We could use the funds to do a watershed assessment for Big Tom Folley, and approach Seneca.
- Jamie asked Jen to set up a meeting with Jeff McEnroe, Lee and her, to discuss project development. Lee is moving away from project development and project management.
- OWEB awarded us \$118,425 in council support for the 2017–2019 biennium, significantly up from the 2015–1017 award of \$88,000.

## Old Business

None.

## New Business

The Board began discussion of Lee and Jen’s personal services contracts and compensation. This was tabled until the August board meeting.

The Landowner Free Lunch Program will be held Saturday, April 8<sup>th</sup>, 2018.

## Announcements

None.

## Adjournment

Nick Botner made the motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:20 PM. All seconded.

# Executive Director Report

## 18 July 2017

### Current Watershed Council Projects:

#### I.) Fitch Creek Culvert Removal:

- Survey and engineering drawings have been completed.
- Need to schedule the construction.

#### II.) Yoncalla Creek Livestock Crossing:

- Since the project is within the 100-year floodplain, we needed an engineering statement that it would not increase the floodplain level.
- Don Porior has looked at the site, and is preparing the report.
- Need to plan delivery of the bridge and schedule construction.

#### III.) Jack Creek Habitat Improvement:

- The OWEB application was not recommended for funding. Basically, the RRT felt the issues raised in the previous application had not been addressed, even though the livestock access to the stream issue was taken out. The complaint was that “other limiting factors” had not been addressed. I interpret this to mean that OWEB will not fund projects that do not address ALL the resource concerns.

#### IV.) Headwaters Elk Creek Habitat and Riparian Improvement:

- The landowner has had to pull out of this project for medical reasons. OWEB and other funding partners have encouraged us not to formally cancel this project, but postpone it until next year, in case the landowner’s circumstances change.

#### V.) Buck Creek Fish Passage Improvement:

- This project is on track for construction in August.

### Project in Development:

#### VI.) Hardscrabble Creek Habitat Improvement:

#### VII.) Ellenburg Creek Habitat Improvement:

### Outstanding OWEB Small Grants:

#### VIII.) Bills Creek Habitat Improvement: (#07-14-005)

- A monitoring report will be submitted in two years.

#### IX.) Zuiches Riparian Improvement: (#07-14-006)

- A monitoring report will be submitted in two years.

#### X.) Elk Creek Habitat Improvement: (#07-14-007)(8/17/2017)

- The 2-year monitoring report is due in August 2017.

XI.) **Dean Habitat Improvement: (#07-14-004)(9/25/2017)**

- The 2-year monitoring report is due in September 2017.

**Current Watershed Council Monitoring Projects:**

XII.) **Bacterial DNA Study (BLM):**

- More delays by the Seattle lab.
- We need to decide on how we want to close this project out.

XIII.) **Watershed Assessment/Bioassessment (BLM):**

- Field work for 2017 has been cancelled.
- We need to develop a strategy that will link the bioassessment to the Council's long-term priorities and goals. [See *Strategic Planning*.]
- So far, the bioassessment work has allowed us to satisfy OWEB's requirement that councils are actively involved in monitoring conditions in their watersheds, and in watershed assessment and planning.
- We now have a better understanding of what creeks have the highest coho densities, and some idea of **why** this habitat is being used.
- We have action plans for the creeks we have surveyed that will help support any funding requests for projects in these watersheds.
- In the future, we need to develop a process to use the data that we collect from the bioassessments that will give us a much more detailed assessment of the watershed, and then to formulate goals and objectives for the watershed that will be the basis for action plans.
- We will be able to use this to explain to landowners what we want to do on their properties, and we will have the baseline data that can show the effectiveness of our restoration projects.
- We need to develop a template for presenting the bioassessment data to landowners.

**Watershed Council Capacity Grant:**

XIV.) **OWEB Council Support Grant:**

- OWEB is recommending that we receive full funding for the 2017-2019 biennium.
- The recommended funding by the OWEB staff will be \$118,425. We need to submit a budget. [See *Working Budget*.]
- The final completion report for the 2015-2017 council support grant will be due in August.

XV.) **Watershed Council Self-Evaluation:**

- We need to use the self-evaluation to set goals and priorities for the next two years. This will be the basis of the work plan that will be submitted to OWEB. [See *Strategic Planning*.]

## Watershed Action Planning:

### XVI.) Landowner Outreach Grant (BLM):

- This BLM RAC grant (\$13,310) will begin development of landowner outreach materials for presenting rapid bioassessment work in priority sub-basins.

### XVII.) Umpqua Focused Investment Partnership:

- This plan was supposed to begin a process where councils and agencies could work together cooperatively, rather than competitively, to prioritize and address problems in the whole Umpqua Basin. There has been NO action taken to explore how this might work.

## Other Activities:

### XVIII.) Strategic Planning:

- The Council *really* needs to consider some long-range planning. Articulating even a rudimentary vision for what the council should look like in the future can help shape strategies to achieve council goals. Planning can also clarify obstacles, and strategies to overcome them.
- The strategic plan should also establish the Council's priorities, and guide the expenditure of resources to achieve priority goals.

### XIX.) Working Budget:

- In the past, the Council's budgets have been minimal. They have only allocated amounts to the general categories used in the OWEB grant agreement. The Council needs a "detailed" budget that will outline what resources will be used to achieve Council priority actions.
- The budget needs to be realistic. Enough resources need to be allocated to priority actions to successfully achieve established goals.

### XX.) Contract Deliverables (Job Descriptions):

- The Council has no "employees," and hence no job descriptions, but the "personal services contracts" that the Council has used to justify independent contractor status are outdated and need to be improved. These contracts are legal documents and need to state clearly what work will be performed (deliverables), what the compensation will be, and how success will be measured.
- The deliverables need to correspond to Council priority actions, and the compensation needs to be realistic and included in the Council's budget.