Bend – May 9, 2012
Face to Face Session – Chart Comments

<u>Question 1:</u> Looking 10 years into the future, what outcomes should OWEB achieve through its investments and how will we know we have achieved them?

- Projects evaluate results in 5-10 years, locally – lessons learned – results – share the information – data base.
    - OWEB role – compile and share and help groups define roles and responsibilities and future
- Ecological indicators for the state, appropriate for basin – and long term tracking of progress. How OWEB would evaluate whether investments meet mission. BEF style.
- DWA – clear place based strategies and OWEB work with locals on agreements to implement. Suite of coordinated actions.
- What works well for watersheds? Consider triple bottom line for future generations to build on and move forward. IN 10 years, understanding of watershed functions
- Whole, functional river systems, agriculture, recreation, fisheries and water quality standards.
- Goal – achieve ecological outcomes - -not done in 10 years. Political and public support necessary to achieve and continue ecological outcomes – community level support
- Set coherent strategies from each community – integrate restoration, protection, education to achieve larger goals. Need to see direct results.
- Structural soundness, cohesive strategies – involve community
- OWEB mechanism to the people to vote on programs/verify programs – allow broader public to become a part of input. Eliminate tunnel vision. Taxpayer bang for buck.
- Define outcomes – frustration that goal is always changing – e.g. what the flow. OWEB should work with other agencies to figure out shared agency goals to know end point.
    - Complementary vs. common – agencies very different
- Tell the story – let people know what is being done not enough time to do it now. OWEB should help. Salem case studies, skill set.
- Need specific and attainable outcomes on basin or regional scale – OWEB doesn't have now. 50% cleaner water (depends on watershed differences in watersheds so can't have statewide outcome). 50% better conservation of water use; self-sustaining fisheries. In watershed – in Upper Deschutes all work goes to these outcomes. Processes should support outcomes.
- 85% reduced weeds
- Increased function of native plants
- Look at deep beneficial uses
- Science needed
- Education/outreach for younger generation's sense of place and stewardship to achieve success. More than 10 years. More support; involve more people.
- Baseline monitoring needed before project to know if we achieve outcome. How to show what was accomplished from a project 10 years ago.
- 10 years are interim- just getting going with Measure 76. Help inefficient Councils to support effective groups to implement cost effective projects on the ground.

- Learn from past – what has worked – 10 years should know what works – share with all – invest in what works.
- Grants are getting tighter.
- Good follow upon projects – healthy watersheds address all parts
- If not a salmon basin, felt harder to get funded.
- Build monitoring in to restoration and outreach work.
    - (15-20% monitoring, shifting small percentage away from restoration and outreach)
- Baseline monitoring over long period – are there models to show results?
- Invest in watersheds that have strategies and goals in their plans.
- e.g. 50% of streams not in attainment, meet water quality standards.
- In Willamette ODFW Conservation Strategy, WRD flow, DEQ TMDL, used GIS to overlay priorities and thing strategically using this information. Do statewide alignment with the GIS blending – and locals determine what can be delivered in 10 years.
    - What can be recovered?
    - Or work on the worst?
    - What is the social capacity?
- Research projects and effectiveness
- Klamath issues – help fisheries and communities be sustainable. Measure this.
- Plan past 10 years – more 10 years! Don't want to plan, keep looking ahead.
- Identify what is longer than 10 years – e.g. 20 year look at temperature.
- More and new landowners are participating in OWEB programs. Find incentives to encourage participation.
- The good news OWEB story is being told. The investments made, the benefits derived. OWEB should be a conduit or a facilitator to gather and disseminate statewide information about what is getting done. Share information with partners to get the word out.
- Upland improvements should become more of a focus. Prescribed fire, juniper projects, etc. will result in ecological outcomes such as more appropriate forest stocking – leading to better forest health and economic benefits, increased water supply.
- Upland improvement will look different from county to county due to ecological, economic, and different approaches.
- Seek more consistency in how upland projects are reviewed statewide. Some considerations include:
    - Reconfigure regions to provide proper equity and get the work done,
    - Evaluate applications around ecological outcomes rather than geographic (current approach). The ecological outcomes should be broader than fish, for example include sage grouse. Such a change would need to deal with the original reasons for using geographic boundaries.
- "Ecosystem function" should be one of the ecological outcomes.
- Review teams could be part of the cause for inconsistencies in projects reviews across the state.
- Uplands are an important "door opener" to gain trust and interest from landowners. Current constraints on only stream/riparian work precludes this. "I can show you specific examples"

- Need post project evaluation and lessons learned.

<u>Question 2:</u> What tools and programs should OWEB have in its toolbox to help you achieve your goals?

