
Volunteers for Rural Watersheds

Research Report

January 2012

The OSM/VISTA Teams:
Appalachian Coal Country Team
Western Hardrock Watershed Team



T Allan Comp, PhD
Coordinator: OSM/VISTA Teams
Project Director

Jenna L. Fehr
OSM/VISTA Volunteerism Coordinator
Lead Researcher 2010-2012

Joseph T. Campbell, M.S.
OSM/VISTA Volunteerism Coordinator
Lead Researcher 2008-2009

Executive Summary

Since its beginning in July 2008, a large amount of information was gathered for the Volunteers for Rural Watersheds” Research Project. This research was transformed into the *Toolkit for Working with Rural Volunteers* being distributed to as large an audience as possible via a workbook publication, www.RuralVolunteer.org website, trainings and more.

In the first phase of the study, surveys were distributed to volunteers with 16 different community/watershed improvement organizations in Appalachia and the Rocky Mountain West. Data was compiled and analyzed to form a general profile of rural volunteers and to gain valuable insight into their opinions. Most respondents were 55 and over, though the average age was 50 years old. The majority was married, has children, and lived in their community for at least 25 years. Volunteers tended to hold a bachelor’s degree and make between \$20,000 and \$39,999 annually. Most were recruited by friends and family already in group, encouraging group’s to use current volunteers as the best recruiters of new volunteers. This information identifies who is most likely to volunteer and, perhaps more importantly, reveals gaps where new individuals and groups can be targeted for recruitment.

In addition to participation with watershed groups, it is clear from survey data that many volunteers are involved in organizations both within and outside of the environmental arena. Survey data also demonstrates that volunteers are very politically active, with a large percentage voting in national and local elections and contacting government officials at all levels about issues. The civic power of these volunteers is a large, often untapped resource for groups to use to spread awareness of issues and secure possible funding. Involvement in other organizations provides connections for potential partnerships that can benefit communities in new ways.

Volunteers for watershed organizations in both regions are very positive about the environmental and community impacts being made. In general, respondents have very positive beliefs in the management of their respective organizations, the benefits they gain personally, and their role within them. A few areas of less optimism emerged, however, primarily in regard to beliefs about their group’s financial, volunteer, and technical resources. There is also less confidence in the financial benefits to communities and ability “to address watershed problems without much delay.” For the Appalachian Coal Country Team (ACCT) and Western Hardrock Watershed Team (WHWT), these doubts are a spur to better broadcast the ties between environmental and economic improvement that are the basis of our work. It is also a reflection and confirmation of the magnitude of entrenched problems in rural, environmentally-degraded communities.

For the second phase of research, 25 volunteer practices proven to be successful in recruiting, managing, or retaining volunteers were identified and tested for one year by two different rural watershed groups. Successful volunteer management practices were identified through informal interviews with watershed organization stakeholders during site visits and analysis of ACCT and WHWT Quarterly Reports. All partnering organizations in the ACCT and WHWT network were then invited to apply to “test” up to three practices within their organization. A formal application was used and the Volunteerism Coordinator worked to match volunteer management needs with successful volunteer management practices. Research was structured for two trials of each of the 25 practices. To monitor and capture the implementation of trial practices, participating organizations completed initial, six-month, and final reports and the Volunteerism Coordinator conducted interviews and site visits.

Twenty-five case studies emerged, brimming with successes, challenges, and ideas for other rural groups to utilize. While each volunteer practice has its own specific characteristics and obstacles, several overarching trends emerged. The need for a lead person or committee to drive planning was a key factor in the success or failure of many trial practices and, in small rural communities, specificity was crucial. Broad appeals for help with tasks and events often went unheeded. Practices that employed targeted recruitment of individuals and groups with skills for specific tasks had the best results. For tasks requiring large groups or crews of volunteers, rural organizations often succeeded by bringing in outside groups, such as alternative spring break crews and faith-based mission teams. These lessons and many more are presented as a suite of volunteer management options in the 25 case studies compiled throughout this research phase.

The end of the one-year trial practice period marked the beginning of the third project phase and the transformation of research into useable rural volunteer management resources. The *Toolkit for Working with Rural Volunteers* was created for the benefit of the larger community of rural volunteer-based organizations. The production and distribution of this *Toolkit* enables rural volunteer managers to explore new methods of volunteer recruitment, management, and retention through the case study accounts of trial practice transplant tests. Case studies are supplemented by regional and local survey findings. Research and experience also generated useful worksheets, checklists, evaluations, planning documents, and other materials to provide a comprehensive rural volunteer management resource and toolkit. To maximize distribution in rural communities that have limited or no Internet access, the workbook is distributed as a hardcopy booklet and CD in addition to an interactive online version hosted at www.RuralVolunteer.org.

The *Toolkit* also serves as the basis of rural volunteer management training workshops conducted by members of the OSM/VISTA Teams Support Offices. This research has been presented at numerous local, state, regional, and national conferences, including the 2011 National Conference on Volunteering and Service in New Orleans, LA. The need for these resources has been felt by the positive and eager response of those attending these presentations. Attendees are eager for training on new ideas, where to start and what to expect. Access to this information enables organizations to learn from each other ways to clean up polluted freshwater ecosystems and initiate community revitalization projects. Volunteers are better equipped to both lead and join efforts that expand economic opportunity in their own communities to increase tourism, property values, and attract new businesses.

By informing and training rural volunteer managers, the OSM/VISTA Teams are mobilizing volunteers to promote environmental stewardship and economic development in rural, under-resourced, environmentally degraded communities.

- EPA OWOW Contract Requirements
 - Conduct research among network of community watershed group partners on what practices, methods, and materials are proving to be the most successful in volunteer management within the ACCT and WHWT.
 - Through the ACCT/WHWT network, identify up to 20 mini-projects that will explore a wide variety of volunteer recruitment, recognition, and retention successes in rural watershed communities.
 - Provide additional funding and/or support, as necessary, to enable the success of the mini-projects.
 - Develop a separate track on volunteer programs for presentation at training sessions funded by the EPA/OWOW Capacity Building Grant to the Eastern Coal Regional Roundtable (the ACCT is a significant partner in this grant).
 - Seek to augment EPA funding with private foundation funding to strengthen and enhance the research, training and distribution of results.

- First Year Accomplishments (July 2008—July 2009)
 - Initiated 16 subsequent long-term, place-based projects on volunteerism within the ACCT/WHWT network.
 - Produced preliminary findings from these place-based projects describing characteristics of rural watershed volunteers.
 - Presented preliminary findings at multiple community meetings and regional and state conferences, including the EPA-funded *Hope & Hard Work: Building Capacity in Appalachian Coal Country Watershed Groups* Fall Training in 2008.

- Second Year Accomplishments (July 2009—July 2010)
 - Identified 25 volunteer practices across rural Appalachian and Western Hardrock watershed groups proven to be successful in recruiting, managing, or retaining volunteers.
 - Developed a procedure for testing and monitoring each of these 25 practices in two different rural watershed groups. By January 15, 2010, each of these 25 practices began a one-year trial period. A total of 34 different organizations are testing one, two, or three of these volunteerism practices, totaling 48 ongoing projects.
 - Received and compiled initial and six-month reports from all participating watershed organizations to track and capture the successes and challenges of their progress.
 - Completed and analyzed final database of information collected in rural watershed volunteer surveys.
 - Presented project overview and examples at three regional OSM/VISTA Watershed Team conferences, including the ACCT Training in Weston, WV, in September 2009 and the WHWT Trainings in Salida (October 2009) and Gunnison, CO (June 2010).
 - Conducted poster presentation at National Water Quality Monitoring Conference in Denver, CO (April 2010) and participated on volunteerism panels for Central Pennsylvania and West Virginia Hugh O'Brian Youth Leadership Conferences.
 - Submitted proposals to present at the National Water Quality Monitoring Conference, National Conference on Volunteering and Service, National Conference on Citizenship, Volunteer WV's Faces of Leadership Conference, 32nd Annual National Association of Abandoned Mine Lands Programs, Midwest Ground Water Conference, West Virginia Water Conference, and Hugh O'Brian Youth Leadership Conferences.

- Third Year Accomplishments (July 2010-July 2011)
 - Monitored the final six months of 48 trial practices across the OSM/VISTA Teams.
 - Received and compiled final reports from all participating watershed organizations to track and capture the successes and challenges of their progress.
 - Submitted a letter of intent to the Roy A. Hunt Foundation for \$25,000 to be used as research support grants to the 34 community/watershed improvement organizations participating in volunteerism research project. Not granted the opportunity to submit a full proposal.
 - Submitted letters of intent to Kresge Foundation (\$40,000), Charles Stewart Mott Foundation (\$30,000), and Harris and Frances Block Foundation (\$10,000) for the funding needs to create rural volunteer management resources.
 - Amended the EPA-OSM interagency agreement to reflect a three-year project period.
 - Wrote articles regarding volunteerism project for ACCT and WHWT Team Summaries and interim ACCT and WHWT email newsletters.
 - Further analyzed database of information collected in rural watershed volunteer surveys to compare viewpoints of watershed group impacts of volunteers with groups on the ACCT versus those on WHWT, and by age brackets of youth adults, adults, and seniors.
 - Presented findings at local, state, and regional trainings and conferences, including Volunteer WV's Faces of Leadership Conference (July 2010), 32nd Annual National Association of Abandoned Mine Lands Programs (September 2010), Midwest Ground Water Conference (October 2010), West Virginia Water Conference (October 2010), ACCT and WHWT Fall Trainings (October and November 2010), Tennessee Conference on Volunteerism and Service-Learning (February 2011), Appalachian Studies Association Conference (March 2011), ACCT Spring Training (April 2011), Southern West Virginia Watershed Associations Meeting (June 2011), and National Conference on Volunteering and Service (June 2011).
 - Submitted presentation proposals for local, state, regional, and national trainings and conferences, including Southern Rural Sociological Association Meeting, National Conference on Citizenship, National Service-Learning Conference, National River Rally, International Association for Research on Service-learning and Community Engagement Annual Conference, PA Abandoned Mine Reclamation Conference, Mid-Atlantic Stream Restoration Conference, Chesapeake Watershed Forum, Mobilizing Rural Communities Conference, and EPA Community Involvement Training Conference.
 - Accepted for PA Abandoned Mine Reclamation Conference and Mobilizing Rural Communities Conference; accepted but declined due to conflicts for Southern Rural Sociological Association Meeting, National Outreach Scholarship Conference, and Mid-Atlantic Stream Restoration Conference.

Table of Contents

<u>Introduction</u>	1
<u>Problem Statement</u>	1
<u>Place-Based Volunteerism Research Projects</u>	2
Phase 1 Data: Survey Findings	4
Demographics	5
Environmental Concerns.....	6
Activities and Involvement.....	6
Individual Volunteer Beliefs and Opinions	8
Watershed Group Impacts on the Community.....	9
Watershed Group Impacts by Region.....	10
Civic Engagement and Other Group Participation	11
Conclusions.....	11
Recommendations.....	13
Phase 2: Volunteer Management Practices.....	14
Trial Volunteer Management Practices	14
Documented Volunteer Management Practices.....	15
Expansion of Volunteerism Projects.....	22
Trial Practice Reporting.....	25
Phase 3: Volunteer Management Final Reports.....	25
<u>Outreach and Education</u>	30
<u>Toolkit for Working with Rural Volunteers</u>	31
<u>List of Appendices</u>	33
Appendix A: Volunteer Surveys	34
Appendix B: Trial Practice Initial Report.....	50
Appendix C: ACCWT/WHWT Volunteerism Trial Practices Application Form.....	55
Appendix D: Volunteerism Practice Project Evaluation Matrix	58
Appendix E: 6-Month Trial Practice Report (Partial Projects).....	59
Appendix F: 6-Month Trial Practice Report (Full Projects).....	62
Appendix G: Final Trial Practice Report (Partial Projects).....	66
Appendix H: Final Trial Practice Report (Full Projects).....	68
Appendix I: Case Studies	70

Introduction

The purpose of the “Volunteers for Rural Watersheds” research project is to identify, test, and document successful volunteer recruitment and management strategies with up to 20 different watershed groups and synthesize this data into a toolkit of best practices to guide these and other watershed organizations in rural areas. This three-year pilot project is now complete.

- Dr. T Allan Comp, Office of Surface Mining and Coordinator of the Appalachian Coal Country Team (ACCT) and Western Hardrock Watershed Team (WHWT), and April Trent, ACCT Program Coordinator, oversee this project.
- Office of Surface Mining/AmeriCorps VISTA (OSM/VISTA) Joseph Campbell served as the Volunteerism Coordinator and lead researcher for this project from August 2008 to December 2009.
- Office of Surface Mining/AmeriCorps VISTA (OSM/VISTA) Jenna Fehr served as Volunteerism Coordinator and lead researcher from January 2010 to March 2012.

This project, as defined in the EPA Cooperative Agreement with the ACCT, consists of three focus areas:

1. Identifying characteristics and services provided by volunteers for rural watersheds
2. Identifying and testing effective approaches or “practices” to managing volunteers for rural watersheds
3. Disseminating data, research findings, tools and resources for engaging volunteers at regional, state, and local trainings, conferences, and through other forms of outreach

Several key partners provided assistance to this project. ACCT Summer Associate Elizabeth Dues (2009), part-time Research Assistant Stephanie Lily (2009), Summer Associate Monica Freeland (2010), and Summer Intern Megan Acord (2011) assisted in survey data entry and compilation of case studies. Other research support is provided by: Heather Lukacs, M.Eng., Stanford University Doctoral Candidate in their Interdisciplinary Program in Environment & Resources; Dr. Tom Koontz, Associate Professor at The Ohio State University School of Environment and Natural Resources; and Dr. Jeff Brudney, Albert A. Levin Chair of Urban Studies and Public Service at Cleveland State University. Ms. Lukacs assisted in research design, survey construction, survey distribution, data entry, and data analysis; Dr. Koontz provided assistance in research design and survey construction; and Dr. Brudney provided several resource websites and informational documents about improving volunteer management, assistance in survey construction, methodology, and reporting systems.

Problem Statement

For many reasons, rural non-profit groups located in Appalachian coal country and in the Western hardrock mining region face additional volunteerism barriers in comparison to organizations located in urban and suburban areas

First, in rural regions there is often less economic diversity compared to their urban counterparts. This lack of diversity is often directly correlated with low levels of employment and high levels of poverty. In coal country and the hardrock mining region in particular, coal and other mining was a key source of employment, responsible for founding hundreds of mining towns throughout the regions. However, as the pre-regulatory era of mining gave way to more efficient extraction

methods, antiquated mines were abandoned, leaving unemployment, poverty, and environmental devastation in their wake. Second, the mountainous terrain of Appalachian coal country and the hardrock-mining West can be a challenge to commuting volunteers. Getting over the mountain to attend an organizational event may prove to be unaffordable or impossible with fluctuating gasoline prices or uncooperative weather. Third, rural watershed organizations often lack reliable Internet and mobile phone coverage, making savvy, modern approaches to volunteerism employed by urban groups near impossible for application in rural areas. Last, Appalachian and Western mining regions have been hit hard by out-migration. Much of the human capital, essential to non-profit groups everywhere, has dissipated at an alarming rate. This often results in low-levels of potential volunteers to contribute to environmental action in the rural communities where we work.

