

From: [Karl Wenner](#)
To: [Davia M Palmeri](#)
Subject: Fundraising Framework for OCRF
Date: Monday, February 1, 2021 9:18:47 AM
Attachments: [FRAMEWORK FOR INCENTIVIZING DONORS TO MAKE LARGE DONATIONS TO THE OCRF \(1\).docx](#)

This communication has been sent BCC to the members of OCRAC

As you are aware, we have a meeting this Friday and I have attached a framework for incentivizing donors that we will be discussing then.
This framework is the outcome of my discussions with all of you over the last month or so. Please take a look at it so we can have an informed discussion on Friday!

Thanks!

Karl C. Wenner, MD
Chair
Oregon Conservation and Recreation Advisory Committee



PROPOSED FRAMEWORK FOR INCENTIVIZING DONORS TO MAKE LARGE DONATIONS TO THE OREGON CONSERVATION AND RECREATION FUND (OCRF)

As you all know, the OCRF has come a long way over the last 10 months. Despite Covid-19, Oregon wildfires, and a pandemic induced recession, we have been successful in raising nearly a quarter of a million dollars. This money is being deployed around the state in order to help realize the promise of the Oregon Conservation Strategy and to fulfill our broad mandate. Our success is in large part due to the generosity of over 13,000 individual Oregonians who have shown just how much they value Oregon's wildlife and outdoors.

Based on the legislative bills being brought forward in the current session, it appears that we have a very good chance of having our sunset date of June 30, 2021 extended or removed as well as receiving the promised match of up to \$1,000,000.

After discussions with the Legislative Fiscal Office, the House Natural Resource Committee and individual legislators, I believe the odds of the OCRF being extended and having the match provided are favorable enough that we should proceed as if these desired outcomes are indeed going to happen. In order to best position the OCRF to maximize the opportunities before us, I would like to present a framework for moving forward that has arisen out of lengthy discussions with our partners, donors, and all the committee members.

While I consider the funds raised thus far be quite a success, there are opportunities to secure larger donations than those we have been typically receiving. Specifically, the match from the state is a powerful incentive to donors, and I feel we can raise significant funds and ultimately reach our \$1,000,000 dollar goal by highlighting that incentive.

The Pew Charitable Trust donation is an example of what is possible. We were able to incentivize their generous \$60,000 contribution in large part due to the match that the legislature has promised. There is ample evidence that similar, and even larger, donations are can occur, especially if we can allocate a percentage of the match back to that particular project.

A current example is the Marine Reserve Project which we funded at \$10,000. Their total need for this project is around \$160,000 and they are working with several entities to raise those funds. In discussions with them, it became apparent that many potential donors would be incentivized to give to the marine reserve project if their donations could be leveraged with a match to would help get that project to the finish line. The way this would work is as follows: The OCRF could accept those donations as "restricted" funds. We would then direct the funds to the project and when (and if) the state match is forthcoming, we would direct a percentage of the matching funds received back to that project. Based on many discussions, thirty percent appears to be a good number in terms of incentivizing donors. This retains 70% of the match funding from the state for other projects that we chose to fund in the future.

To carry this example out to its hypothetical conclusion, let's say we are successful in raising \$100,000 in restricted funds for the marine reserve project. We have already allocated \$10,000 of "unrestricted" funds to the project. This provides the project with \$110,000, or 2/3rds of

their goal, When the state match is available, we would then allocate another \$30,000 to the project, getting them 90% of the way to their goal of \$160,000. And don't forget that we would then also have another \$70,000 (from the match) available to distribute to other worthy projects around the state.

Based on my discussions with you all, this concept has broad support. To make this happen we need to clarify and codify a few points, which I hope to do at our meeting on Friday, February 5th at 10 AM. Following are some of those points.

1. We need to agree as a committee that this is an appropriate adjunct to our current fundraising efforts.
2. We would then need to settle on what percentage of the donation would be appropriate to match with the forthcoming state funds.
3. We have to decide what would be a minimum amount of "restricted" donation that we would accept for match. If it is too small the logistics, paperwork, and Davia's time would not be worth it. I am going to ask Davia to help us with this.
4. We need to decide if we are going to limit such "restricted" donations to just the projects we have already vetted, or if we would consider other appropriate projects that we learn about throughout the state.
5. If we extend this to other selected projects around the state, then how will we vet those projects to make sure they conform to our mandate and our guiding principles.

I'm asking that each of you consider this proposal for incentivizing large, restricted donations and come prepared to discuss how we can clarify and codify our approach going forward. This proposal is a work in progress, so please feel free to reach out to me to discuss further and let me know of any questions or concerns.

Looking forward to our future discussion!

Sincerely,

Karl Wenner
Chair
Oregon Conservation and Recreation Advisory Committee