



**LEFT HAND**  
watershed center

## **5-Year Strategic Planning Retreat**

September 20th 2022

8:30 - 3:30 PM

Izaak Walton Clubhouse

18 S. Sunset Street

Longmont, CO 80501

### Welcome and introductions

Ryan initiated introductions around the room.

#### New Business

Jessie introduced the vote to approve Cat McIntyre and Kevin Peterson as ex-officio board members. Chris asked for a motion to make it official, Sue moved and Barb seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Jessie went over goals for the day and Ryan went over flow of the day.

### Part 1: Reflection

Jessie presented on the History and Notable Growth Phases of the organization

- Sue noted that the foundation of the organization was based on both Captain Jack and Burlington mines (not just Captain Jack - Burlington just west of Jamestown). The company responsible (Honeywell or Raytheon?) for Burlington did a voluntary cleanup, so there was no need to address it.
- Sue noted that Jessie was the main reason we were able to handle the rapid expansion in 2015-2018
- Kevin asked if the boundary was technically the county line or the basin boundary. Jessie and Chris clarified that the Watershed Center works throughout the basin, which essentially lines up with County boundary.
- Chris noted that the main reason for 2019 organizational expansion was that we couldn't continue to exist the same scale and remain relevant and impactful
- Barbara the organizational leadership of the Watershed Center was the reason this organization survived the expansion
- Kathy noted that as we were expanding, there was a fear that we would forget the core mission of mine reclamation



- Chris noted that staff motivation is key to growth and capacity, and that support from the board of staff priorities is important. Noted that succession planning should also be a focus.

Jessie presented on Our Services and Current Funding Environment

- Eric asked what is driving the funding – is it focused on climate change resilience or responsive to specific events? Are funding organizations taking a longer view of things or responding to discrete events? Jessie noted that we do see both drivers. Our local funding partners are definitely taking a longer view. Chris noted that there has always been the question of whether we’re setting priorities based on funding opportunities or seek out funding based on independently established priorities, and that our history includes both strategies.
- Barbara noted that the stated “limited funding” under the Education service doesn’t align with our desire for statewide water literacy. With the new water plan grant going through, we should keep an eye on this to keep match with our enormous goals. Yana noted that with a funding focus on pilot programs versus sustained efforts, this is where the limits exist. Jessie noted that we applied for two education grants this year and were not successful; competition has been fierce.
- Monica noted that federally recognized disasters open up a lot of opportunities; in between disasters the funding is a different landscape.
- Kathy acknowledged that COVID put the brakes on education efforts in a lot of ways.

### Reflection and Discussion

Ryan led a discussion about reflections on presentation (ideas captured on [flipchart images](#)).

**Q: What most excites you about the organization?**

Eric: Everything! Collaborative, multijurisdictional process leading to local credibility. Marketing opportunities, the money comes back into projects.

Monica: As a downstream partner organization, the knowledge that the upstream area is being taken care of and we don’t have to plan for it while still having some say in what happens is a great relief. Not just in a generic way but actual, boots on the ground, scientific processes.

Kathy: Growth! If you don’t have any growth you can’t keep up with what you need to do.

Kevin: The nimbleness and flexibility of the organization. The ability to adapt and mobilize quickly compared to other organizations.

Barbara: That we can demonstrate a proven track record of taking science to decisions and building projects through funding.



Darren: The ability to communicate with stakeholders in the basin on tough topics. We all need to work together in order to make this a working system, and the Watershed Center seems to be a way to bring organizations/diverse parties together.

Jenny: Making a positive impact on people and the environment. The Watershed Center is improving the experiences people have with water and forests.

Chiara: We're thought of as leaders and can change how management is happening by encouraging people to incorporate the best available science into management.

Chris: The self-motivating drive that everyone has to accomplish things. Everyone brings their own calling to the work they do.

Deb: A deep understanding of our surroundings (boots on the ground literally) and the ability to bring this knowledge of the land into conversation with our partners.

**Q: What is the greatest contribution we can make as an organization?**

Kevin: Getting the science and resources in the hands of decision makers, especially as we talk about expansion of geographic scope.