Nevertheless, thousands of volunteers contribute countless hours of service to support watershed groups within the ACCT and WHWT networks. In spite of the barriers to volunteerism in the isolated and rural communities of Appalachian coal country and the Western hardrock mining region, a massive volunteer effort is happening for the betterment of mine-scarred watersheds.

Place-Based Volunteerism Research Projects

The ACCT partnered with 34 different watershed organizations located primarily in rural and isolated areas. Sixteen organizations were involved in “full” volunteerism research projects, where they participated in over two years of research with the ACCT. This included surveys to their core volunteer base and testing at least one strategy or practice that addressed an organizational need and was proven effective by another organization. Thirteen of these groups are located in Appalachian coal country and come from the ACCT’s network. Three additional organizations are located in the Rocky Mountain West and are part of WHWT. Furthermore, 18 organizations have forgone the survey distribution phase, but are testing and monitoring at least one volunteer management practice. Similarly, these “partial” volunteerism research projects were in both ACCT and WHWT networks.

Watershed groups partnering through full volunteerism research projects include:

1. Plateau Action Network, Fayetteville, WV
2. Upper Guyandotte Watershed Association, Mullens, WV
3. George’s Creek Watershed Association, Barton, MD
4. Headwaters, Inc, Whitesburg, KY
5. McClure River Restoration Project, Clintwood, VA
6. Morris Creek Watershed Association, Montgomery, WV
7. Woodlands Community Land Trust, Clairfield, TN
8. North Fork River Improvement Association, Hotchkiss, CO
9. Lake Fork Valley Conservancy, Lake City, CO
10. Friends of Deckers Creek, Morgantown, WV
11. Schuylkill Headwaters Association, Pottsville, PA
12. Little Beaver Creek Land Foundation, Lisbon, OH
13. Crooked Creek Watershed Association, Indiana, PA
14. Friends of Russell Fork, Haysi, VA
15. Lackawanna River Corridor Association, Scranton, PA
16. Upper Pecos Watershed Association, Pecos, NM

The research methodology employed for these full projects consisted of three research phases that required certain outputs from partnering sites and subsequent mini-grant payments as awards. Research partnerships with each site spanned the course of two years in which each participating site received three payments totaling \$2000 for their complete participation. The payment schedule is based upon a series of three phases. A watershed's successful completion of a phase results in a payment. Outcomes from this place-based research at each site were:

- Phase 1: Survey data from their volunteer base (average 71.4% response rate has been retrieved for these surveys).
- Phase 2: Identify an organization's volunteer management needs and find best practices from other groups that best fit these needs, then transplant and monitor these "volunteer trial practices." In short, try out old practices in a new setting.
- Phase 3: A web-ready final report featuring recommended practices and tracking the effectiveness of the trial practices over a six-month and one-year period.

Watershed groups partnering through partial volunteerism research projects include:

1. Friends of the Cheat, Kingwood, WV
2. Shamokin Creek Restoration Alliance, Shamokin, PA
3. Rural Appalachian Improvement League, Mullens, WV
4. Piney Creek Watershed Association, Beckley, WV
5. Brownsville Area Revitalization Corporation, Brownsville, PA
6. Friends of Milam Creek, McGraws, WV
7. Coal Creek Watershed Coalition, Crested Butte, CO
8. Savage River Watershed Association, Frostburg, MD
9. Lackawanna Heritage Valley Authority, Scranton, PA
10. Kid's Pasta Project, Hotchkiss, CO
11. Kiskiminetas Watershed Association, Leechburg, PA
12. Upper South Platte Watershed Association, Lakewood, CO
13. Mountain Studies Institute, Durango, CO
14. Upper Tennessee River Roundtable, Abingdon, VA
15. Friends of Lower Muskingum River, Marietta, OH
16. Roaring Run Watershed Association, Apollo, PA
17. Clear Fork Watershed Council, Mt. Vernon, KY/Jellico, TN
18. Redbank Watershed Association, New Bethlehem, PA

The research methodology for these partial projects consisted only of the latter two research phases, as described in the full project description above. These groups refrained from surveying their volunteer base and only tested one or more volunteer trial practices. Research partnerships with each partial site spanned the course of one year in which each participating site received two payments totaling \$700 for their complete participation. Like the payment schedule established for the 2nd and 3rd phases outlined in the full projects, these payments were based upon a series of two phases. A watershed's successful completion of a phase resulted in a payment. Like the full projects, these partial projects included:

- Phase 2: Testing and monitoring of a volunteer trial practice over the course of one year.
- Phase 3: A web-ready final report featuring recommended practices and tracking the effectiveness of the trial practices over a six-month and one-year period.

Phase 1 Data: Survey Findings

For the first phase of this research, a survey instrument was constructed for volunteers for watershed groups. The survey was developed to better understand the following questions: how did these rural watershed volunteers get involved with their organizations, what are some of their personal characteristics, what do they do for their respective organizations and communities, and how they might be further engaged in volunteer activities in the future. This survey contained 16 pages of questions related to various aspects of volunteering, demographics, and perspectives on watershed group activities. In addition, the instrument provided space for volunteers to express certain practical issues such as days and times when they are available to volunteer, areas of concern for the watershed group and community, and provision of additional follow-up interviews. This survey was distributed to volunteers representing 16 different watershed organizations. The findings from this phase are reported below. This survey can be found in **Appendix A**.

As of July 2010, 315 surveys were retrieved from volunteers for 16 different watershed organizations. Within that timeframe, 441 surveys were distributed, tallying a respectable response rate of 71.4%. Those surveyed must have, within the past year, volunteered at a minimum of two watershed events for no less than two hours total and/or have attended at least half of group-specific meetings. The following organizations have participated in this research. Their location is listed by their name and acronym, in addition to the total number of surveys received to the number distributed:

Northeast Pennsylvania

- Lackawanna River Corridor Association (LRCA): Scranton, PA (17/36)
- Schuylkill Headwaters Association (SHA): Pottsville, PA(14/16)

Western Pennsylvania

- Crooked Creek Watershed Association (CrCWA): Indiana, PA (12/13)

Northeast Ohio

- Little Beaver Creek Land Foundation (LBCLF): Lisbon, OH (13/22)

Western Maryland

- George's Creek Watershed Association (GCWA): Barton, MD (34/36)

Northern West Virginia

- Friends of Deckers Creek (FODC): Dellslow, WV (16/26)

Southern West Virginia

- Plateau Action Network (PAN): Fayetteville, WV (31/35)
- Upper Guyandotte Watershed Association (UGWA): Mullens, WV (19/25)
- Morris Creek Watershed Association (MCWA): Montgomery, WV (34/36)

Southeast Kentucky

- Headwaters, Inc.: Whitesburg, KY (25/32)

Southwest Virginia

- McClure River Restoration Project (MRRP): Clintwood, VA (10/13)
- Friends of Russell Fork (FORF): Haysi, VA (9/21)

Northeast Tennessee

- Woodlands Community Land Trust (WCLT): Clairfield, TN, (28/35)

Western Colorado

- North Fork River Improvement Association (NFRIA): Hotchkiss, CO (31/35)
- Lake Fork Valley Conservancy (LFVC): Lake City, CO (12/17)

Northern New Mexico

- Upper Pecos Watershed Association (UPWA): Pecos, NM (10/43)

To reflect the results of the survey and to itemize data into categories relevant to watershed group volunteer management, findings are divided up into themes. These are: **a) demographics; b) environmental concerns; c) activities and involvement; d) individual volunteer beliefs and opinions; e) watershed group impacts in the community; f) watershed group impacts by region; and g) civic engagement and other group participation.** Additional sections include: **g) conclusions and h) future research.**

Demographics

Watershed organizations studied in this project are represented by a wide range of ages, backgrounds, careers, and lifestyles. Broad generalizations are provided to illustrate general volunteer demographic trends. The average age for a survey respondent is 50 years. 54% of respondents are male, 46% are female. The majority of respondents are married (65%). Furthermore, 63% have children and 32% have grandchildren. Of these families, only 15% have children and 3% have grandchildren that volunteer for the watershed group, respectively. Most often these activities include stream and litter clean-ups. Other less common activities include: water sampling, attending meetings, and assistance with specific projects.

56% of respondents are from the area served by the watershed group. The average respondent has lived in their community for 25 years, but ranged from less than a year to 78 years. 39% of volunteers had parents/guardians that regularly volunteered. 78% currently reside in the area served by the watershed, 19% do not, and 3% don't know. 77% receive water in their home through a public water supply system, 18% receive water from a private well on their property, and 5% are on another form of system. 58% use the public water supply as their primary source of drinking water, while 18% use bottled water, 14% use well water, 4% use spring water, and 7% use other sources for drinking water.

Watershed group organizations tend to be represented by volunteers with comparatively high formal educational attainment. In terms of highest level of formal education achieved, 1% has no high school education. 6% have some high school education, 8% have a high school diploma or GED. 18% have some college education or an Associate's degree. Most commonly, respondents achieved either a Bachelor's degree (39%) or Graduate degree (29%).

Almost half of watershed volunteers surveyed (49%) are employed full-time. 24% are retired,

11% are employed on a part-time basis, 4% are disabled, 5% are unemployed, 4% are full-time homemakers, and 3% are students. More than a quarter (27 %) of volunteers is employed by a government agency or organization, while a third (32%) has an occupation that is environmentally related. The most commonly cited employment sectors were “education” (23%) and “health care and social assistance” (13%). However, the category “other” was selected most frequently (44%), where careers ranged considerably. Careers related to specific professions included: environmental consultation, GIS and computer specialists, community development, and legal work. Gross household income levels also ranged considerably. Total responses indicated that in 2007: 9% made less than \$10,000; 10% made between \$10,000 and \$19,999; 22% made between \$20,000 and \$39,999; 19% made between \$40,000 and \$59,999; 17% made between \$60,000 and \$79,000; 11% made between \$80,000 and \$99,000; 10% made between \$100,000 and \$149,000; and 3% made more than \$150,000.

Environmental Concerns

To gauge local water issues respondents were presented with a list of 11 different forms of water or environmental pollution. Each respondent selected the top three issues that they were most concerned about. In order of selection: “acid mine drainage” was selected most often by respondents (44% of the time), followed by “drinking water quality” (40%), “mine waste (e.g. leeching tailings, gob piles, etc.)” (35%), “deforestation” (34%), “pollution from wastewater” (33%), “illegal trash dumps” (31%). Other issues received less response: “flooding” (20%); “agricultural pollution” (17%); “land use change” (15%); “other toxic materials” (8%); and “mine openings” (4%).

However, local water concerns varied often based on watershed group. Some environmental concerns were associated primarily with a select handful of groups. For example, “flooding” was a concern for 63% and 53% of volunteers for two groups in southern WV. In addition, a western PA and western CO group’s volunteers selected “agricultural pollution” as a concern 67% and 53% of the time, respectively.

Over half of the volunteers with one group in southwest VA (80%) and two in southern WV (65%, 53%) were concerned about “pollution from wastewater.” Nearly a third of a southeastern KY group’s volunteers (32%) selected “other toxic materials,” the only group with a strong response to this form of pollution.

Again, “AMD” was the most commonly selected water pollution concern and was selected by at least one respondent in each organization. For groups in northeast PA, northern WV, and western MD volunteers, “AMD” was selected almost unanimously. “Deforestation” is a commonly held environmental concern for volunteers in a range of areas, including eastern OH (77%), western PA, western CO, southwest VA (50%), and northeast TN (48%).

Activities and Involvement

Respondents were asked to select their primary interest in the watershed group based on six different reasons. 70% selected “environmental preservation” as their primary interest. “Opportunity to give back to the community” (12%), “recreation” (5%), “opportunity to work with/make friends” (3%), “economic development” (2%), “volunteer service credit” (1%), and “other” reasons (7%) were also selected.

Interests ranged significantly between groups. For example, George’s Creek Watershed Association (western MD) and Schuylkill Headwaters Association (northeast PA) had the highest rating for “environmental preservation” (94% and 93% of responses, respectively). With the exception of Woodland Community Land Trust in northeast TN, every group ranked “environmental preservation” highest. Woodland Community Land Trust (TN) ranked “opportunity to give back to community” highest (26%). 35% of Morris Creek Watershed Association (southern WV) volunteers listed this same category. Comparatively, North Fork River Improvement Association (western CO) rated “recreation” the highest (20%); Upper Guyandotte Watershed Association (southern WV) received the most responses for “volunteer service credit” (11%); and Headwaters, Inc., (southeast KY) had the highest overall ranking for “economic development” at 8%.

Volunteers found out about their respective watershed group through a variety of methods. “Through a friend involved with the watershed group” was the most common way of involvement (36% of respondents). Next were: “through a family member involved with the watershed group” (18%), “through a watershed event” (10%), “through a newspaper article” (7%), “through my school” (3%), and “through my church” (1%). 14% selected “other” and these were often variations or more specific versions of the methods listed prior and some who founded their group.

In addition, 16% of volunteers had family members who were part of the organization prior to their participation. 70% of volunteers had friends who were part of the organization prior to their participation. 95% of volunteers list that at present they have friends in the organization.

Less than half of the volunteers who responded to this survey indicated that they’ve held leadership positions within their organizations (41%). At some point, 33% have served on the board of their organization, 8% as a group coordinator, and 7% as a committee chair.

In contrast, volunteers indicated participation in a wide range of other watershed group activities within the past year. 66% have “read the newsletter and are aware of current watershed issues.” 59% “show up at events and do what is asked of them.” Less common activities volunteers participate in are: “participate in decisions about future directions of the watershed group” (35%); “conduct water quality sampling and/or develop watershed assessments” (28%); “provide education and outreach for the watershed group” (22%); “represent the watershed group when meeting with other groups” (22%); and “organized one or more events from start to finish” (16%).

A single watershed organization generally featured a higher percentage of volunteers engaged in each activity. For example, 93% of Plateau Action Network (southern WV) volunteers “read the newsletter and are aware of current watershed issues.” Other examples of highest percent of volunteer participation in activities by group are:

- Crooked Creek Watershed Association (western PA) volunteers who “show up at events and do what is asked of them” (83%)
- Lake Fork Valley Conservancy (western CO) volunteers who “conduct water quality sampling and/or develop watershed assessments” (50%)
- Crooked Creek Watershed Association (western PA) and Lake Fork Valley Conservancy (western CO) volunteers who “participate in decisions about future directions of the

watershed group” (58%).

- Schuylkill Headwaters Association (northeast PA) volunteers who “provide education and outreach for the watershed group” (64%)
- Schuylkill Headwaters Association (northeast PA) volunteers who “represent the watershed group when meeting with other groups” (43%)
- Morris Creek Watershed Association (southern WV) volunteers who have “organized one or more events from start to finish” (23%)

Out of all of the respondents surveyed, 25% consider their participation as representing another organization. 75% participate as an “individual”, while less than two percent consider it to be both. Represented organizations are most often staff at local schools, county or state government, and representatives of other civic groups. A southwest VA group features the highest percentage of volunteers representing other organizations at (70%), while a western CO group is comprised of the most volunteers participating as individuals (97%).

Other forms of volunteer contributions include: giving money to the watershed group, including membership dues (52% of all volunteers surveyed); contributing in-kind donations (e.g. materials, land or food) to the group (44%); and attending regional training opportunities through ACCT (17% of ACCT-based volunteers) or Colorado Division of Wildlife River Watch (6% of WHWT-based volunteers). Groups in northern and southern WV feature the highest rate of financial donations (81%). A northeast TN group receives the highest percentage of in-kind contributions (70%). Per capita, southwest VA and western CO volunteers have participated in the most number of trainings (50% and 47%, respectively).

