



## Board Minutes – May 15, 2018

### **Attendees**

Chris Smith with proxy for Mark Schueneman  
Kathy Peterson  
Rick Kauvar  
Ken Lenarcic with Ward proxy  
Julie McKay  
Jessie Olson  
Chris Wiorek  
Monica Bortolini  
Sean Cronin (by phone until 2:50)  
Jessie Olson  
Glenn Patterson  
Yana Sorokin (arrived 2:40)  
Sue Schaffler (arrived 3:00)

### **Welcome and Introductions**

Chris S called the meeting to order at 2:05, and led a round of introductions.

### **Public comments on items not on the agenda**

None.

### **Presentation of 2017 Audit—Paul of Clifton Larson Allen**

There were big changes since last year in LWOG’s financial program. The budget exceeded \$750K and we received federal funds, so the audit is more involved this year. LWOG did a great job with documentation of handling the federal money. There were no findings or recommendations pertaining to being a recipient of federal money. Audit opinion on page 1 is clean and unmodified. The auditor did contact both CWCB and DOLA to corroborate some information, as was appropriate. Two letters were issued. The first and shorter, addressed to the Board, covered significant audit findings. Everything looked fine, for second year in a row. LWOG was helpful with requested information. Some accounting adjustments were needed to account for expended funds that were not yet received by December 31. One other item led to the second letter: From the standpoint of best practices in a small organization with few internal checks and balances, the financial integrity and oversight of the Board is important.

This includes the monthly board review of the financial statement, and the review of checks by the President prior to signing. Chris S proposed that a subset of the Board might want to select a few vendors at random and provide a separate review of the checks. Sean mentioned that the SVLHWCD board has a financial subcommittee that reviews transactions monthly. Final comment is on page 15 of the large report: unmodified opinion and no material weaknesses, and no non-compliance with state or federal regulations. If we get two successive years of federal-influenced clean audits like this, then in the third year we can be considered low-risk instead of high-risk.

Kathy moved, Rick seconded, to accept the audit report; motion carried unanimously.

Jessie mentioned that we are switching from a cash to an accrual basis, which will affect our accounting methods and financial reports. We will recognize revenue at the same time as the expense occurs, rather than waiting for the reimbursement to arrive after the expense has been claimed on a reimbursement request.

### **Approval of Minutes**

Kathy moved, Monica seconded, to approve the minutes from the April meeting, with the single correction that Chris Carroll was listed twice among the attendees. Motion carried unanimously.

### **Monthly Financial Report**

Jessie reported on both March and April, as the March report last month was delayed. We no longer need the notes cover sheet as we now use the accrual basis. The negative net income for March had to do with the cost of the audit and the delayed reimbursement.

Fundraising from property owners for the fish passage study went well, and we have collected \$5,000 in pledges for this component.

Kathy moved, Rick seconded, to accept the financial reports. Motion carried unanimously.

(Sean hung up)

### **Vista Program**

Meg has notified us that she will be leaving in August to attend graduate school. Jessie wondered whether we should pick up on an opportunity to bring on an Americorps/VISTA volunteer to help with items such as an education program or outreach. Most volunteers are just out of college. Meg was a VISTA volunteer just prior to joining LWOG, and Jessie was an Americorps volunteer early in her career. It would be a full-time 1-year position. The cost to us would be \$13,000/year. Benefits are covered by Americorps/VISTA. There is also an expectation that we try to provide lodging if the volunteer is from out of town. We could

recruit someone who is already in the area. VISTA would give us a list of applicants, but we could also recruit and advertise. We would have to take the \$13K from our unrestricted funds, but we would also show the unpaid volunteer time (About \$25 - 6.25/hr) as in-kind service received, that we could use as match for grants.

Kathy mentioned that there were a number of headaches related to supervision of our previous VISTA volunteer before Glenn came onboard.

(Sue arrived)

Monica mentioned that she likes volunteer/internship programs as a way to test out potential applicants and take advantage of help at a reasonable rate.

The sense of the board was that this decision should be made by Jessie at her discretion.