Cat: The Watershed Center in a good position to orchestrate what local organizations are doing – create a database to outline and prioritize all the efforts in the county

Jenny: Input on the updated Water Plan. Accepting stories; what watershed center stories can we share that can help guide the state towards better watershed restoration?

Barbara: Change the landscape of water literacy in our community such that all stakeholders can understand each other's needs enough to find the common ground. Ultimately find a place for the environment amongst all these various needs.

Chris: Bringing competing groups to the table to discuss water. As a board, we can create the legacy of this organization to make sure that it grows beyond us (succession and legacy moving forward).

Eric: To be an example for other watersheds. Create – both on an organizational and physical "playbook" level – a model for how this can be done across the country. Work in an ability to create replicable/scalable/repeatable models for the future.

Kevin: Funding from inflation reduction act is an opportunity to enact more of these multi-benefit efforts.

Darren: This is all about education! (Barbara: Communications and outreach.)



Monica: This is where work actually gets done and where land use decisions are made; changes can be made at the local level from here. Land use decisions are the most important thing we're doing across the country that will make a difference in whether a community will survive or not.

Jessie: We have an opportunity to make a landscape-scale difference in Boulder county. Engage the community and agencies in a holistic, cross-boundary approach to restoration and resilience in the face of climate change.

Chiara: There are a lot of competing interests in the forests as well – a lot of agencies we work with don't have a lot of flexibility because they're having to work on a federal level, whereas we have more of a local ability to effect change. We can be the glue to bring stakeholders together across various jurisdictions. We're an interdisciplinary team of scientists.

**Q: Do you see other opportunities and challenges that lie ahead for our organization?**

Chiara: More granular-scale opportunities to provide individual, private landowner resources – ex. scientists to walk their property and make recommendations.

Jessie: We've made a lot of landowner connections as a result of the flood, but there are plenty more people to connect with!

Chris: Getting funders to see the value in funding the ongoing operation of ? . Keeping focus on the environment and multi-use priorities.

Jenny: Current and future policies – extreme positions that affect policy. Watershed Center is in a good place to influence policy or identify opportunities to influence existing policies. Challenge is dealing with those high-level structures and processes.

Eric: Expanding the part of the body of funding from individuals and private foundations. Cementing the organization in the community to the point that we get that money starting to flow our way. Part of that is having a central headquarters where the community can come to us. Also starting to market and brand ourselves. Dust off the stream handbook and maybe have a forest handbook. Part of growth is that recognition.

Kevin: Echo policy piece – this seems like a way to effect more lasting change. Demonstrating value to local decision makers – what are you receiving from this organization? How does this org advance our work and priorities? How do we think about engaging these groups? Do we ask for input or offer the science we have to aid decision making process? Which of these approaches works best?



Chris: The approach I take with my organization is “here’s what it would cost and what our reach would be if we were to do all of this ourselves”. Also what kind of savings we see from the disaster prep that’s being done by the Watershed Center.

Barbara: We’re challenged to raise our community profile to a large enough audience. There’s a messaging part of this that communicates (into new communities) what our general, positive impact has been.

Monica: Unity in the Community (a collaboration of various businesses and organizations in Longmont that have a sustainable focus) would be good to get involved in.

Cat: Reaching out to real estate organizations – training for real estate agents. This leads you to private landowners because real estate agent can talk about ecology of the property and then resulting landowners can reach out about doing restoration. Also outreach to ditch companies – this could be a real area of growth for the Watershed Center.

Darren: RFP for Yampa basin – is it a concern to move outside the basin? Opportunity to grow, but may be a concern for funders who want funding to stay within the basin.

Jessie: We can use the model that we’ve used here and take it to a different geography and develop the same process there using their funding.

Chris: This type of work establishes a ready staff to respond to this type of need – there won’t always be enough local need to keep staff relevant, so this makes sure that we have a model that keeps funding coming into the organization. It can be a challenge to explain to partners/funders.

Kevin: Prioritizing where you’re doing outreach is important, especially if there isn’t a lot of additional funding for this effort. Outreach is super expensive and time-consuming, so considering when/where outreach is a priority (and being strategic about use of staff time) is important.

Eric: Managing discrete events and keeping them from overtaking the organization as they happen without losing sight of the ongoing programs we have in place. Consider having some sort of organizational or board structure to handle discrete events as they come up.