Individual Volunteer Beliefs and Opinions

Participants in watershed group activities offer a variety of beliefs and opinions on the ways in which their organization is managed, the benefits they gain from participation, and their overall role within the organization. In general, respondents have very positive beliefs in the management of their respective organizations, the benefits they gain, and their role within them. A few areas of less optimism are highlighted, primarily in regard to beliefs about their group’s financial, volunteer, and technical resources.

84% of volunteers agree (47% strongly) that the “watershed group informs them of issues and activities in a timely manner.” 100% (87% strongly) of Friends of Deckers Creek (northern WV) volunteers believe in this statement, the highest among organizations surveyed. 63% of volunteers agree (38% strongly) that “their roles and responsibilities are made clear.” Volunteers for Morris Creek Watershed Association (southern WV) held the strongest belief in that statement (91 % agree, 76 % strongly).

Most volunteers believe that “group meetings are conducted in an efficient and productive manner” (62% either agree or strongly agree). However, 24% of total volunteers surveyed state that they “don’t know.” 85% of Morris Creek Watershed Association (southern WV) volunteers strongly agree with the above statement.

It’s clear that volunteers believe that they receive a variety of benefits through participating in watershed group activities. 79% of volunteers surveyed agree that “participating with the watershed group helps to fulfill their civic duty” (38% strongly). Volunteers also indicate

“participation provides an opportunity to learn new things” (89% agree (51% strongly)). Lake Fork Valley Conservancy (western CO) volunteers agree with this statement 100% (82%); higher than all other groups surveyed.

Last, while few volunteers claim to have “had a high knowledge about local watershed issues prior to participation” (32% agree, 8% strongly), this number increased through participation with 69% claiming to have “a high knowledge about local watershed issues” (22% strongly). A significant increase in knowledge occurred at various levels for volunteers with each organization. Most notable shifts occurred for:

- Friends of Deckers Creek in northern WV (0% agree to 67% agree)
- Lake Fork Valley Conservancy in western CO (18% agree, 0% strongly) to (90% agree, 27% strongly)
- Schuylkill Headwaters Association in northeast PA (46% agree, 8% strongly) to (91% agree, 50% strongly)

A few areas of volunteer pessimism emerged from this survey, primarily in relation to financial, volunteer, and technical resources. Of the volunteers surveyed, 52% of volunteers believe that “their group does *not* have enough financial support to accomplish its goals” (14% disagree with this statement); 33% of volunteers believe that “their group does *not* have enough volunteers to accomplish its goals” (34% disagree with this statement); and 29% of volunteers believe that “their group does *not* have enough technical resources to accomplish its goals” (27% disagree with this statement).

Another area of note is the rate of volunteers who responded “don’t know” to whether their group had enough financial, volunteer, or technical resources to accomplish its goals. This figure is: 22%; 22%; and 27%, respectively. Collectively, 0 organizations show a majority that their group has enough financial support to accomplish its goals. Significantly more than others, Morris Creek Watershed Association (southern WV) and Friends of Deckers Creek (northern WV) volunteers do agree that the amount of volunteers is adequate (76% and 73%, respectively). In contrast to most organizations, volunteers for Lake Fork Valley Conservancy (western CO) and Crooked Creek Watershed Association (western PA) believe that they have enough technical support to accomplish their goals [(73% agree, 42% strongly) and (50% agree, 42% strongly), respectively].

Watershed Group Impacts on the Community

Watershed organizations engage their community and impact the local environment in a variety of ways. Respondents were provided with a variety of statements intended to measure their beliefs on how their organizations address community and environmental issues. Similar to the primarily optimistic outlook of volunteers revealed in the prior section, volunteers hold strong beliefs in the ability of their organizations to make an impact. However, the degree of volunteer optimism often varies between group and area of community/environmental impact.

Volunteers hold the strongest belief in their groups’ ability to: “help improve local environmental conditions” (94% agree, 71% strongly); “provide environmental education programs to the local community” (85% agree, 48% strongly); “build communication networks in the local community” (84% agree, 45% strongly); “encourage cooperation among diverse people/organizations” (83% agree, 53% strongly); and “produce on-the-ground results” (73%

agree, 46% strongly).

Volunteers for a northern WV and a northeast PA group share the strongest beliefs in their organization to improve local environmental conditions (100% and 93% strongly agree). A northern WV group's volunteers most strongly believe in their group's ability to provide environmental education programs to the local community (93% strongly agree). Southwest VA and northern WV volunteers strongly agree that their organization builds communication networks in the local community (100% and 93%, respectively). Southwest VA volunteers strongly believe that their organization encourages cooperation among diverse people/organizations (100% agree, 88% strongly; 100% agree, 80% strongly). Similar to beliefs in the groups' ability to improve local environmental conditions, southwest VA, northeast PA, and northern WV volunteers overwhelmingly agree (100%) that their group is capable of producing on-the-ground results (89%, 77%, and 73% strongly agree, respectively).

Volunteers seem less convinced in their groups' ability to: "bring financial benefits to the local community" (61% agree, 29% strongly) and "address watershed problems without much delay" (45% agree, 18% strongly). Further, 14% and 21% of volunteers responded "don't know" to these statements, significantly higher than those in the prior paragraphs.

Lake Fork Valley Conservancy (western CO) volunteers perceive the highest rate of financial benefit to their local community (83% and 61%, with 1 "don't know" response). Whereas, Morris Creek Watershed Association (southern WV) volunteers hold the strongest beliefs that their organization is able to address watershed problems without much delay (78% agree, 39% strongly with 1 "don't know" response).

Watershed Group Impacts by Region

At a regional level, the ACCT and WHWT work with watershed organizations to engage their community and impact the local environment in a variety of ways. Volunteers for watershed organizations in both Appalachian coal country and the Western hardrock mining region are very positive about the environmental and community impacts being made. There is less optimism, however, about financial benefits to communities and ability "to address watershed problems without much delay."

93% of ACCT and 96% of WHWT volunteers agree that their watershed groups help to improve the local environment (70% and 75% strongly, respectively). WHWT's slightly higher rate is also reflected in their ability to produce on-the-ground results (82%), while 71% of ACCT volunteers agree with this statement. Volunteers with watershed groups in the ACCT show a higher agreement on the provision of environmental education programs to the local community (88%), while 71% of WHWT volunteers agree with that statement.

83% of ACCT and 85% of WHWT volunteers indicate that their organizations "encourage cooperation among diverse people/organizations." In a similar vein, 84% of ACCT and 83% of WHWT volunteers agree that their "watershed group builds communication networks in the local community."

There is less agreement on the ability of watershed groups to bring financial benefits to local communities (58% ACCT, 78% WHWT). However, 16% of ACCT volunteers reported that they

“don’t know” and 20% “neither agree nor disagree.” 12% of WHWT volunteers also “neither agree nor disagree.”

Volunteers for watershed groups in the ACCT and WHWT are also unsure of their group’s ability to “address watershed problems without much delay.” 45% of ACCT volunteers agree that their group addresses problems without much delay, but 21% “don’t know,” 17.5% “neither agree nor disagree,” and 13.9% “mildly disagree.” For the WHWT, 44% agree, while 22% “don’t know,” 20% “neither agree nor disagree,” and 14% “mildly disagree” that their organization addresses watershed problems without much delay.

Civic Engagement and Other Group Participation

Volunteering is regarded as an indication of civic engagement.¹ Therefore, participating in watershed group activities should be regarded as an act of civic engagement. In addition to their participation with watershed groups, it is clear from survey data that many volunteers are involved in organizations both within and outside of the environmental arena.

Data indicates that the following percentage of volunteers currently belong to: a conservation organization (48%); a church-affiliated group (45%); a civic or political organizations (45%); a community improvement organization (36%); a professional or academic society (33%); an industry/business advocacy group (29%); a hunting or fishing organization (26%); a hobby or garden club (25%); a farm organization (22%); a literary, art, or discussion group (22%); a sports group (20%); a fraternal organization (20%); a labor union (19%); and a veterans’ organization (17%).

This particular area of the survey often received poor response. On average, 11% of respondents didn’t answer these questions. It is unclear how that has impacted the overall response. Each section starts off with a maximum of 89% participation, therefore it is believed that in reality overall participation may be higher.

52% of volunteers indicate that their faith or church is an active part of their life, with 44% attending at least once a month (34% weekly).

Survey data also demonstrates that volunteers are politically active. In the past year: 92% of respondents talked with someone about politics; 90% voted in the 2008 presidential election; 82% voted in a local election in 2006 or 2007; 79% voted in the primary election; 63% contacted a member of Congress or state legislature for any reason; 51% contacted a local government official about a policy issue; 42% attended a political rally, speech or meeting; 40% participated in an interest group; 38% made a contribution to a political party or candidate; and 27% assisted in a political campaign.

Conclusions

Like their respective watersheds, volunteers for each organization surveyed are unique in their characteristics and qualities, in addition to the services they provide to their organizations. To describe a “typical” volunteer for rural watersheds (if one exists), it would likely be an adult,

¹ Points of Light Foundation. 2006. “A Paradigm for Studying Civic Engagement.”

married, be employed full-time, making between \$20,000 and \$39,000 per year, and reside within the watershed. However, it is likely an unfair representation given the incredible variation in age (ranging from 12 to 85), employment status, and residency.

Furthermore, there is no single environmental concern that encompassed all organizations and, as expected, local water concerns often varied by location. Acid mine drainage was the most common local water quality concern among volunteers in general, however it was not in the majority across groups (44% selected).

Becoming involved for “environmental preservation” was motivating for over two thirds of respondents (70%), and interpersonal relationships (i.e. friends and family participating in the group) was an important way of spreading the word about the organization.

Data demonstrates that about half of the volunteers surveyed show up to events and do what is asked of them. This is surprising given this survey population includes volunteers who attend at least half of their group’s meetings and/or have volunteered twice in the past year. Less than a third of volunteers participate in more extended activities like water sampling, organizing events, representing the group at other meetings, and providing education and outreach. However, it appears that two-thirds of volunteers are reading newsletters and staying aware of current watershed issues. Similar to other areas of volunteerism, rate of participation in activities ranges across groups. Additionally, half of volunteers surveyed gave money to their watershed organization within the last year. This figure is slightly less for in-kind donations.

In general, volunteers tend to hold positive beliefs about the impact that their organization makes in the community and the local environment. For the most part, volunteers show strong support for the way their group’s improve local environmental conditions, provide education and outreach to the community, and build community partnerships. Although there are some concerns among volunteers about the availability of resources, primarily financial, required to accomplish group goals. There exists less concern about availability of other volunteers and technical support to accomplish group goals. However, there seems to be a high degree of uncertainty regarding availability of technical support. Again, data retrieved shows that no two volunteer groups are the same, and although responses were generally optimistic there was range in this optimism across different organizations in various arenas.

Survey data shows that watershed group volunteers often participate with a multitude of other community and interest groups. The most common organizations that watershed group volunteers participate with are conservation organizations, church-affiliated groups, and civic or political organizations. It also appears that volunteers surveyed participate more actively in political acts (e.g. voting) than the general U.S. population.

At a regional level, volunteers for watershed organizations in both Appalachian coal country and the Western hardrock mining region are very positive about the environmental and community impacts being made, with a large majority of ACCT and WHWT volunteers agreeing that their watershed groups help to improve the local environment, produce on-the-ground results, and provide environmental education programs to the local community. ACCT and WHWT volunteers also indicate that their organizations encourage cooperation among diverse people/organizations and build communication networks in the local community.

Recommendations

It is clear that volunteers are essential to improving watershed management and their opinions reflect the great ambitions and goals of these organizations. It also reflects the hard reality of being faced with a limited pool of resources and long-term environmental degradation. As noted throughout this report, each organization offers insights into various ways in which volunteers participate in watershed activities and the best approaches towards recruitment and management. The data provided in this report merely describes general survey data. As it pertains to this set of volunteer survey data, additional research directions could be pursued in future research. Potential research questions are outlined below.

First, are watershed group volunteers representative of their communities in terms of income, education, and overall civic engagement? Research will explore and compare volunteers' demographic information to census-data for non-participating community citizens. In a similar vein, a comparison will be conducted between youth (25 and under), adults (25-54), and seniors (55 and over) to better understand their roles and motivations as volunteers.

Second, are the same volunteers participating in the majority of watershed group activities? Or are services and participation evenly divided among volunteers? A thorough follow-up on the degree or existence of egalitarian participation for watershed group activities would enhance the understanding of best practices for rural volunteer recruitment and management. It is important to learn if it is the same people or different people doing all the activities.

Third, in building off the prior question, do volunteers who participate for one or a limited set of activities possess different beliefs, opinions, and general characteristics in comparison to those volunteers engaged in most or all watershed group activities? Anecdotal evidence suggests that a portion of volunteers prefer certain tasks and might only engage in a small set of group activities. A deeper understanding of these volunteers, in comparison to those who participate in everything, might provide a useful insight into further recruitment and/or retention strategies for group projects and activities.

Also, why do some volunteers for organizations (e.g. in WV and northeast PA) that are facing long-term forms of environmental pollution (e.g. AMD) and are implementing projects that take a long time to employ (e.g. AMD treatment systems) possess strong opinions of the effectiveness of their organization? Many environmental remediation projects take time to put in effect, and to better understand the motivations for these volunteers to continue the fight over extended periods of time might aid in the ability to recognize strategies to keep volunteers engaged.

The snapshot taken here is indicative of the entire survey population for this study, providing a deeper insight into volunteerism in the ACCT and WHWT, and perhaps shining additional light into commonalities and differences between mining communities in both regions. Last, in a separate but related strand of research, the ACCT/WHWT research team is developing a further understanding of specific management practices by transplanting and measuring already proven volunteer management strategies to the watershed groups and communities that need them.

Phase 2: Volunteer Management Practices

Trial Volunteer Management Practices

The second phase of this research project was designed to first identify successful volunteer management practices, and then apply these directly for organizations. For this phase, a three-step process was applied:

- a) Identify volunteer management areas of need for participating watershed organizations.
 - Examples include groups who need more volunteers for water monitoring; groups not currently using volunteers to fundraise; and an organization that would like to involve more senior/retired volunteers.
- b) Find practices or strategies being used with success by other organizations within the ACCT/WHWT.
 - Examples include the Upper Guyandotte Watershed Association's (WV) use of volunteers for water monitoring; the McClure River Restoration Project's (VA) "Miles for McClure" fundraiser; and the Schuylkill Headwaters Association's (PA) approach to recruiting RSVP water monitors.
- c) Transplant successful practices to other participating organizations that need them.
 - For example, a group that needs more volunteers for water monitoring would try the Upper Guyandotte Watershed Association's approach to recruiting and managing volunteer water monitors.

This three-step process is outlined in further detail below.

Volunteer management needs were identified by:

- Distributing the Phase 1 "Volunteers for Rural Watersheds" survey to volunteers that identifies certain areas of need for the participating watershed organizations.
- Supplementing this data through direct observation and informal discussion with leaders and volunteers for these watershed organizations.

Based on these two indicators, the Volunteerism Coordinator identified specific areas for improvement for participating watershed organizations.

Successful volunteer management practices were identified by:

- Informal interviews with watershed organization stakeholders during site visits
- Analysis of ACCT and WHWT Quarterly Reports
 - Quarterly reports are a requirement for all OSM/VISTAs that capture their progress and accomplishments through narrative and quantitative reporting components.