Monica asked if we could hire the volunteer as a regular staff member if he/she worked out well during the volunteer year.

### **Draft Work Plan Update**

Jessie introduced this topic by asking if the topics listed in the plan cover the tasks the board would like to see staff working on during the next year and a half. Monica asked whether staff will have sufficient time to complete these tasks. Jessie responded that she thinks this is reasonable.

Pertaining to the Watershed Science Program, Rick asked about streamflow monitoring. Jessie described the existing gages at Hover Rd. and above the Haldi intake, and mentioned that the restoration legacy project funds could be used to add an additional gage. All agreed it would be good to keep in mind that LWOG has the capacity to conduct streamgaging. Rick also suggested that we could develop a menu of potential fee-for-service activities that we could offer.

Pertaining to the Restoration Program, Jessie mentioned that some restoration work can be done without contracting for heavy construction. She also described a potential crack-willow removal program that could involve removing both young and mature crack-willow trees that encroach too much on the channel. This could potentially be funded with an invasive phreatophyte removal grant.

Under the Stewardship Program, we would seek to implement the monitoring activities derived from the adaptive management plan currently being finalized, and the community science initiative recently funded by the Gates Family Foundation.

Tasks 3.5 and 3.6 should be renumbered to 3.3 and 3.4. The idea for these tasks is to collaborate with other watershed or other groups on protection and preservation of local

watersheds. This could help us to access needed expertise such as forest health, which could be good to include in our comprehensive watershed management activities.

The Fourmile Creek group is considering expanding their geographic scope to include Boulder Creek Watershed, which currently has no active group. This could provide some opportunities for collaboration with LWOG on activities that are appropriate to pursue in both watersheds. A discussion ensued in which there was general agreement that we should continue discussions with Fourmile regarding potential collaboration on activities such as stewardship, water quality (there is only 1 River Watch monitoring site in the Boulder Creek Watershed), education, and fundraising.

Under the Education and Outreach task, Jessie described the watershed map that we are working on with Lauren of the Lynker team, and other related activities as described in the plan. Sue mentioned Wild Bear Nature Center in Nederland, which offers nature-based education for kids, including programs at Mud Lake. The E & O program also has goals for interpretive signs and growing the membership program. The interpretive sign could go at Buckingham Park, Left Hand Creek Park, or the bike trail underpass at 87<sup>th</sup> and Diagonal, the Altona Schoolhouse, or Heil Ranch, for example.

Kathy mentioned that providing books for kids is a great outreach activity. She would be willing to help sponsor this.

The Organizational task covers straightforward activities, including a few new ones such as maintaining a contacts database.

The Fundraising task describes our continuing efforts to maintain financial stewardship of the organization.

### **Legacy Project Update**

We are drafting the RFP for this project now. It will be a little different from our past projects in that we will use a scientific approach to restoration, and compare restored and unrestored reaches. We would be interested in adding some additional representation on our contractor procurement/evaluation team to participate in the recruitment, to ensure an unbiased approach to recruitment, now that we know all the contractors who are likely to be bidding. Proposals will be due in mid to late June. Monica is willing to help.

### **63<sup>rd</sup> street extension site visit**

This segment of the agenda was a field visit following adjournment of the regular meeting. At the 63<sup>rd</sup> St extension project site, at Haystack Mountain Golf Course and just downstream, Scott and Doug from Left Hand Excavation, and Vince from Biohabitats showed us recently completed work. Features included:

- Sloped banks that had previously been near vertical, and bank toe protection using boulders.,
- Riffle-pool sequences with engineered riffles and drop structures, to create diverse aquatic habitat and dissipate energy.
- Root wads and other woody structures along banks that could use an extra measure of protection, to slow down water, create backwater, and create diverse aquatic habitat.
- Large rock structures in the riparian zone to help stabilize banks in back yards where extra stabilization is needed.
- Stone steps through rock structures to provide landowner access to the creek.

### **Adjournment**

The regular meeting was adjourned at 4:05 pm. The field trip was completed by 5:20.