Jessie: Capacity! Lauren Duncan highlighted this as a challenge as well. We need to be strategic and have priorities that keep capacity in mind.

Chiara: Increased staffing opportunity/need in forest program.

Barbara: There’s a lack of interest from the community when there isn’t a disaster.



Monica: Drought is a sort of disaster that isn't immediate but that can provide focus for the long-term.

Kevin: It's important to hear from staff on challenges specifically.

## **Part 2: Visioning**

Yana presented on our current services and opportunities involved with each.

### Planning, AM, Science, and Research

Eric: We often use the word "county" to describe our scope, but does this conflict with our desire to work throughout the St Vrain watershed/basin?

Jessie (supported by Kevin): There is very little boundary difference between the county and the watershed, so we sometimes use these terms interchangeably.

Chris: Have the goal to remain open to the pursuit of our "Lower Certainty" opportunities. They're not a priority but staff remain open to these – board will support as long as they don't take away from our other/ongoing efforts.

Jenny: Does the watershed center publish papers in peer-reviewed journals or present at conferences? Jessie: Individually we publish papers, and organizationally we present at conferences. Jenny suggests we publish papers. Staff discussed lower lift/higher distribution potential associated with publishing white papers vs peer reviewed journals.

Sue: I don't see the lower-certainty opportunities reflected in the five year strategic goal – maybe having some language that includes these opportunities.

Kevin: Goal = trying to do more to embed our science into decision-making processes in the watershed. Perhaps recommendations could come out of our annual watershed report? This could conflict slightly with the goal of expanding outside the watershed.

Jessie: Comp Plan is a good example of this. We could review comp plan updates and provide comments and provide our data and recommendations.

Yana: Exploring a strategy for this in the next five years within the Adaptive Management at Scale project.



Darren: Have we looked into representation on the South Platte Round Table? Environmental Seat might be available. Jessie: Perhaps Darren could represent as both Watershed Center board member and Boulder County rep.

Monica: Longmont is updating their comp plan (Envision) and I would like everyone in this room to comment on the plan, as an environmental lens is not currently not incorporated.

Kevin: How do we get our science into the hands of decision makers? Figuring out a strategy here is important (some of the ideas above are good start).

Cat: It would be great if someone (watershed center?) could say “here’s where funding should go in order to have the greatest impact on restoration in the watershed” to guide agency funding and efforts. (Examples/ideas: certain metrics you can plug in on a map to envision where work should happen. Also applies when agencies purchase properties by understanding where higher and lower priorities exist.)

Yana: We’re working on developing a conditions map, plus this is a goal of the adaptive management process and this service in general. In talking to CWCB [funder on AM] there’s a request for this sort of map.

Jessie: CWCB also saw us an organization that could help with vetting priorities and projects in this area.

Kevin: Everyone values mapping as a tool, so this seems like a really useful end goal for the Watershed Center to have a map that can help guide prioritization processes.

Monica: There are existing, various stream management plans from other agencies that we could be working from as well.

Chiara: Eric brought up that we have a lot of things in existence already that could be suitable for publication – white papers; peer review is a bigger lift. Things we already have could still help guide recommendations.

Matt: Good to also not dismiss peer reviewed papers as this cements us as experts.

Kevin: White papers reach a wider audience.

Chris: Clarification on third bullet point (“Develop annual or semi-annual...”) to include mapping of prioritization is helpful.

Darren: Reaching out to academic institutions for research and publication

Deb: This service is a really foundational piece, and the word “science” as a title could be confusing; it’s more a science-based collaboration. Regarding playbook idea, it would be helpful



to see how all of our plans fit together via maybe a guiding document that looks at the intersection of our plans/priorities.

**Discussion topic/decision: Green light for staff to scale up this service outside the watershed.**

Ryan asked for initial thoughts without spending too much time on this topic.

Generally positive thoughts on concept, need more time on specifics of decision chart wording and content. Chris noted that this is just to ensure that the first decision to bring an opportunity to the board remains with staff; staff can vet opportunities as they come in.

Kevin: Adding in a caveat that opportunities align with goal of remaining a trusted entity in the community

Darren: Considering trans-basin systems and how work relates to our watershed

### Forests

Barbara: Shouldn't "Implement on-the-ground projects" be higher certainty? If our goal is to secure a million in funding, don't we need the projects for this?