These approaches allowed us to find proper volunteer management strategies that demonstrate some measure of effectiveness. Through this process, 25 strategies or "trial practices" were identified.

Volunteer management practices were applied to participating watershed organizations through the following process:

- Coordinating research findings and sharing documented volunteer management practices at the ACCT and WHWT Regional Trainings. The Volunteerism Coordinator organized these findings, synthesizing proven practices in a list of 25 trial practices.
- Providing the list of 25 trial practices to the entire ACCT and WHWT network through regional trainings and direct contact.
- Inviting all partnering organizations to apply to “test” up to three practices within their organization. A formal application procedure was used in this effort. Research was structured for two trials of each of the 25 practices, resulting in 50 case studies. This process lasted from January 2010 until January 2011.
- Requiring groups awarded the opportunity to test a single or set of volunteer practices to work directly with a key contact for that practice, sharing information regarding successful procedures for the application of the practice.
- Conducting an online reporting system developed for representatives from each watershed group to track the effectiveness of their volunteer management trial practice(s). The Volunteerism Coordinator worked to match volunteer management needs with successful volunteer management practices.

Documented Volunteer Management Practices

Watershed groups apply a variety of approaches to engaging volunteers in service to their organizations. Many projects that rely on volunteer efforts face challenges and barriers to success. However, many groups have applied strategies to overcome these limitations. An assortment of these volunteer management practices has been documented in the past year. Twenty-five of these strategies, representing nearly every state in the ACCT and WHWT networks, are listed below.

	Goal	Description	Organization/Contact
1	Recruiting volunteers through a skills/needs spreadsheet and letter writing	Looking for a way to identify and recruit volunteers with specific skills? Headwaters, Inc. needed additional volunteers for their board of directors. Two group leaders and the OSM/VISTA created a spreadsheet that listed the skills they needed and those that were met by their current volunteers. It clearly indicated the types of people they would need to recruit in the future. In addition, they sat down and made a list of 20 to 25 people in the community from across various careers and roles as leaders in the community. They sent each one a personal letter inviting them to attend a meeting to discuss the formation of the non-profit. The meeting resulted in the highly functioning board that they have now and they continue to use the spreadsheet to identify new volunteers. Consider using this approach for any project where you need volunteers with specific skills.	<u>Headwaters, Inc. (KY)</u>

	Goal	Description	Organization/Contact
2	Recruiting volunteers through partnerships with off-road and 4x4 clubs	Do people like to come to your watershed to ride 4-wheelers or go off-roading? Have any of them taken time to volunteer for your organization? MCWA works directly with these folks and they've helped with water sampling in remote areas, lead watershed tours to educate local residents, and cleaned up trash in the creek. These volunteers were critical to the formation of the group. In recent years MCWA hosts "work a day, play a day" weekend events, where members of a 4x4 club come and clean up trash one day then ride the trails the next. These events have been very successful and a lot of fun for the group and the volunteers. Consider tapping into this volunteer base within your own community and watershed.	<u>Morris Creek Watershed Association (WV)</u>
3	Recruiting volunteers through church partnerships	"Be a good steward of the Earth", "help those in need", do any of these slogans sound familiar? Yes, watershed groups and churches and religions share similar values when it comes to volunteer service and commitment to a clean environment. RAIL works with church group volunteers, who visit from outside the area to volunteer for RAIL on a variety of tasks. At the same time, UGWA, a local watershed group in the area, finds spin-off projects for these same volunteer groups to participate in while volunteers are visiting. So look to recruit church groups who may travel to your area to engage in volunteer work, they can be an excellent resource to your group several times throughout the year once you get the partnerships established.	<u>Upper Guyandotte River Watershed/Rural Appalachian Improvement League (WV)</u>
4	Recruiting volunteers through business partnerships	LBCLF worked with a local bank to supply volunteers for a tree-planting project. The bank has an employee volunteer program. At least 12 volunteers, sporting matching t-shirts, participated from one bank that day in two shifts. It's believed that this relationship may also lead to longer-term financial support. To reward the service of these business volunteers, LBCLF sent a picture of the volunteers hard at work to several of the bank's branches within the watershed. Your task: seek out a local business for volunteers on a project, with long-term ambitions! Following LBCLF's approach may lead you to a productive volunteer base through a committed local business.	<u>Little Beaver Creek Land Foundation (OH)</u>

	Goal	Description	Organization/Contact
5	Litter clean-up support from mandatory service volunteers	Do you find a lot of litter or trash dumps in your watershed? Do you have trouble finding volunteers willing to work all day cleaning these dumps up? Consider working with your local "Litter Officer." These folks will set you up with probationers and community service volunteers who are there to pick up trash in your watershed.	<u>Russell County/Town of Lebanon Project (VA)</u>
6	General project support from community service volunteers	There's no limit to the types of activities certain probation programs can assign. The LRCA has made the most of this opportunity. They've worked with the local magistrate and county probation office for over 8 years to recruit community service volunteers for activities ranging from database management and graphic design to electrical work and office landscaping. An upfront screening interview is critical before you start to assign tasks. But you never know a recent DUI offender just might be your next web site designer.	<u>Lackawanna River Corridor Association (PA)</u>
7	Labor support from student athletes volunteers	Contrary to popular belief, student athletes can help clean up your watershed. Tom Biebighauser has partnered with a university's athletic department at Morehead State University to recruit student athlete volunteers. At this school, all athletic teams are required to volunteer and one team in particular helps out 4 times a year with projects. Advice: Saturday's are usually the best day to assign projects, keep them for only a few hours, and provide lunch. To get this going, find projects that student athletes could participate in and contact the school's athletic department and establish a rapport with a coach. Eventually, those coaches might seek you out for projects.	<u>USDA Forest Service in Eastern Kentucky</u> Tom Biebighauser
8	Building community networks and board development through bi-monthly outreach meetings	Looking for a new way to spread your group's mission while also creating a forum to share ideas and issues in your community? FoDC accomplishes this through board meetings! More specifically, FoDC holds a board meeting every month, except each month they alternate between "business" and "outreach" meetings. Business meetings cover the usual nitty gritty issues of managing a watershed group. Outreach meetings although still attended by the board, are more focused on reaching out to a new or different part of the community. Advice: the more groups you can share your mission with the more avenues you have to spread that mission. Also, stick around after meetings to answer all questions from all attendees to get to know people from other groups and host meetings in different places across the watershed.	<u>Friends of Deckers Creek (WV)</u>

	Goal	Description	Organization/Contact
9	Improving board meetings by keeping them to under an hour	Survey says...MCWA volunteers believe that group meetings are held in an efficient and productive manner! They also receive a very high turnout at meetings. Why is this? The MCWA keeps meetings to an hour or less every month, accomplishes tasks, and allows everyone to get involved. Providing food doesn't hurt either! If you're looking to increase the number of folks attending your group meetings then consider taking an idea out of the MCWA playbook.	<u>Morris Creek Watershed Association (WV)</u>
10	Getting volunteers to contribute to the group's newsletter	Does the same person write every article for your newsletter each month? PAN has found a way to bypass this situation by soliciting contributions from board members (required to submit an article each quarter) and volunteers and community members. Their mission incorporates the environment and the economy, so members of the community who may be involved in these areas are encouraged to contribute their thoughts, opinions, projects, etc. to PAN's message. A volunteer organizes their newsletter.	<u>Plateau Action Network (WV)</u>
11	Recruiting youth volunteers through the development of a Youth Advisory Board	FoDC's Youth Advisory Board is "open to all youth 18 and under interested in the future of Decker's Creek and willing to work 30 hours a year volunteering for FoDC and YAB"—YAB By-Laws. Are you looking for a creative way to engage youth, while also incorporating their voice in the management of your organization? Consider YAB! With help from an adult coordinator, these youth volunteers created their own by-laws, mission statement, and more. They've participated in rain barrel workshops, water monitoring, recycling programs, and have a representative that sits on the FoDC's board.	<u>Friends of Deckers Creek (WV)</u>
12	Recruiting youth volunteers through the formation of a youth "helper" organization	The TN/KY Helpers formed out of a need to do a cleanup and interest to involve youth. This project became the vehicle in which youth volunteers were involved in a variety of service projects. The coordinating OSM/VISTA contacted some local youth she knew through the organization and participation grew through a "snowball effect." She was able to create a youth project that worked on litter clean ups, participating in and leading a MLK Day Event, raised its own money, and perhaps most importantly, developed an ownership of the project. Recommendations: have an adult in place to keep the group organized, get to know your youth volunteers' schedules, and be able to provide transportation.	<u>Woodland Community Land Trust (TN)</u>

	Goal	Description	Organization/Contact
13	Youth engagement through the Wild & Scenic Film Festival	PAN received national recognition for engaging youth through its approach to organizing and implementing a Patagonia-sponsored <i>Wild & Scenic Film Festival</i> . For two years a dedicated community volunteer and an OSM/VISTA coordinated an effort to give a youth-voice to the festival and worked to have environmentally—oriented short films played during school hours in front of hundreds of local high school students. Patagonia, critical to the success of the project, seeks to expand the membership base of hosting organizations. PAN took this one step further, building memberships in the community and to focus primarily on youth education and to make it fun for those students involved.	<u>Plateau Action Network (WV)</u>
14	Recruiting college student volunteers through service-learning projects	Service-learning projects can benefit your organization and students tremendously. ASPI finds that college students can serve (trash dump and stream cleanups, trail maintenance, gardening) and learn (about the local ecology and carrying capacity) at the same time. For alternative spring breakers it helps to provide some sort of lodging and showers. For day trip volunteers it helps to have a local college. Either way, start by contacting a college’s student life coordinator because they all should have one.	<u>Appalachia--Science for the Public Interest (KY)</u>
15	Filling group needs by recruiting senior citizen volunteers through the Retired & Senior Volunteer Program	Do you have a particular skill that you’re recruiting for but not having any luck filling it? SHA found a way to meet a variety of needs by linking up with the RSVP program in their county. Perhaps most importantly these volunteers have been critical in supporting their water monitoring efforts and help out various office tasks. Contact your local RSVP program and list the tasks your group needs accomplished.	<u>Schuylkill Headwaters Association (PA)</u>
16	Assisting volunteers by providing transportation to meetings and events	Do some of your youth or senior volunteers have trouble making it to events? Would it help if they had transportation? WCLT provides transportation to volunteers who need it. They advertise this service before events and base their pick-up schedule around those who request transportation. Some of those who benefit most: seniors who serve on committees and youth who want to attend outdoor events. May work best for groups in rural areas and those who may have events that require senior or youth volunteers who need transportation. Also, volunteers who provide transportation can count the mileage as in-kind!	<u>Woodland Community Land Trust (TN)</u>

	Goal	Description	Organization/Contact
17	Developing a volunteer-based water monitoring program through partnerships	Need volunteers to help you get out and pull water samples? In starting a volunteer-based water-monitoring program, UGWA needed folks who were interested in getting out in the streams and with a watershed their size; volunteers were essential to this process. To recruit volunteers, UGWA partnered with several different pre-existing organizations to recruit volunteers. They've worked with their local Trout Unlimited chapter, the "Friends of the Earth" club at their local high school, and visiting church volunteers. Recommendations: partner with those most interested in being in the stream, be very clear about volunteer roles, assign someone to manage volunteers and paperwork (in their case this was an OSM/VISTA), and work very closely with the state agency.	<u>Upper Guyandotte Watershed Association (WV)</u>
18	Developing a volunteer-based water monitoring program through individual development	NFRIA has been managing a self-sustaining, volunteer-based water-monitoring program for over 6 years. This volunteer-run operation is managed by: putting 2 volunteers in charge of organizing other volunteers, 1 in charge of supplies, and 1 part-time staff person who makes supply purchases, gets landowner permission, and contacts a local grocer for donated food. This core group is essential to the process: some people will drop out, but others will come back if you have the structure in place. It needs some form of governmental funding and support to be successful. Learn how to follow the NFRIA model!	<u>North Fork River Improvement Association (CO)</u>
19	Recognizing long-term volunteers by hosting a Volunteer Picnic	NFRIA volunteers have monitored streams in their watershed for over a half a dozen years. It was about time to show them how valuable their service was to their efforts. Host an event for your volunteers, invite current and old ones and their families, and try to schedule around an already occurring event to cut back on travel time. Recommendations: share a report based on recent accomplishments but no big fancy speeches just let the volunteers and their families come and enjoy the festivities. Your volunteers deserve it!	<u>North Fork River Improvement Association (CO)</u>
20	Working with volunteers to construct rain gardens	Thinking about building a rain garden? Looking for a way to connect with volunteers in your area? Scott Fanello has worked with a variety of organizations to construct rain garden projects. When it comes to assessing locations, working with backhoe operators, and most importantly for this project, recruiting and managing volunteers, Scott has useful advice.	<u>National Park Service/Appalachian Coal Country Team</u>

	Goal	Description	Organization/Contact
21	Managing volunteers to construct wetlands	Tom B. has built hundreds of various wetland type systems throughout parts of Appalachia. Many of these projects partnered directly with volunteer groups for construction. Some partners that he's worked with include local conservation group chapters (e.g. Izaak Walton League) and local schools. Tom's advice: you get the greatest involvement from volunteers when they see a direct benefit to themselves and their community and when you tailor the outcomes of a wetland to the volunteers' goals. Thinking about building a wetland this year? Consider Tom's approach!	<u>USDA Forest Service in Eastern Kentucky</u> Tom Biebighauser
22	Community outreach and volunteer recruitment through fundraising— Duck Race	Looking for an entertaining fundraising activity to connect your community to its local stream? Have you tried a "duck race"? If so, did you use a lot of little plastic ducks that ended up lost somewhere downstream? Did attendees seem engaged in the event? LRCA found a way to keep the ducks and get the community interested and involved in the event. By purchasing larger, hunting decoy ducks and putting them with local schools to be painted and designed for race day, they were able to solicit more youth volunteers. Furthermore, these ducks are paraded around the watershed festival before the race. Work with community members (e.g. schools, civic clubs) to construct these racing ducks and see how it leads to more community awareness of your organization (and perhaps more satisfied volunteers).	<u>Lackawanna River Corridor Association (PA)</u>
23	Community outreach and volunteer recruitment through fundraising— 5k-Race	On the run for more group members and potential volunteers? Get a running start by hosting a 5k-race event. GCWA sees this as a wonderful opportunity to increase their membership as the race entrants provide their information (along with money) at registration. Running events are a great way to get people interested in your organization and a great opportunity to spread your message and solicit membership and volunteer opportunities. Not a bad way to boost the number of small donors contributing to your organization either.	<u>George's Creek Watershed Association (MD)</u>
24	Community outreach and volunteer recruitment through fundraising— Miles for McClure	Want to find a way to connect with local businesses, elected officials, and citizens? The MRRP accomplished this, while also raising money for their organization by going person-to-person in their community selling "miles" of the stream and rewarding with personal recognition and certificates. Think "Adopt-a-Highway" but for your local river or stream.	<u>McClure River Restoration Project (VA)</u>

	Goal	Description	Organization/Contact
25	Community outreach and volunteer recruitment through fundraising— Fish Fry	Looking for a way to connect with your local fishermen population, while at the same time showing your current volunteers a good time? For 18 years the CrCWA has partnered with a local civic club to host a “Fish Fry” featuring fish caught from their stream! Local fishermen are critical to this process and it’s a great way to raise money and open up your doors for more community members.	<u>Crooked Creek Watershed Association (PA)</u>

Expansion of Volunteerism Projects

The testing of 25 volunteer management practices by watershed organizations that demonstrated the most need for each practice, were geographically representative of the ACCT and WHWT, and had the capacity to test and monitor each practice, required a significant expansion of the breadth and scope of the watershed organizations participating in the project. Through a formal application process, all ACCT and WHWT-partnering groups were given the opportunity to apply for, and if approved, test up to three practices. The Volunteer Trial Practices Application is attached in **Appendix C**.

Applications were ranked and awarded based on the following criteria: whether the requested practice addresses a significant need that the group has; the group applying is capable of implementing the practice requested; each of the 25 practices are tested by two separate organizations; these projects are inclusive of organizations that haven’t had a chance to participate yet; each of the original 16 organizations who signed up for the project are able to meet their Volunteerism Research Agreement requirements. The Volunteerism Practice Project Evaluation Matrix is attached in **Appendix D**.

Thirty-five different organizations were approved for the testing of one, two, or three practices. Again, there are 25 practices, each to be tested by two watershed organizations. As of February 2010, however, two trial practices were only tested by one group each. There was no additional interest in testing trial practice #2 recruiting volunteers through partnerships with off-road and 4x4 clubs, so only one organization tested that trial practice (Rural Appalachian Improvement League, WV). Saquache County Sustainable Environment & Economic Development (CO) was unable to implement trial practice #6 general project support from community service volunteers, and dropped out of the study. Coal Creek Watershed Coalition (CO) is the only group that tested that practice.

Most participating organizations tested only one practice (21), some tested two (12), and one organization tested three practices. Sixteen full volunteerism project sites were paid \$2000 total for participating in all three phases. Partial volunteerism project sites are organizations that just tested out a volunteer practice. They reported on the implementation of one or multiple trial practices. These organizations received \$700 for their participation in the one-year study. Eighteen organizations participated as partial projects.

The chart below features each of the 25 practices, the two organizations that implemented them and the state where they are located. The trial practices conducted by only one organization are denoted with an asterisk (*). Furthermore, it distinguishes whether it was recorded and funded as

a full or partial volunteerism project.

Practice #	Practice Description	Organization	State	Full/Partial
1	Skills/ needs spreadsheet and letter writing	Friends of the Cheat	WV	Partial
		Shamokin Creek Restoration Alliance	PA	Partial
2*	Partnerships with off-road and 4x4 clubs.	Rural Appalachian Improvement League	WV	Partial
3	Church Partnerships	Lake Fork Valley Conservancy	CO	Full
		Friends of the Russell Fork	VA	Partial
4	Business Partnerships	Piney Creek Watershed Association	WV	Partial
		Brownsville Area Restoration Corporation	PA	Partial
5	Mandatory Service Volunteers	Friends of Deckers Creek	WV	Full
		Friends of Milam Creek	WV	Partial
6*	Community Service Volunteers	Coal Creek Watershed Coalition	CO	Partial
7	Student Athlete Volunteers	George's Creek Watershed Association	MD	Full
		Friends of Deckers Creek	WV	Partial
8	Bi-monthly outreach meetings	Plateau Action Network	WV	Full
		Headwaters, Inc.	KY	Full
9	Keeping board meetings to under an hour.	Savage River Watershed Association	MD	Partial
		Lackawanna Heritage Valley Authority	PA	Partial
10	Getting volunteers to contribute to the group's newsletter	North Fork River Improvement Association	CO	Full
		Crooked Creek Watershed Association	PA	Full
11	Development of a Youth Advisory Board	Piney Creek Watershed Association	WV	Partial
		Kid's Pasta Project	CO	Partial
12	Formation of a Youth Helper Organization	Little Beaver Creek Land Foundation	OH	Full
		Upper Pecos Watershed Association	NM	Full
13	Wild and Scenic Film Festival	Kiskiminetas Watershed Association	PA	Partial

Practice #	Practice Description	Organization	State	Full/Partial
		Friends of the Russell Fork	VA	Full
14	Service learning projects	Upper South Platte Watershed Association	CO	Partial
		Headwaters, Inc.	KY	Partial
15	Retired & Senior Volunteer Program	Mountain Studies Institute	CO	Partial
		Upper Tennessee River Roundtable	VA	Partial
16	Providing transportation to meetings & events	Rural Appalachian Improvement League	WV	Partial
		Friends of Deckers Creek	WV	Partial
17	Water monitoring program through partnerships	Morris Creek Watershed Association	WV	Full
		Little Beaver Creek Land Foundation	OH	Partial
18	Water monitoring program through individual development	Friends of the Lower Muskingum River	OH	Partial
		Lackawanna River Corridor Association	PA	Full
19	Hosting a volunteer picnic	Woodlands Community Land Trust	TN	Full
		Roaring Run Watershed Association	PA	Partial
20	Volunteers to construct a rain garden	Woodlands Community Land Trust	TN	Partial
		Friends of the Cheat	WV	Partial
21	Volunteers to construct wetlands	Clear Fork Watershed Council	KY	Partial
		McClure River Restoration Watershed	VA	Full
22	Duck Race	Redbank Watershed Association	PA	Partial
		Crooked Creek Watershed Association	PA	Partial
23	5k Race	Schuylkill Headwaters Association	PA	Full
		Friends of the Lower Muskingum River	OH	Partial
24	Miles for McClure	Upper Guyandotte Watershed Association	WV	Full
		Upper Pecos Watershed Association	NM	Partial
25	Fish Fry	Lackawanna River Corridor Association	PA	Partial

Practice #	Practice Description	Organization	State	Full/Partial
		Coal Creek Watershed Coalition	CO	Partial

Again, 34 different organizations are represented in this study. Twenty-one organizations are testing one practice, 12 are testing two, and one organization is testing three practices. As represented by state, there are 9 groups from PA, 8 groups from WV, 6-CO, 3-VA, 2-OH, 2-MD, 2-KY, 1-TN, and 1-NM.

Trial Practice Reporting

Reporting templates were created and distributed through the online survey database SurveyMonkey (www.surveymonkey.com) at the beginning, 6-month, and end points of the one-year trial practice study period.

Watershed organizations submitted initial reports for trial practices in January 2010 to document the progress of their initial planning and implementation efforts. This report template can be found in **Appendix B**. Additionally, they worked with the Volunteerism Coordinator to select indicators to measure the impact of their practice over the coming year. These indicators were tailored to each trial practice and the site's goals and intentions, and ranged from the number of new volunteers recruited for an event to the average duration of board meetings.

Midterm reports were collected in June 2010 to assess progress in implementing trial practices after six months of effort on the part of participating watershed organizations. These report templates can be found in **Appendices E and F**. Groups were in a flux of every stage of implementation from planning to final result. Some were recruiting volunteers for planning committees, picking dates and venues, waiting on grant funds to buy needed equipment. Others were making final event arrangements, changing plans due to new obstacles, or continuing discussion on board development, meeting efficiency, and community outreach. After a winter of planning, many held events relevant to their trial practice, working with student athletes, local businesses, community service volunteers, and the Retired and Senior Volunteer Program to complete a variety of projects.

Final reports were collected in January 2011 to assess trial practices after twelve months of effort by participating watershed organizations. These reports are a detailed reflection upon the implementation of the practice, its applicability to their group, and an evaluation of the effectiveness of the practice through the measurement of particular indicators associated with each practice. Report templates can be found in **Appendices G and H**.

Phase 3: Volunteer Management Final Reports

The end of the one-year trial practice period marked the beginning of the third project phase and the transformation of research into useable rural volunteer management resources. Forty-eight case studies emerged, brimming with successes, challenges, and ideas for other rural groups to utilize. While each volunteer practice has its own specific characteristics and obstacles, several overarching trends emerged. The need for a lead person or committee to drive planning was a key factor in the success or failure of many trial practices and, in small rural communities, specificity was crucial. Broad appeals for help with tasks and events often went unheeded.

Practices that employed targeted recruitment of individuals and groups with skills for specific tasks had the best results. For tasks requiring large groups or crews of volunteers, rural organizations often succeeded by bringing in outside groups, such as alternative spring break crews and faith-based mission teams. These lessons and many more are presented as a suite of volunteer management options in the 48 case studies compiled from Phase 2 research.

The need for these resources has been felt by the positive response of those attending presentations of the project overview and case study examples at local, state, regional, and national conferences. Attendees are eager for final products as a good source of ideas and a guide of where to start and what to expect. Case studies have been compiled for each of the 48 trial practices that were implemented between January 2010 and January 2011. **Appendix I** contains complete case studies for the 25 trial practices. The following are just a sample of the successes and challenges documented by rural community/watershed improvement organizations in Appalachian coal country and the Western hardrock mining region:

Trial Practice #2: Recruiting volunteers through partnerships with off-road and 4x4 clubs

The Rural Appalachian Improvement League (RAIL) had everything planned for an ATV Poker Run/Trail Clean-up event: Volunteers would pick up litter on sections of the Indian Ridge trail, a part of the Hatfield-McCoy trail system near Mullens, WV. It would take place on March 13, 2010, and, upon completion, volunteers would receive the first of five playing cards. The following day, volunteers would have a chance to ride other trails, stopping at four other locations and acquiring four new playing cards. The rider with the best hand would win a prize at an end-of-day BBQ. This combination event is a wonderful idea, but unfortunately various factors did not align as planned. The biggest problems were finding ATV riders that were willing to spend their valuable recreation time and money doing a litter clean-up and conducting the major outreach effort necessary with a small, overworked staff. The general interest and willingness to help by local businesses, campgrounds, and the trail system were just too low to get the event off the ground.

Even though the event fell through, RAIL was able to follow a different route. RAIL has the capacity and facilities to host alternative spring break groups and have successfully hosted hundreds of students. In March 2010, 15 visiting students from Columbia University in New York used ATVs for a Hatfield-McCoy Trail clean-up. Participants, who had never ridden ATVs before, were able to clean 10 miles of trails with donated hedge trimmers, machetes, and ATVs. By cleaning the trail and keeping the area open to riders, they helped to bring tourists and revenue to the restaurants, campgrounds, and other businesses of a rural area “Community members were happy to see ‘outsiders’ getting a taste of what is, for many southern West Virginians, a very important part of their culture,” said Jack Seitz, a RAIL employee at the time of the clean-up.

Because of her work coordinating alternative spring break volunteers to clean up the Hatfield-McCoy trail system, former OSM/VISTA Katie Prussia was asked to present at the National Off-Highway Vehicle Conference in Great Falls, MT, in August 2010. She presented on her OSM/VISTA experience, her involvement with the Hatfield-McCoy Trail System, and how other systems can use VISTAs or volunteers. The presentation was well received and Prussia fielded a lot of questions from people seeking more information about the ACCT and other AmeriCorps VISTA programs.

Trial Practice #3: Recruiting volunteers through church partnerships

Friends of the Russell Fork (FORF) has difficulty recruiting the large numbers of volunteers needed to complete big projects from the small local population of 302 people² in Haysi, VA, so they have begun looking beyond town limits. Volunteers at FORF are meeting with an Asheville, North Carolina-based organization called ReCreation Experiences, a program whose mission is to share their faith through home repair. Many homes in the Russell Fork watershed are in need of repair or lack proper wastewater treatment systems. Volunteers with ReCreation Experiences currently do home repair mostly in western North Carolina, but are interested in expanding their scope. “They just happened to be looking for another area that they could work in when I contacted them about work in Haysi and Dickenson County,” said former OSM/VISTA Amber Bellamy, who laid much of the groundwork for this partnership.

ReCreation Experiences staff has visited Haysi twice and are planning another site visit to solidify plans. ReCreation Experiences would bring in a home repair crew of about 100-120 people for two weeks at two different times during the summer. The main requirement for the host area is finding a place for the volunteers to stay with access to a kitchen. Other than housing, there is no cost to host a volunteer crew---volunteers pay a fee to participate that covers the cost of supplies. This is a huge advantage for rural organizations with limited resources. FORF is now tasked with identifying homes in need of repair, working with homeowners, and locating housing for visiting volunteers. To help with this effort, FORF has applied to get help from an NCCC team in the spring of 2011 to conduct sewer surveys and identify families who need help in the region. Local citizens and town officials have been notified of plans to have ReCreation Experiences establish a work plan in the area and FORF has received all positive responses. By putting in the time and effort to lay the groundwork for a visiting faith-based group, FORF is building a partnership with the potential to truly benefit residents of their watershed. Installation of septic systems will also improve water quality in the Russell Fork, which is popular for recreation.

Trial Practice #7: Labor support from student athlete volunteers

Many communities have a college or university within their boundaries, and student volunteering with a local watershed group is a great way to connect the campus to the community while addressing environmental issues. George’s Creek Watershed Association (GCWA) in Frostburg, MD, was able to recruit the Frostburg State University (FSU) football team to help an AmeriCorps National Civilian Community Corps (NCCC) crew plant trees on reclaimed mine lands in partnership with the Appalachian Regional Reforestation Initiative (ARRI).

The main challenge GCWA faced was locating the right people at FSU to ask for help. Former OSM/VISTA Adrian Uzunian persevered in this challenge and was able to establish a contact with a member of FSU’s Office of Leadership and Civic Engagement, who helped compile a list of coaches and compose an e-mail to draw interest. By the end of February 2010, the head football coach expressed interest in having his athletes volunteer with GCWA. Twenty-five football players assisted the NCCC in planting 4,000 trees in 4 hours in western MD, which was part of a larger 10-day project where a total of 8,000 trees were planted on 11 acres by 135 volunteers recruited by GCWA.

GCWA highly recommends recruiting athletes as volunteers because of their high levels of

² U.S. Census Bureau, 2009 Population Estimates.

discipline, motivation, energy, and strength, desire to do well, and room in their minds to learn about environmental issues. “The team was very respectful and disciplined and worked very hard to plant every seedling that there was room to plant. It was a great exercise for everyone. The event made the athletes appreciate how difficult it is to replace a forest,” commented Kelly Martin, Regional Watershed Coordinator for Western MD Resource Conservation and Development Council. GCWA hopes to recruit volunteers from the FSU athletic department for future sustainability projects.

Trial Practice #11: Recruiting youth volunteers through the development of a Youth Advisory Board

Based in Hotchkiss, CO, the Kids' Pasta Project (KPP) engages youth in serving their community by having them prepare and serve freshly-made pasta dinners and donating profits to local causes. The adult board and volunteers, however, would like to see the kids participate not only in the kitchen and dining room, but also in the board room. As a program dedicated to helping youth serve their community and learn through the process, the idea of empowering youth volunteers is at the top of their list of intentions, and developing a youth advisory board (YAB) was a way to formalize this intention. “Kids' Pasta Project and youth development organizations in general need to explore ways of involving youth more in management, not only to enhance the educational experiences of the youth, but also to help ensure the sustainability of the organization,” said former OSM/VISTA Moni Slater, who continues to serve as KPP’s program manager.

The formation of a Youth Advisory Board (YAB) has engaged kids in the inner workings of the organization. Since its creation, the YAB has elected their board, attended meetings of the adult board, discussed expanding the weekly menu and experimented with making lasagna and gluten-free pasta. Some of the members of KPP YAB have become more involved in behind-the-scenes operations and have had opportunities to express their opinions about management issues. They have also been involved in some outreach activities and gave a presentation to the local Rotary Club.