Yana: the difference is between actually implementing projects versus acquiring funding and being a part of the planning.

Chris: Putting together a "playbook" or emergency response plan for responding to fires (both forests and rivers?) and how we might respond to the next one. This might take away some of the uncertainty surrounding when the next fire will occur in terms of the five year plan.

Jessie: Yes, we could make the existing playbooks more specific to the St Vrain and partners here.

Kevin: How does this compliment the work being done by the Boulder County Fireshed group?

Chiara: We're nested within this and other regional collaboratives, but we're more able to get work done on the ground. Other collaboratives are more focused more on policy and planning. I would also consider changing emergency response language to recovery response/recovery plan and leave emergency response to the professionals.

Jenny: Given that work on private property has risen in importance this year, does it make sense to define a goal around this?

Chiara: This could be a niche that we could fill, especially as it relates to competition in securing funding for implementation. We could focus here on higher-value but smaller-scale projects.





Jessie: As a higher-level goal, I like that it just states cross-boundary, but in terms of work planning etc. we can focus on this.

Clarification = the million in funding is specifically for forest restoration not related to fire. Adding fire mitigation to last bullet point about funding.

Eric: I don't know if I agree with the lower cert implementation aspect being in the draft. Our strength is in acquiring funding and coordinating planning; I don't see us doing the job of other agencies in implementation.

Chiara: The benefit of implementing projects would be that a lot of entities don't have the capacity to do monitoring of their projects; implementing ourselves helps with our monitoring and also increases trust in the community.

**Discussion topic/decision: Green light for staff to continue to grow this service area as opportunities arise and capacity (and funding) allows?**

Chris: Pay attention to staff goals and priorities/professional direction.

Kevin: The scale of need for forest restoration is so great that there don't need to be a lot of guardrails around what kind of things we can engage in. Focus on getting projects done!

Monica: Are you thinking about implementation within a certain geography? Do we want a geographical restriction?

Chiara: What would make most sense to me is to focus within the watershed; it's also a focus area nationally. There's opportunity here where we already have focus areas laid out.

Jenny: Prioritizing land adjacent to surface water as criteria.

Chiara: Would this be a requirement of work to be done?

Jenny: No, but higher priority to multi-benefit, high-ROI projects.

Barbara: Is the environmental equity of represented groups implied as a consideration, or does it need to be stated implicitly?

Chris/Jessie: This is mostly stated in Community, but maybe it should be a part of every service.

Kevin: It should be stated as part of the prioritization process.

### Rivers

Barbara: Clarification on tracer study?

Yana: Study to see where there are mine legacy inputs into the watershed.



Chris: Same as with forests, positioning ourselves to respond to the next flood event could be a part of the five year plan and mitigate some of the uncertainty around lower-certainty “lead flood recovery following future floods” bullet point.

Sue: Is water quality monitoring considered here?

Jessie: We can add this specifically to mine oversight.

Eric: It would be good to have a written flood recovery plan (reiterating Chris’s comment). Would also be good to pursue funding for the tracer plan. Can Joe Ryan (?) be involved in this?

Yana: Current funding won’t support study here but we’ve been working with him to pursue funding.

Jenny: Have surface waters other than rivers (ponds, gravel pits, wetlands, etc.) been considered here?

Jessie: I consider these as parts of rivers.

Jenny: Maybe we could call the category surface waters instead of rivers?

Jessie: Considering the need to keep the title compelling to the public.

Chris: It’s okay for some of these types of surface water to be outside our jurisdiction, mostly due to land ownership, various restrictions, etc.

Darren: How does land ownership affect the Watershed Center’s ability to “lead” restoration across the basin?

Jessie: There’s a lot of private land ownership (Left Hand is almost all privately owned) on our rivers, and we led flood recovery there even though it included some public land.

Chris: A huge concern after the flood was that there was no single entity that could unite all the landowners towards recovery; this is where the leading came in. There needed to be an NGO involved in leading recovery.

Deb: Not explicitly stated in this category, but there is a coordination and outreach piece of the river program that’s nested in the AM service (so is monitoring).