Working with a YAB has had several challenges. The large size of the YAB, 11 members, has proved to be prohibiting, particularly with scheduling. Youth are engaged in a lot of other activities, making scheduling management meetings when youth were available difficult. The regular management activities of the group have had to go on without regular input from youth. It has also been difficult to maintain the adult board’s engagement YAB development and board members were not available to mentor the YAB officers as planned.

The community response to the KPP YAB is very positive, although many members of the community do not have clear ideas about YAB responsibilities and activities. It is important in the future for KPP to share the intentions of the YAB and the importance of youth input to the organization. Though still working out the exact functions of the YAB, future possibilities include working with a local chef on expanding the menu, organizing a volunteer appreciation picnic, and beginning to take over some of the responsibilities of working with partner-recipient organizations.

Trial Practice #15: Recruiting senior citizen volunteers through the Retired and Senior Volunteer Program (RSVP)

The Upper Tennessee River Roundtable (UTRR), based in Abingdon, VA, hoped to recruit more

volunteers from the Retired and Senior Volunteer Program (RSVP). With one existing RSVP volunteer, UTRR wanted to expand their pool of volunteers to assist with large mailings, creation of education kits, manning festival booths and other office tasks. This assistance would help reduce the coordinator's overtime, and the community would benefit by having additional citizens involved in the work of UTRR and sharing the importance of protecting rivers and streams. This trial practice proved to be a disappointment for UTRR, however. Though expanding the involvement of the existing RSVP volunteer, no new volunteers were recruited despite several outreach efforts.

Former OSM/VISTA Spencer Moss attended an RSVP luncheon and spoke about UTRR and opportunities for involvement. She also distributed custom-made invitations to a UTRR recruitment/orientation dinner to each person at the luncheon, but the dinner was cancelled due to the lack of responses. The existing RSVP volunteer initiated a festival outreach booth that otherwise would not have happened without her. She thought of the idea, found a location, secured approval to place the booth at a site on Main Street, picked up outreach materials twice from the UTRR office during the two-week festival and manned the booth. Despite not recruiting more volunteers, she was able to conduct a lot of positive outreach work during the two-week festival. This helped to raise awareness about the organization and the need to protect rivers in the area. "We found it very challenging and very frustrating continually trying to engage the RSVP volunteers, who were already committed to other volunteer projects and did not have time to work with us, too," said UTRR coordinator Carol Doss, "People in the RSVP program here are already committed to definite programs."

Trial Practice #16: Assisting volunteers by providing transportation to meetings and events

The staff and volunteers of Friends of Deckers Creek (FODC) in Dellslow, WV, often need to work in rural and remote locations within the watershed to carry out tasks important to the organization's mission. FODC also has a need for their Youth Advisory Board (YAB) members to attend board meetings and community activities on a regular basis and in greater numbers in order to empower the next generation of watershed stewards. Over the past year, FODC successfully met these needs by organizing carpools or providing transportation to volunteers. Volunteers that needed transportation were informed about the program via word of mouth or phone, website postings of volunteer opportunities and transportation details on an event calendar, electronic listserv, and seasonal newsletters.

Carpooling and FODC-provided transportation were used extensively in sampling, monitoring, and site assessment trips. Volunteers are always needed for this type of work, and by providing transportation FODC was able to bring volunteers, including YAB volunteers, on almost every trip. Overall, carpooling or FODC-provided transportation was used at least 54 times and accounted for at least 310 volunteer hours committed to FODC-related activities. Of the 310 hours, at least 50 were from new volunteers who had never volunteered with FODC before and another 65 were from YAB members who otherwise would not have been able to participate. The trial practice increased and diversified the FODC volunteer base at events such as yearly fish community sampling, macroinvertebrate sampling, quarterly and monthly water quality monitoring, habitat assessments, and stream walks. The volunteer base for all of these activities was made up of YAB members, community members, college students, interns, probationer volunteers, and senior citizens. Having reliable and regular volunteers is crucial to FODC's continuous monitoring and data gathering efforts throughout the watershed for acid mine drainage pollution, fecal coliform contamination, sediment impairments, and biological

community assessments.

Mileage and fuel costs are large factor to consider when providing transportation and, despite successes, will play a role in the future use of this practice by FODC. FODC hopes to continue to provide transportation to YAB members for meetings, field work, and events because they are an important part of the organization and mission, and this trial practice demonstrated how beneficial it is to have all of them present at all FODC and YAB meetings and events. FODC will also continue to provide transportation to volunteers for monitoring and sampling as long as funding for mileage is available.

These case studies are just a sample of the progress, successes, and challenges in the 48 trial practices conducted throughout Appalachia and the Rocky Mountain West. Initial, six-month, and final reports are compiled into case studies for each trial practice in **Appendix I**.

Outreach and Education

The OSM/VISTA Teams recognize that providing immediate data feedback to its watershed groups is essential to place-based research, but it is also necessary to share this data and information with outside individuals and institutions. Once survey data was gathered and analyzed from a site, the Volunteerism Coordinator created a PowerPoint presentation to deliver to each watershed organization's board of directors and other volunteers. Data from this project has also been shared with the Corporation for National and Community Service, the Hands-On Network, and the National Council on Aging.

The EPA-funded "Hope & Hard Work: Building Capacity in Appalachian Coal Country Watershed Groups" did not host Regional Trainings since fall 2009. To overcome these setbacks, the OSM/VISTA Teams developed their own regional trainings with sessions based on the "Volunteers for Rural Watersheds" Research Project. These volunteerism tracks addressed the outreach and education guidelines initially set forth in the EPA Cooperative Agreement.

Furthermore, data and strategies for improving volunteerism in rural watersheds have been shared to an estimated 900 people at the following conferences:

- EPA-funded Hope & Hard Work Fall 2008 Training: Building Capacity in Appalachian Coal Country Watershed Groups (over 150 people trained)
- CNCS-funded OSM/VISTA Retreat (over 40 people trained)
- Faces of Leadership Strengthening Community conference sponsored by Volunteer West Virginia (over 40 people trained)
- ACCT and WHWT Fall 2009 Trainings (over 150 people trained combined)
- WHWT Spring 2010 Training (over 40 people trained)
- Water Management of Ohio Annual Conference 2009 (over 100 people attended)
- National Water Quality Monitoring Conference in Denver, CO (poster session)
- 32nd Annual National Association of Abandoned Mine Lands Programs (10 people trained)
- West Virginia Water Conference (over 25 people trained)
- Midwest Ground Water Conference in Columbus, OH (poster session)
- ACCT and WHWT Fall 2010 Trainings (over 100 people trained combined)
- Tennessee Conference on Volunteerism and Service-Learning (30 people trained)
- Appalachian Studies Association Conference (15 people trained)

ACCT Spring Training (45 people trained)
Southern West Virginia Watershed Associations Meeting (12 people trained)
National Conference on Volunteering and Service (60 people trained)
2011 PA Abandoned Mine Reclamation Conference (40 people trained)
Chesapeake Watershed Forum (poster session)
Mobilizing Rural Communities Conference (30 people trained)
ACCT and WHWT Fall 2011 Trainings (over 100 people trained)

The OSM/VISTA Teams will continue to submit proposals to present at local, state, and regional trainings and conferences in order to share the final product of this research, *Toolkit for Working with Rural Volunteers*.

Toolkit for Working with Rural Volunteers

Under-resourced and under-staffed organizations often pour all of their time and effort into an event or task and are able to achieve some goal: raise money, get mentioned in the newspaper, recruit volunteers to help out. Key tasks, especially with volunteer management, often slip through the cracks: gathering contact information for those involved, entering that information into a database, welcoming new individuals to the organization, getting them involved as dues-paying members, giving them upcoming events and tasks so they continue to be involved: the list goes on.

After engaging in place-based research at 34 rural sites, the OSM/VISTA Teams created a workbook to share approaches to volunteer recruitment, management, and retention that are successful in rural settings. This information could have been bound into this extensive research report, but rural volunteer managers generally lack three things: time, people, and money. An impenetrable block of “research findings” would simply gather dust on a shelf. With this workbook, this research is put into a useable format that establishes a complete framework necessary for sustainable volunteer management. Readers will not only learn new ways to work with volunteers, but be guided through the larger process of really bringing those volunteers into an organization and keeping them there—with the least amount of time, people, and money.

The production and distribution of a volunteer management workbook enables rural volunteer managers to explore new methods of volunteer recruitment, management, and retention through the case study accounts of trial practice transplant tests. Case studies are supplemented by regional and local survey findings. Useful worksheets, checklists, evaluations, planning documents, and other materials provide a comprehensive rural volunteer management resource and toolkit. To maximize distribution in rural communities that have limited or no Internet access, the workbook is distributed as a hardcopy booklet and CD in addition to an interactive online version hosted at <www.ruralvolunteer.org>.

The workbook also serves as the basis of rural volunteer management training workshops conducted by members of the OSM/VISTA Teams Support Offices. To date, this research has been presented at numerous local, state, regional, and national conferences. The need for these resources was felt by the positive and eager response of those attending these presentations. Attendees were eager for training on new ideas, where to start and what to expect. Access to this information enables organizations to learn from each other ways to clean up polluted freshwater ecosystems and initiate community revitalization projects. Volunteers are better equipped to

both lead and join efforts that expand economic opportunity in their own communities to increase tourism, property values, and attract new businesses.

By informing and training rural volunteer managers, the OSM/VISTA Teams are mobilizing volunteers to promote environmental stewardship and economic development in rural, under-resourced, environmentally degraded communities.

List of Appendices

Appendix A: Volunteer Surveys	34
Appendix B: Trial Practice Initial Report.....	50
Appendix C: ACCWT/WHWT Volunteerism Trial Practices Application Form.....	55
Appendix D: Volunteerism Practice Project Evaluation Matrix.....	58
Appendix E: 6-Month Trial Practice Report (Partial Projects).....	59
Appendix F: 6-Month Trial Practice Report (Full Projects).....	62
Appendix G: Final Trial Practice Report (Partial Projects).....	66
Appendix H: Final Trial Practice Report (Full Projects).....	68
Appendix I: Case Studies.....	70

Schuylkill Headwaters Association Volunteer Survey



The **Schuylkill Headwaters Association** is conducting this survey in partnership with the Appalachian Coal Country Watershed Team. The purpose of this survey is to identify some of the needs of volunteers for the Schuylkill Headwaters Association (SHA). The SHA promotes the environmental integrity of the Schuylkill River, and its tributaries, and the watershed that lies within the boundaries of Schuylkill County.

The survey should take 30 minutes or less to complete. Your *participation is completely voluntary* and if you choose to respond, you do not need to answer all of the questions. Your *answers will be kept confidential*. No individual names or distinguishing characteristics will be released.

Thank you very much for your participation. Your responses will help us increase our organization's capabilities and provide better opportunities for you to get involved!

Directions

Please answer the questions to the best of your ability. Most questions involve a simple check to answer the question. Please check just one answer unless the question says to check more than one. For questions that ask you to answer in your own words, please use the space provided below the question. Read the questions carefully and take your time. We thank you again very much for your feedback!

Section A: Your Volunteer Experience

1. Which best describes your *primary* interest in this watershed group? (Please check just one response)

- Environmental preservation (stream cleanup, water quality, etc.)
- Recreation (bird watching, hunting, boating, fishing, etc.)
- Economic development
- Opportunity to give back to community
- Opportunity to work with/make friends
- Volunteer service credit
- Other (please specify) _____

2. Which of the following three local water issues are you most concerned about? (Please check a maximum of 3)

- Acid mine drainage
- Mine waste (e.g. leeching tailings, gob piles, etc.)
- Agricultural pollution
- Pollution from wastewater (please specify) _____
- Illegal trash dumps
- Other toxic materials (please specify) _____
- Land use change (please specify) _____
- Deforestation/loss of habitat
- Mine openings (e.g. open adits)
- Drinking water quality
- Flooding
- Other (please specify) _____

3. Please describe how you and/or your family are directly affected by the local water issues you checked above (if you need more space, please use the last page of this survey):

4. Do you, or did you, consider your participation in this watershed group to be as an individual or representing a particular organization? (If you are representing an organization, please fill in the blank)

- Individual
- Representing an organization (please specify) _____

5. How did you first find out about this watershed group? *(Please check the one most appropriate response)*

- From my employer
- Through a newspaper article
- Through a watershed event
- Through my school
- Through my church
- Through a friend involved with the watershed group
- Through a family member involved with the watershed group
- Other *(please specify)* _____

6. When was the first event that you attended for this watershed group? *(Please specify the month and year. Enter the best approximation if unsure.)*

_____ month in _____ year

7. Before you attended this first watershed group event, were any of the group's members also members of your family? *(If Yes, please fill in the blank)*

- Yes→How many? _____
- No

8. Before you attended this first watershed group event did you consider any of the group's members to be your friends? *(If Yes, please fill in the blank)*

- Yes→How many? _____
- No

9. What was your main reason for beginning to participate in this watershed group? *(Please describe below)*

10. Which of the following leadership positions have you held in this watershed group? *(Please check all that apply)*

- None. *Please skip to question 12 if you have not held a leadership position.*
- Served on board (President, Secretary, Treasurer, voting member etc.)
- Committee chair
- Group coordinator/facilitator
- Other *Please describe:* _____

11. For how many years in total have you held a leadership position?

_____ Years

12. In addition to formal leadership positions, we recognize that there are many jobs without titles. Which statements best describe the way you have participated in this

watershed group in the past year? *(Please check all that apply)*

- I read the newsletter and am aware of current watershed issues
- I show up at events and do what is asked of me.
- I conduct water quality sampling and/or develop watershed assessments.
- I provide education and outreach for the watershed group.
- I have organized one or more events from start to finish.
- I represent the watershed group when meeting with other groups
- I participate in decisions about future directions of the watershed group
- Other. *Please describe:* _____

13. During the past year, about how many hours per month (on average) have you spent on each of the following activities for this watershed group? If you did not participate in an activity, please write 0. (Fill in the blank for each row)

<u>Hours per month</u>	<u>Activity</u>
_____	Attending general group meetings (monthly meetings, etc.)
_____	Writing or updating a watershed management plan
_____	Planning a restoration project (river cleanups, tree plantings, etc.)
_____	Participating in a restoration project (river cleanups, tree plantings, etc.)
_____	Fundraising
_____	Helping with member recruitment/membership drives
_____	Monitoring or doing environmental assessments (stream monitoring, etc.)
_____	Planning education or outreach events (workshops, outdoor activities, festivals, etc.)
_____	Attending education or outreach events (workshops, outdoor activities, festivals, etc.)
_____	Publishing of newsletters and/or brochures
_____	Providing information or opinion pieces to the media
_____	Helping with office work (paying bills, stuffing envelopes, etc.)
_____	Other (please describe) _____

14. During the *past year*, have you given any money to this watershed group, including membership dues?

- Yes
- No

15. During the *past year*, have you contributed in-kind donations (materials, land, or food) to the watershed group?

- Yes
- No

16. At present, do you consider any of the group's members to be your friends? (If Yes, please fill in the blank)

- Yes→How many? _____
- No

17. Have you ever attended an Appalachian Coal Country Watershed Team or Eastern Coal Regional Roundtable Training event?

- Yes
- No

18. What days of the week, at what times of day and which seasons do you prefer to volunteer? (Please place a check on the line at what time on each day you prefer)

Day	Time					Season			
	Morning	Noon	Afternoon	Evening	Night	Winter	Spring	Summer	Fall
Monday	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tues.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Wed.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Thurs.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fri.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sat.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sun.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

19. Please describe a specific experience that has encouraged your participation in this watershed group.

20. Please describe a specific experience that has discouraged your participation in this watershed group.

21. What three emotions do you associate with the creek or river closest to your home?

_____, _____, & _____.

22. What additional activities would you participate in if this watershed group offered them? (Please list)

Section B: Your Watershed Interests

1. People have different perceptions about how watershed groups affect the local community. How much do you agree or disagree with each statement? (Circle one number for each row)

Level of Agreement

	Strongly Disagree	Mildly Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Mildly Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
This watershed group helps improve local environmental conditions	1	2	3	4	5	DK
This watershed group brings financial benefits to the local community	1	2	3	4	5	DK
This watershed group builds communication networks in the local community	1	2	3	4	5	DK
This watershed group encourages cooperation among diverse people/organizations	1	2	3	4	5	DK
This watershed group provides environmental education programs to the local community	1	2	3	4	5	DK

2. The following statements address your perception of the flow of communication within this watershed group. How much do you agree or disagree with each statement? (Circle one number for each row)

Level of Agreement

	Strongly Disagree	Mildly Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Mildly Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
Open communication exists among group participants	1	2	3	4	5	DK
The watershed group informs participants of issues and activities in a timely manner	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Group meetings are conducted in an efficient and productive manner	1	2	3	4	5	DK
Group participants' roles and responsibilities are made clear	1	2	3	4	5	DK

3. People have different perceptions about whether watershed groups are capable of accomplishing their goals. How much do you agree or disagree with each statement about this watershed group? (Circle one number for each row)

Level of Agreement

	Strongly Disagree	Mildly Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Mildly Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
The number of volunteers this group has is adequate for accomplishing its goals	1	2	3	4	5	DK
This group does not have enough financial support to accomplish its goals	1	2	3	4	5	DK
The leadership of this group is adequate to accomplish its goals	1	2	3	4	5	DK
This group does not have enough technical support to accomplish its goals	1	2	3	4	5	DK
This group is able to address watershed problems without much delay	1	2	3	4	5	DK
This group is capable of producing on-the-ground results	1	2	3	4	5	DK

4. The following statements concern the extent to which group members share similar opinions. How much do you agree or disagree with each statement about this watershed group? (Circle one number for each row)

Level of Agreement

	Strongly Disagree	Mildly Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Mildly Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
Group participants rarely agree on how group funding should be spent	1	2	3	4	5	DK
A majority of group participants share similar attitudes about what activities the group should take on	1	2	3	4	5	DK

5. The following statements are about attitudes, knowledge, and skills. How much do/did you agree or disagree with each of the following statements both currently and before you began participating with this watershed group? (In each of the two blocks, circle one number for each row)

My views **before** participating with this group My views **after** participating with this group

	Strongly Disagree	Mildly Disagree	Neutral	Mildly Agree	Strongly Agree	Strongly Disagree	Mildly Disagree	Neutral	Mildly Agree	Strongly Agree
Most of the time, government officials can be trusted to make sound decisions about the environment	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Most of the time, citizens in my community can be trusted to make sound decisions about the environment	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
I have a high level of knowledge about local watershed issues	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
I have difficulty communicating my ideas to others	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

6. People have many different experiences participating in watershed groups.
How much do you agree or disagree with each statement? (Circle one number for each row)

Level of Agreement

	Strongly Disagree	Mildly Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Mildly Agree	Strongly Agree
I make meaningful contributions to this group	1	2	3	4	5
My participation allows me to take action that is consistent with my environmental ethics	1	2	3	4	5
I do not have much of an impact on the group's final decisions	1	2	3	4	5
My participation does not provide me with many positive social interactions	1	2	3	4	5
My participation often gives me opportunities to learn new things	1	2	3	4	5
My participation allows me to take action that is consistent with my religious beliefs	1	2	3	4	5
By participating, I have opportunities to protect my personal interests	1	2	3	4	5
Others in the group do not appreciate my contributions	1	2	3	4	5
Participating with this group helps me to fulfill my sense of civic duty	1	2	3	4	5
I value the goals this group seeks to achieve	1	2	3	4	5
By participating, I have the opportunity to express my professional interests	1	2	3	4	5

Section C: About You

Finally, we need to ask you a few questions about your background. This information, as with all information in this survey, will be used for group reports only -- no individual reports will be made and all information will be kept strictly confidential. Again, thanks for your participation.

1. What is your age?

_____ years

2. What is your gender?

Male

Female

3. What is your marital status?

I am married

I am not married, but living with a significant other

I am single

I am a widow / widower

4. Where does the water in your home come from?

Private well on my property

Public water supply system ("city water" or "public service district")

Other. *Please specify:* _____

5. What is your primary source of drinking water at home?

Bottled water

Well water

Water from a piped system (city water)

Spring

Other. *Please specify:* _____

6. Do you have any children? (Please include step and adopted children)

No (please skip to question #8)

Yes → How many? _____

How many are currently living at home with you? _____

How many are under the age of 5? _____

Do any of your children volunteer for this group?

Yes → In what ways _____

No

7. Do you have any grandchildren?

Yes

No (if no, please skip the next question)

Do any of your grandchildren volunteer for this watershed group?

Yes → In what ways _____

No

8. Is your family from the area served by the watershed group?

Yes

No

Don't know

9. Do you reside in the area served by this watershed group?

Yes

- No. How far away do you live? _____
 Don't know

10. What do you consider to be your local community? (Please **check only one** response that best describes your local community)

- Town. Please specify name: _____
 County. Please specify name: _____
 Watershed. Please specify name: _____
 Region. Please specify: _____
 Other. Please specify: _____

11. Why do you live in your community? (Please rate the following reasons by level of importance.)

Level of Importance

	Not at all Important	A Little Important	Moderately Important	Very Important
My family and/or my spouse's family is from here	1	2	3	4
My job and/or or my spouse's job is near here	1	2	3	4
My friends live nearby	1	2	3	4
My family lives nearby	1	2	3	4
The pace of life	1	2	3	4
Access to the outdoors (hunting, fishing, boating, gardening, hiking)	1	2	3	4
The cost of living	1	2	3	4
Other reason. Please specify: _____	1	2	3	4

12. For how long have you lived in your community? (Please fill in the blank)

_____ years

13. Do you own or rent your current residence?

- Own
 Rent
 Other. Please describe: _____

14. Do you own or rent a home in another location?

- Yes. I own another home. Please specify where: _____
 Yes, I rent another home. Please specify where: _____
 No

15. When you were growing up did your parents/guardians regularly volunteer?

- Yes, in the area served by the watershed group → In what ways _____
 Yes, in another location → In what ways _____
 No

16. Some people belong to many national and/or local organizations, while others belong to few or none. For each type of organization listed below, please write the number of organizations to which you currently belong and belonged before you began participating in this watershed group. If you do not or did not belong to any in a category, please write 0.

Number of organizations you belong(ed) to:

Organization	Before participating with this watershed group	Currently
Civic or Political organization <i>ex: Kiwanis, local government, NRA, PTA, etc.</i>		
Church-affiliated group <i>ex: local Church, Bible study, Knights of Columbus, etc.</i>		
Conservation organization <i>ex: Nature Conservancy, Sierra Club, etc.</i>		
Hunting or fishing organization <i>ex: Trout Unlimited, National Wild Turkey Foundation</i>		
Farm organization <i>ex: Farm Bureau, etc.</i>		
Fraternal organization <i>ex: Eagles, Free Masons, Odd Fellows, etc.</i>		
Hobby or garden club		
Industry/Business advocacy groups <i>ex: Chamber of Commerce, Friends of Coal</i>		
Community improvement organization <i>ex: community revitalization group, Rails to Trails, etc.</i>		
Labor union		
Literary, art, or discussion group		
Professional or Academic society <i>ex: American Nursing Association, etc.</i>		
Sports group <i>ex: local team, American Bowling Congress, etc.</i>		
Veterans' organization <i>ex: American Legion, AMVETS, VFW, etc.</i>		
Other <i>Please specify _____</i>		

17. Please list the 1 to 3 groups to which you dedicated the most time this past year:

18. With which group or organization do you most identify? Please specify name:

19. Is your faith or church an active part of your life?

- Yes→What faith or church? _____
 No

20. How often do you attend a place of worship?

- Don't attend
 Attend about 1-2 times a year
 Attend about 1-2 times a month
 Attend weekly
 Attend more than once a week

21. What is the highest level of your formal education?

- Some high school
 High school diploma or GED
 Some college or Associate's degree
 Bachelor's degree
 Graduate degree

22. What is your current employment status?

- Employed or self-employed on a full-time basis
 Employed or self-employed on a part-time basis
 Retired. *Please specify year retired:* _____
 Full-time homemaker
 Student. *Please specify expected graduation date* _____
 Disabled *Please specify length of disability* _____
 Unemployed

23. What employment sector best describes the kind of work you do? (Please choose only one.)

- Retail trade
 Education
 Health care and social assistance
 Construction
 Mining and mining-related services
 Accommodation and food services
 Transportation and warehousing
 Real estate and rental and leasing
 Utilities
 Arts, entertainment, and recreation
 Other. Please specify: _____

24. Are you currently employed by a government agency or organization? (If Yes, please fill in the blank)

- Yes→Which agency? _____
 No

25. Is your primary occupation environmentally related? (if Yes, please fill in the blank)

- Yes→How so? _____
 No

26. What is your spouse's current employment status? (Please skip to #29 if single)

- Employed or self-employed on a full-time basis
 Employed or self-employed on a part-time basis
 Retired. *Please specify year retired:* _____
 Full-time homemaker
 Student. *Please specify expected graduation date* _____
 Disabled *Please specify length of disability* _____
 Unemployed

27. What employment sector best describes the kind of work your spouse does?

- Retail trade
 Education
 Health care and social assistance
 Construction
 Mining and mining-related services
 Accommodation and food services
 Transportation and warehousing
 Real estate and rental and leasing
 Utilities
 Arts, entertainment, and recreation
 Other. Please specify: _____

28. What is the highest level of your spouse's formal education?

- Some high school
 High school diploma or GED
 Some college or Associate's degree
 Bachelor's degree
 Graduate degree

29. Which of the following broad categories best describes your gross household income, from all sources, before taxes for 2007?

- Less than \$10,000
 \$10,000 - \$19,999
 \$20,000 - \$39,999
 \$40,000 - \$59,999
 \$60,000 - \$79,999
 \$80,000 - \$99,999
 \$100,000 - \$149,999
 \$150,000 or more

30. Of the items in the following list, please check all the ones you have personally done within the last year. (Please check all that apply)

- Talked with someone about politics
- Voted in the 2008 presidential election
- Voted in the primary election
- Voted in a local election in 2006 or 2007
- Made a contribution to a political party or candidate
- Assisted in a political campaign
- Contacted a member of Congress or state legislature for any reason
- Contacted a local government official about a policy issue
- Attended a political rally, speech, or meeting
- Participated in an interest group

Section D: Comments / Feedback

Thank you very much for your feedback. The results from this survey will assist the Schuylkill Headwaters Association in their ongoing efforts to improve their local community and watershed. Please place your complete survey in the envelope provided and seal it for confidentiality. Then please follow the drop-off arrangements that you have made with the Local Project Coordinators or Research Assistant.

Please use the space below for any additional comments about this survey or water resource issues in your community.

Some respondents might be selected to participate in a follow up interview. If you would like to participate further in this study, please include your name, phone number, and/or email address.

Local Project Coordinators:
Schuylkill Headwaters
Association

Research Assistant:
Appalachian Coal Country Team

Appendix B: Trial Practice Initial Report

1. Introduction

This is the Trial Practice Report as part of Phase 2 of the Volunteers for Rural Watersheds Project. This Report should take about 20 minutes to complete.

A "Trial Practice" is an approach to managing volunteers that your organization has not attempted. Examples might include: establishing a Youth Advisory Board similar to the model set forth by a watershed group in West Virginia; recruiting new volunteers to your organization by establishing a gardening committee similar to an approach taken by a group in Ohio; and developing a board of directors comparable to the method used by an organization in Kentucky.

Please fill out this form prior to implementing a Trial Practice. Please fill out one form per Trial Practice. Once this report is completed for all selected Trial Practices and they have been implemented then your organization will receive \$700 of unrestricted funds.

We ask that you complete this report fully. Continue to think about the implications of the Trial Practice and be prepared to submit a 6 month interim report documenting changes observed as a result of this Trial Practice. Also, plan on discussing the impacts of the practice with fellow team members because we are all learning as we go along!

Thank You!

2.

1. Your Name:

2. Your Organization's Name

3. What is the name of your Trial Practice?

4. When do you plan on starting this Trial Practice or when did you start this Trial Practice?

Start Date MM DD YYYY
 / /

3.

5. Where did you learn about this Trial Practice? (Please explain your answer in the space provided below)

- An ACCWT Volunteerism Training
- Other Training
- Newspaper
- Internet
- Other watershed group
- Other

Please specify

6. Have you discussed this Trial Practice with another individual or organization? Please explain.

7. Are there any similarities or differences between your two organizations that might impact the implementation of this practice? Please explain:

4.

8. Why did you choose to implement this practice?

9. What do you hope to gain from this practice?

10. Do you foresee any barriers to implementing this practice?

11. How will you know if this Trial Practice is working? It will be useful to select some sort of indicator to measure changes. (Examples of indicators include: increase in new volunteers, increase in donations, increase in volunteer hours contributed by current volunteers, increase in number of articles in the local paper, etc.).

5. Thank You!

We appreciate your time and completion of this Trial Practice Report. Once this Report is submitted along with Reports for other Trial Practices then your organization will receive \$700 of unrestricted funds. Please continue to reflect on the impacts of the Trial Practice and we look forward to hearing about the progress you make throughout this process.

Thanks

Joe Campbell, Volunteerism Coordinator

Allan Comp, Director ACCWT/WHWT

Appendix C: ACCWT/WHWT Volunteerism Trial Practices Application Form

Disclaimer: each organization is eligible to “test” up to three different practices. You are not required to test more than one practice. In an effort that you get to test at least one we recommend that you provide the list of your top three choices.

Your Organization:

Your Name:

Please select the total number practices you would like to implement if approved. Select one:
1 2 3

Below please rank the practices (1 through 3) in the order in which you want. Remember to select them in order of interest.

Practice 1 (required)

Practice Number:

Name of Practice:

What significant need is this practice addressing for your organization?

Please indicate how you plan on implementing this practice?

What resources are available to your organization to put this practice into place?

Who will be the project coordinator? This individual will be responsible for submitting your practice summary reports.

Is this project new to your group? Please explain:

Practice 2 (optional)

Practice Number:

Name of Practice:

What significant need is this practice addressing for your organization?

Please indicate how you plan on implementing this practice?

What resources are available to your organization to put this practice into place?

Who will be the project coordinator? This individual will be responsible for submitting your practice summary reports.

Is this project new to your group? Please explain:

Practice 3 (optional)

Practice Number:

Name of Practice:

What significant need is this practice addressing for your organization?

Please indicate how you plan on implementing this practice?

What resources are available to your organization to put this practice into place?

Who will be the project coordinator? This individual will be responsible for submitting your practice summary reports.

Is this project new to your group? Please explain:

Please send your complete application form, no later than Friday, Nov. 6:

Electronically to Stephanie Lilly, assist@accwt.org, (304) 461-3133,

Or by snail mail to Volunteerism Coordinator, ACCWT, 198 George St., Beckley, WV 25801

Appendix D: Volunteerism Practice Project Evaluation Matrix

We're looking for Volunteerism Practice projects where: the requested practice address a significant need that the group has; the group applying is capable of implementing the practice requested; each of the 25 practices are tested by two separate organizations; these projects are inclusive of organizations that haven't had a chance to participate yet; each of the original 15 organizations who signed up for the project are able to meet their Volunteerism Research Agreement requirements.