Ryan: Do we need to add language to call out the outreach and monitoring pieces here, or is it implicit?

Yana: We could highlight adaptive management pieces in river language (cross reference between the two services).



Kevin: Does flood mitigation (pre-flood work) get called out here? Can we clearly communicate what we hope to get out of implemented projects? Defining climate-forward goals.

Sue: We should have a plan for responding to another mine disaster, informed by current monitoring. Monitoring is a critical piece and should be front and center; the only way you know you're protecting the watershed is through monitoring.

Cat: Flood resiliency is going to be most beneficial to the watershed. Can this be expanded to private landowners and educating them about the benefits of having resiliency built into their backyards?

Deb: The collaborative piece of the AM plan captures a lot of this. Some of this outreach can be nested in Education as well.

Eric: Are we going to do any media recording of three river projects for future? Good selling points!

Kevin: Consider expansion here – forests project expansion will lead to expansion here too.

### Community

**Discussion topic/decision: An engagement strategy is need to prioritize work in this service.**

Chris: Regular volunteer opportunities are well suited under Tier 2. This often just creates more work.

Eric: Putting on events is time consuming, but if you want to increase your branding and name you need to do some of these things. Seek out businesses that might want to help out with this effort (ex. Breezethrough carwash for WRV). Tabling is a great way to get names on an email list versus hosting events.

Chris: Have to consider capacity as well. Staff spend time to set up tabling events, sometimes without a lot of return. Board members/volunteers are key to participation in these events to support staff.

Kevin: I would tend to defer to staff to determine what is a good use of their time. Good place to set goals: through forest engagement, for example, what do you want volunteers to do? Can help you say no to some of these opportunities.

Monica: Do events that are already planned and you don't have to start from scratch. Unity in the Community, Rhythm on the River, etc. Only put our efforts into ones that are well attended. (Other ideas: Ollin Farms)



Sue: We need to engage landowners who want to do something, but there's no funding. This isn't going to happen on private property until there's the funding.

Jessie: Bringing resources to our target audience would be a good criteria for engagement events.

Chiara: Conversation and knowledge exchange alone is often valuable to bringing people in to support our work

Chris: We need to choose like-minded organizations to partner with. With that criteria, I think there's room to involve this in the five year goal. With the involvement of TEK, we need to identify what this would look like and how we would integrate the concept into our projects rather than just putting it into our mission statement.

Barbara: We should use inclusive language here rather than outdated terms. What exactly do we mean by "disadvantaged communities"? How do we want to represent in the environmental equity space? Outreach in certain communities is different than using these equity considerations to prioritize projects.

Monica: Is there a national organization that we see as a leader? Modeling after larger orgs and stay connected to people who are doing what you're doing elsewhere in the country.

Barbara: It pains me that we can't get traction in this community for a real watershed celebration.

### Education

**Discussion topic/decision: An engagement strategy is need to prioritize work in this service.**

Kevin: One way to prioritize is to look at gaps in current programs. Age gaps (early and older grades perhaps; 2<sup>nd</sup> to 5<sup>th</sup> grade is well covered).

Chiara: There is a report outlining which grades are least reached with environmental education. St Vrain school district receives less environmental education funding than Boulder Valley.

Chris: Innovation Center gets great grants, is science-based, and may want to develop curriculum.

Yana: We have discussed opportunities with them but haven't found a solution to funding issues.



Kathy: I see expansion here as approaching administrative level of schools with our science curriculum. We might have a better reach by speaking to people at the higher administrative levels (district level) to find out about gaps and needs surrounding environmental education.

Chiara: It would be good to talk specifically about what ages we're wanting to reach.

Barbara: We need to explore these potential funding models first before we move forward with the other pieces. Schools don't have the funding either! Are there other funding models we could model here? (This applies to PR and outreach as well.) Things that have to do with youth are appealing to funders.

Chris: Once we took the community/adult ed. out of Education, Education became such a reach that it almost looks like an entirely separate non-profit.

Jessie: That's why we're focused on keeping this service as small as it is.

Kevin: It looks like this (Education) isn't a huge area of focus and there's not a lot of capacity here.

Jessie: We can realistically rotate schools to accommodate lack of capacity, but we need to be strategic about our efforts.