The matrix below serves as a ranking of indicators of successful Volunteerism Practice Projects based on required information in the Volunteerism Application Forms

Is the applying organization a “full” volunteerism project site? Yes/No

Has this organization been included in the volunteerism project thus far? Yes/No

Ranking Criteria	1	2	3	4
The practice addresses a significant organizational need	This practice doesn't address a significant organizational need.	This practice slightly addresses a significant organizational need.	This practice adequately addresses a significant organizational need.	This practice clearly and directly addresses a significant organizational need.
A plan to implement the practice	The organization doesn't have a plan to implement the practice.	The organization has a plan, but its broad and/or vague.	The organization has a clear plan, but it is uncertain if they are capable of achieving it.	The organization has a clear focus that can be implemented.
Resources and support for practice implementation	Minimal or no resources available to support implementation of the practice.	Few resources or support available to implement the practice.	Adequate resources available for practice implementation.	Strong availability of resources and support to ensure successful project implementation.
Organizational personnel exists to submit practice reports	Little or no interest/support to follow through on reports. No project coordinator who will be with the project more than one year.			Strong ability to follow through on reports, including a project coordinator who will see the project from start to finish.
Project is new to the organization	Organization has used a practice similar to this approach before with success			Organization has never attempted this practice OR has used a practice similar to this before but without success

Comments:

Appendix E: 6-Month Trial Practice Report (Partial Projects)

Volunteer Trial Practice 6-Month Report

7. What have been the successes and key benefits to your group from your Trial Practice?

8. What challenges has your organization had in implementing this Trial Practice for your group?

9. Do you think other rural watershed groups would face similar difficulties implementing this Trial Practice? Why or why not?

10. Are there particular circumstances or factors about your group, its operations, or its environment that other rural watershed groups should know before implementing this Trial Practice?
Are there any particular factors that would make implementation of this practice easier or more difficult?

4.

11. Have you contacted the individual listed as the contact person for your Trial Practice in the last 6 months (since January 2010)? Why or why not?

12. Have any similarities or differences between the contact's organization and your organization had an impact on the implementation of this practice?

13. Have you discussed or recommended your Trial Practice to any other individuals or organizations (other than those directly involved in implementing your Trial Practice)? Please list the individuals or organizations.

Volunteer Trial Practice 6-Month Report

14. Has implementing your Trial Practice resulted in any new partnerships for your organization? Caused you to use existing partners in new ways? Please explain and list partners.

5.

15. In phone discussion, we talked about various indicators of success to be measured throughout practice implementation. If possible, please report on the discussed measures below.

Please contact the Volunteerism Coordinator if you are unsure of or have any questions regarding measures of practice success.

16. Has this Trial Practice entailed any costs to your organization? If so, how much are the estimated or actual costs?

17. What does your organization plan or hope to achieve in the next 6 months of implementing this practice?

18. What does your organization plan or hope to achieve beyond the next 6 months of implementing this practice?

19. At this point, would you recommend this Trial Practice to other watershed groups with needs similar to yours?

Under what circumstances would you recommend this Trial Practice? Under what circumstances would you not recommend this Trial Practice? Please explain.

6. Photos and Upcoming Events

Volunteer Trial Practice 6-Month Report

Please send relevant photos and dates of upcoming events to volunteerism@accwt.org or mail to:

Appalachian Coal Country Watershed Team

c/o Jenna Fehr

2795 Robert C. Byrd Drive

Beckley, WV 25801

20. General questions, comments, and concerns about the volunteerism project:

7. Thank You!

We appreciate your time in completing this Trial Practice 6-Month Report. You will receive an email confirmation from the Volunteerism Coordinator when your report is approved.

Please continue to reflect on the impacts of the Trial Practice. We look forward to hearing about the progress you make throughout this process both through informal discussions and visits, and in your Final Report (tentative timeline: January 2011).

After a year of implementation and upon completion of your Final Report documenting the impacts of this Trial Practice, your organization will receive \$500 in unrestricted funds.

Thanks again for your participation!

-Jenna Fehr, Volunteerism Coordinator

-Dr. T Allan Comp, OSM/VISTA Teams Coordinator

Appendix F: 6-Month Trial Practice Report (Full Projects)

Volunteerism Project 6-Month Report	
1. Introduction	
Please complete this Trial Practice 6-Month Report as part of your participation in the Volunteers for Rural Watersheds Project.	
This Report should take about 30 minutes to complete.	
Please fill out one form per Practice.	
DUE JUNE 25, 2010	
We ask that you complete this report thoughtfully and thoroughly. Please continue to think about the implications of the Trial Practice, and be prepared to submit a final one-year report documenting changes observed as a result of this Trial Practice. Also, plan on discussing the impacts of the practice with fellow team members--we are all learning as we go along!	
Thank you!	
2.	
1. Your Organization's Name	
<input type="text"/>	
2. Your Name:	
<input type="text"/>	
3. What is the name and number of your Trial Practice (as listed on the 25 ACCWT/WHWT Volunteer Trial Practices List)?	
<input type="text"/>	
4. What is today's date?	
Date: <input type="text"/> <small>MM</small> / <input type="text"/> <small>DD</small> / <input type="text"/> <small>YYYY</small>	
5. If your Trial Practice entails a single event or activity, has this event occurred?	
If yes, on what date? <input type="text"/>	
If no, what is the tentative date or timeframe? <input type="text"/>	
3.	
6. Please describe your group's progress in implementing your Trial Practice over the past 6 months (since January 2010):	
<input type="text"/>	

Volunteerism Project 6-Month Report

7. What have been the successes and key benefits to your group from your Trial Practice?

8. What challenges has your organization had in implementing this Trial Practice for your group?

9. Do you think other rural watershed groups would face similar difficulties implementing this Trial Practice? Why or why not?

10. Are there particular circumstances or factors about your group, its operations, or its environment that other rural watershed groups should know before implementing this Trial Practice? Are there any particular factors that would make implementation of this practice easier or more difficult?

4.

11. Did the volunteerism survey results influence the implementation of this Trial Practice? How so?

If not, discuss how your organization could use survey results to better implement the Trial Practice.

12. Have the survey results for your site been used for any other purposes?

5.

13. Have you contacted the individual listed as the contact person for your Trial Practice in the last 6 months (since January 2010)? Why or why not?

Volunteerism Project 6-Month Report

14. Have any similarities or differences between the contact's organization and your organization had an impact on the implementation of this practice?

15. Have you discussed or recommended your Trial Practice to any other individuals or organizations (other than those directly involved in implementing your Trial Practice)? Please list the individuals or organizations.

16. Has implementing your Trial Practice resulted in any new partnerships for your organization? Caused you to use existing partners in new ways? Please explain and list partners.

6.

17. In phone discussion, we talked about various indicators of success to be measured throughout practice implementation. If possible, please report on the discussed measures below.

Please contact the Volunteerism Coordinator if you are unsure of or have any questions regarding measures of practice success.

18. Has this Trial Practice entailed any costs to your organization? If so, how much are the estimated or actual costs?

19. What does your organization plan or hope to achieve in the next 6 months of implementing this practice?

20. What does your organization plan or hope to achieve beyond the next 6 months of implementing this practice?

Volunteerism Project 6-Month Report

21. At this point, would you recommend this Trial Practice to other watershed groups with needs similar to yours?

Under what circumstances would you recommend this Trial Practice?

Under what circumstances would you not recommend this Trial Practice?

Please explain.

7. Photos and Upcoming Events

Please send relevant photos and dates of upcoming events to volunteerism@accwt.org or mail to:

Appalachian Coal Country Watershed Team

c/o Jenna Fehr

2795 Robert C. Byrd Drive

Beckley, WV 25801

22. General questions, comments, and concerns about the volunteerism project:

8. Thank You!

We appreciate your time in completing this Trial Practice 6-Month Report. You will receive an email confirmation from the Volunteerism Coordinator when your report is approved.

Please continue to reflect on the impacts of the Trial Practice. We look forward to hearing about the progress you make throughout this process both through informal discussions and visits, and in your Final Report (tentative timeline: January 2011).

After a year of implementation and upon completion of your Final Report documenting the impacts of this Trial Practice, your organization will receive \$1000 in unrestricted funds.

Thanks again for your participation!

-Jenna Fehr, Volunteerism Coordinator

-Dr. T Allan Comp, OSM/VISTA Teams Coordinator

Appendix G: Final Trial Practice Report (Partial Projects)

Please complete this Trial Practice Final Report as part of your participation in the Volunteers for Rural Watersheds Research Project. This report should take about 45-60 minutes to complete. Please fill out one form per practice.

Due December 17, 2010

We ask that you complete this report thoughtfully and thoroughly. Please think about the community and organizational needs that attracted you to this practice, as well as the implications and changes observed as a result of this trial practice.

Your organization's trial practice application, initial report, and 6-month report should have been emailed to you by the Volunteerism Coordinator for your convenience in this year-long reflection. Please contact Jenna Fehr with any questions regarding these documents.

1. Your organization's name:
2. Your name:
3. What is today's date?
4. What is the name and number of your trial practice?
5. If your trial practice entails a single event or activity, has this event occurred?
If yes, on what date?
If no, what is the tentative date or timeframe for implementation?
6. Please reflect on the entire year of implementing this trial practice. Consider:
 - What were your organization's intentions? What is the background story?
 - What organizational and/or community needs were addressed?
 - How has your organization and/or community responded?
 - Why is this important to the community?
 - What was the impact on your organization and/or community?
7. Describe the successes and key benefits to your group from your trial practice.
8. Describe the challenges in implementing this trial practice for your group.
9. Have you discussed or recommended your trial practice to any other individuals or organizations (other than those directly involved in implementing your trial practice)? Please list the individuals or organizations.
10. Has implementing your trial practice:
 - Resulted in any new partnerships for your organization?
 - Caused you to use existing partners in new ways?
 - Please explain and list partners.

11. Does the community know about this practice? What do they think of it? Try and recall specific people saying specific things that could be quoted. Paraphrasing is perfectly acceptable!

12. If possible, please report on discussed measures of success.

- Measurements of success vary with each practice and organization. Please contact the Volunteerism Coordinator if you are unsure of or have any questions regarding measures of practice success.

13. Please list the estimated or actual costs of implementing this practice, including amount and description of expense. Did this practice generate a net profit for you? How much? Also, how much time was involved with the planning of this event and how many were involved in the planning?

14. Is this method/event worthy of repeating? Why or Why not? Who will be responsible for implementing it next year? What does your organization plan or hope to achieve in the future regarding this practice?

15. Would you recommend this trial practice to other groups with needs similar to yours? Why or why not?

16. General comments or questions about your group's progress in implementing your trial practice over the past year (since December 2009) or about the project overall:

Please send any photos, articles, reports, or other documents relevant to this trial practice to Volunteerism Coordinator Jenna Fehr via-

Email: volunteerism@accwt.org

Fax: 304-252-4889

Mail:

Appalachian Coal Country Watershed Team

Attn: Jenna Fehr

2795 Robert C. Byrd Drive

Beckley, WV 25801

We appreciate your time in completing this Trial Practice Final Report. You will receive an email confirmation from the Volunteerism Coordinator when your report is successfully submitted.

Upon successful review and approval of this final report, your organization will receive \$500 in unrestricted funds. You may be contacted for follow-up or additional information regarding this trial practice and your organization over the next few months.

I hope that your organization has benefited from their participation in the Volunteers for Rural Watersheds research project. Your efforts are playing a vital role in the creation of rural volunteer management resources.

Thanks again for your participation!

Appendix H: Final Trial Practice Report (Full Projects)

Please complete this Trial Practice Final Report as part of your participation in the Volunteers for Rural Watersheds Research Project. This report should take about 45-60 minutes to complete. Please fill out one form per practice.

Due December 17, 2010

We ask that you complete this report thoughtfully and thoroughly. Please think about the community and organizational needs that attracted you to this practice, as well as the implications and changes observed as a result of this trial practice.

Your organization's survey results, trial practice application, initial report, and 6-month report should have been emailed to you by the Volunteerism Coordinator for your convenience in this year-long reflection. Please contact Jenna Fehr with any questions regarding these documents.

1. Your organization's name:
2. Your name:
3. What is today's date?
4. What is the name and number of your trial practice?
5. If your trial practice entails a single event or activity, has this event occurred?
If yes, on what date?
If no, what is the tentative date or timeframe for implementation?
6. Please reflect on the entire year of implementing this trial practice. Consider:
 - What were your organization's intentions? What is the background story?
 - What organizational and/or community needs were addressed?
 - How has your organization and/or community responded?
 - Why is this important to the community?
 - What was the impact on your organization and/or community?
7. Describe the successes and key benefits to your group from your trial practice.
8. Describe the challenges in implementing this trial practice for your group.
9. Have you discussed or recommended your trial practice to any other individuals or organizations (other than those directly involved in implementing your trial practice)? Please list the individuals or organizations.
10. Has implementing your trial practice:
 - Resulted in any new partnerships for your organization?
 - Caused you to use existing partners in new ways?
 - Please explain and list partners.

11. Does the community know about this practice? What do they think of it? Try and recall specific people saying specific things that could be quoted. Paraphrasing is perfectly acceptable!

12. Did the results of the volunteer surveys influence the implementation of this Trial Practice? Have the survey results for your site been used for any other purposes? Please reflect on possible uses and influences of survey results.

13. If possible, please report on discussed measures of success.

-Measurements of success vary with each practice and organization. Please contact the Volunteerism Coordinator if you are unsure of or have any questions regarding measures of practice success.

14. Please list the estimated or actual costs of implementing this practice, including amount and description of expense. Did this practice generate a net profit for you? How much? Also, how much time was involved with the planning of this event and how many were involved in the planning?

15. Is this method/event worthy of repeating? Why or Why not? Who will be responsible for implementing it next year? What does your organization plan or hope to achieve in the future regarding this practice?

16. Would you recommend this trial practice to other groups with needs similar to yours? Why or why not?

17. General comments or questions about your group's progress in implementing your trial practice over the past year (since December 2009) or about the project overall:

Please send any photos, articles, reports, or other documents relevant to this trial practice to Volunteerism Coordinator Jenna Fehr via-

Email: volunteerism@accwt.org

Fax: 304-252-4889

Mail:

Appalachian Coal Country Watershed Team

Attn: Jenna Fehr

2795 Robert C. Byrd Drive

Beckley, WV 25801

We appreciate your time in completing this Trial Practice Final Report. You will receive an email confirmation from the Volunteerism Coordinator when your report is successfully submitted.

Upon successful review and approval of this final report, your organization will receive \$1000 in unrestricted funds. You may be contacted for follow-up or additional information regarding this trial practice and your organization over the next few months.

I hope that your organization has benefited from their participation in the Volunteers for Rural Watersheds research project. Your efforts are playing a vital role in the creation of rural volunteer management resources. Thanks again for your participation!

Appendix I: Case Studies

Case studies are available online at <http://ruralvolunteer.org/pages/Case-Studies.cfm> or contact the Appalachian Coal Country Team:

2795 Robert C Byrd Drive

Beckley, WV 25801

(304)252-4848

www.CoalCountryTeam.org