Cat: Could "train the trainer" be an area where we could expand? Ex. Train folks at Calwood as they have wide reach.

Deb: Even though this service area seems small, it's a guaranteed avenue for outreach with a captive audience so remains valuable.

### **Part 3: Planning**

Jessie went over Organizational Challenges and Opportunities

#### Financial Planning Considerations

Eric: We didn't get funding from SVP but got in-kind services. Are we done receiving these services and have we gotten a software?

Jessie: We went with Bloomerang.

Eric: Do we have a board committee focused on fundraising?

Jessie: It's been recommended and could work but is a challenge because of who our board members represent (more agency seats than community).



Chris: If we're going to be serious about fundraising then we need that Development Manager position. Receiving partner funding comes down to demonstrating our importance to agencies and what it would take them (agencies) to do this work themselves.

Monica: When I approached COL about supporting the Watershed Center, I went to four different departments to contribute.

Kevin: It can be difficult to coordinate across organizational departments and figure out who's going to benefit. Focus on what will this get the agency in numbers – acres of forest treated, etc.

Monica: Unrestricted funding is always better though!

Cat: When I talk to managers at OSMP, their first question is about deliverables, which are then compared to what it would take OSMP to accomplish these goals internally. Having a list of concrete deliverables would be helpful.

Kevin: Can make particular use of the forest program as an area of expansion and growth; hiring another forest program staff would lead to this many more acres treated, etc.

Cat: What new deliverables are being offered year to year?

Jessie: The projects implemented and the continuation of the process of acquiring and implementing projects.

Chris: The deliverable is having an organization that can look for the funding and have a plan prepared to deal with floods, fires, etc. If you wait for a disaster to get funding, the organization needed doesn't exist.

Monica: Deliverables do need to cater to each organization.

Jessie: Maybe we need to outline more specifically the benefits to COB. We can follow up with Cat directly.

Kathy: Individual giving will be difficult. As we increase our visibility this should increase as a funding source. We need to be seen as local in Boulder to access that money.

Barbara: TU doesn't have any agency funding but relies on corporate partnerships and individual giving. We need to be seen not only as local, but having a mission that is a cause that will excite the local person. Many of our goals are broad, but should be distilled into a simple cause.



Chris: For individual giving, remember that these are taxpayers. Getting them to support via elected officials is support too! Connecting with their representatives on topics that support the Watershed Center and its mission.

### Organizational Planning Considerations

#### **Should we change our mission and bylaws? Should we re-brand?**

Kevin: Do we want to still include some geographic extent? Maybe St Vrain basin.

Chiara: Many people don't know what a basin/watershed is, nor that they live in the St Vrain watershed.

Eric: The lack of geographic specificity leaves us open to expansion.

Kevin: The audience may determine which mission statement is more useful.

Barbara: Lack of geography eliminates the need for explanation and clarification when working outside the basin.

Darren: Including language acknowledging roots in Left Hand watershed.

Sue: We already acknowledge "as a resource for other watersheds", which is the inclusivity piece.

Barbara: "Serving as a resource" versus being a leader in restoration is very different. We want to assert ourselves as leaders in our mission statement.

Kathy: Can it be more than one sentence? Use "core watersheds" language?

Chris: Use "our" watersheds.

Eric: If we go to The Watershed Center, then it's fine to keep the mission statement general (without geography).

Chiara: Using "our" watersheds does not align with incorporating indigenous knowledge and experts.

Kevin: I think you lose something when you take out geographic references from both mission statement and name.

Jessie: Does Left Hand make us just another watershed group? Can we be something different if we are The Watershed Center?

Deb: I'm inspired by being something different than just another watershed group.



Chris: I'm okay with the mission statement having a second sentence with "rooted in", but I like the idea of The Watershed Center. People in the community know it's their watersheds we're talking about. The Watershed Center doesn't leave anyone out.

Kathy: The Watershed Center but with a two-sentence mission statement.

Darren: Could get creative with the logo to include Left Hand roots.

Chiara: A longer mission statement can sound rehearsed when spoken. Do we need a full written version that can be verbally shortened?

Kevin: Truncating version is the way to go. Could include "roots" as well as "ongoing focus", "anchored in", etc. Including climate resiliency, systems level change, etc. in mission statement. Important on a national level if we want to be The Watershed Center.

Sue: Mission needs to be short and sweet but also explain what we're doing. I'm fine with The Watershed Center.

Monica: There are so many other "Left Hand" things!

Yana: The "rooted in" language does currently exist in our bylaws.

Summary: broad support for name change and including roots in the mission statement.

### **What are the considerations or requirements for new non-agency board members?**

Barbara: Would we be swapping Lyons for Ward? Ditch company rep. – there are so many ditch companies, would one rep. create an inequity of representation?

Kathy: We should be fluid with how we think about other representation. We used to have an ex officio member from USFS.

Chiara: It would be good to have content expertise on forests.

Darren: I could represent a combination county/ditch interest.

### Other

Monica gave update on Montgomery Farms. The City agrees that it's a good use for the property. Jessie and Monica need to do a Limited Impact/Special Use Review. Only limited by renovations and getting the green light from the county. Does anyone else want to see the place? We can have a field trip. (Eric expressed interest.)

Jessie: Maybe next board meeting?





Sue: Are you still renting from the fire district?

Jessie: We haven't gotten the lease or a move in date, but we're ready!

Kathy: Is willing to take on editing the bylaws

Consensus: decisions will be made later after the next Strategic Plan draft is complete

Next steps:

- Staff will incorporate changes into the Strategic Plan
- Jessie will circle back with steering committee and then follow-up with full group. Aim to draft by end of year/early next year.
- We are taking on the new logo and new name!

### **Strategic Planning Meeting Subgroup**

**September 9, 2022 (Feedback from Those who couldn't attend the meeting)**

**Jessie, Yana, Ken L., Lauren D., Roger**

#### Section 1 Discussion Questions

- Ken asked about pot of money that's unrestricted that could cover staff pay for rainy days. Jessie clarified that all money could be used for that purpose.
- Ken asked about how Calwood work was financed and Jessie explained and describe how it is restricted.
- Lauren asked about development director to support fundraising goals. Jessie noted more considerations are needed before advising on this. Lauren suggested consultant and leveraging existing event by partners.
- Roger noted importance of branding so that we are more recognizable. Wants us to be more recognized.
- Reflection and Discussion:
  - Ken thought challenges are greatly diffused by the way community is responding to fire concerns. Greatest contribution is our ability to respond after disaster. Excited about continued growth. Excited that we are "filling the vacuum" left by the Jamestown Initiative but would love to see more in Jamestown.
  - Lauren most excited about the growth post-flood. Greatest contribution is that we are a trusted partner. See opportunity in forest management and wildfire mitigation. See challenges as capacity.
  - Big opportunity and challenge is becoming better known to the general public and the specialized organizations that deal with water. They should know us as the scientific and



managerial capable people regardless of the problem with the watershed. Excited about recent growth. Greatest contribution is that we should see our expertise in science and management over a larger geographic area. USA not too large.

## Section 2 Discussion Questions

- Planning, AM, Science, and Research
  - Lauren and Ken agreed with draft goals.
  - Roger noted that BOD should check that Watershed Center gets benefits from scale projects. Jessie added that there should be a check in terms of capacity so that we are not neglecting our responsibilities in this basin in favor of others. Roger added that we should have a decision tree.
- Overall
  - Lauren asked for clarification in the plan around the need and extent for the expansion, in response to the proposed re-branding.
- Rivers
  - Roger asked for clarification on Captain Jack and emphasized priority.
- Community and Education
  - Ken suggested seminar through CU and CSU.
  - Roger noted that no one has stopped by to talk to him about river stewardship.
- Bylaws
  - Ken noted that individuals should represent a group or community (e.g. an HOA) but just an individual living on the creek and representing themselves shouldn't be a BOD member. Roger echoed this. Individuals with technical expertise or historic role in the watershed or organization are the exception.
  - Roger that JCWI could be an importance source of power over what happens in the watershed and wanted to provide discuss with the BOD about removing them from the bylaws. Prefers to give them a year to sort out their participation.
- Rebrand
  - Roger thinks it's a great idea but suggested Western Watershed Center or Mountain States Watershed Center.
  - Ken likes the Watershed Center name as a rebrand. Likes that it's simple and flexible.