- SIP – modeled after success in Deschutes – do more!
- Address issues from regional perspective – not project by project
- Dedicated source for monitoring – pre and post
- Partnerships
- Maintaining a corporate database
- Funding for research – how will a project affect different waterways?
- Training on how to write proposals
- Support strategies that can be used across the state
    - Database (GIS)
    - Build on education program – invest in people to help engage, inform and connect communities
- Support watershed councils, SWCDs and CWMAs – support for coordinators
- Keep a broad look and recognize unique needs/strengths/knowledge of local areas. Don't leave a community behind while building broader (statewide) strategies
- Encourage appropriate levels of public access
- Develop new initiatives but not at the expense of maintaining core mission of on the ground restoration
- Tool to help us develop regional solutions to problems – e.g. funding to support collaborative networks
- OWEB as catalyst/facilitator/possibly technical resource to gather baseline knowledge, develop best practices, etc. at the watershed scale. A link and connector of data and experts.
- Online grant applications
- Provide physical on the ground tools, e.g. fish screens, monitoring devices
- More uplands restoration work (broader than and including weeds)
- Build capacity for organizations to take 'watershed approach' – individual organizations as well as support for collaborative.
- Evaluate review team capacity across regions to improve quality and consistency
- Provide the opportunity for review teams and project proposers to interact during the review process. This will allow the proposers to answer questions the review team may have and would serve to clarify the challenges inherent in a proposal and promote better implementation of projects.
- Allow small grant projects to be larger for "tried and true" methods. In-stream projects would be too complex so keep them at the same smaller scale.
- Some standards and guidelines need to be updated.
    - To gain efficiency, allow strategic use and pooling of services, such as engineering, across regions. OWEB could help with this through SIPs?
    - Historically, NRCS covered some services but no longer. NRCS basin teams might be able to help with this.

<u>Question 3:</u> What does OWEB need to do differently to achieve the benefits (ecological, social/community, and/or economic) that are important to you?

- Facilitate method to obtain broad community outreach and associated tools to determine what community wants from watersheds (Bend 2030 Community Vision)
- Take a whole watershed perspective prioritizing and funding projects
- Divide funding amongst watersheds and let locals decide which projects to fund (think small grants) – community prioritizing/block grant model
- Mechanism for voters to weigh in on projects
- Carry funds for projects through multiple cycles for larger projects – the longer, the better
- Think about projects beyond 'legacy damage' and look for prevention of future damage (i.e. urbanization)
    - Preventing takes a variety of forms
- Establish regionally directed goals and take RFPs to address those
- Have local entities select projects based on OWEB-identified ecological priorities (SIP-like model)
- If a project needs multiple years of funding, fund all years (SIP-like model)
- Encourage scientific understanding of surface-ground water interactions
- Shift focus to uplands where it makes sense
- Limiting factor analysis statewide –contribute to/ invest in a short-term intensive effort to complete these so subsequent investments can be targeted
- Work with NFWF and others with flexible dollars
- Investments (outreach restoration, etc.) need to be a part of a local strategy
    - Recognize the project facilitates building a strong, healthy watershed for the future – it's not just about the project itself
- What is local? It's different in every part of the state
- OWEB should support partners' ability to tell stories in a compelling way
- OWEB should encourage public access to acquired properties where encouraged and supported locally
- Seek more funding to invest locally
- Recognize value of educating young people to develop a sense of 'place' and stewardship
- Get office staff out of the office to see projects (fiscal staff)
- Broaden grants to include a wider range (weeds, upland, capacity-building)
- Signage for OWEB-funded projects
- Keep focused on 'telling the good story'
- Monitor projects and implementers to make sure both are on the right track
    - Use to inform future project selection
- Less paper- more action!
- Allow simpler approval process for some grants. If a proposal exceeds some stated amount, then a more complex approval process could be required. This would allow more projects to get done.
- Another approach to get more done would be to consider lengthening the time span of projects. Longer term commitments (e.g. five years) would save on project review and get more large projects done. This might be thought of as a "site specific SIP". OWEB and the Regions would have to determine how much of the future annual budgets could be "pre-committed" in this approach.

- Large, watershed scale, complex multi-landowner projects should be funded by OWEB over extended periods of time. Look at the ODA water quality program. OWEB would need to look at issues on a watershed basis and commit money to each region through the process.
- Require regions to prioritize their project proposals. Force them to be strategic, e.g. "give us your 3 best projects". Some watershed councils are being directed to a multitude of proposals hoping that some will get approved. Put the onus on regions to rank their proposals. A set of standards might be necessary. A SIP model was suggested (by Tom Byler) as a way to look at this.
- Regions need help in figuring out how to deal with contingency cost increases, so that opportunities are not missed due to lack of funds.
- Don't backfill federal deficits with funds needed by the watershed councils. It will divide our communities. Projects on federal lands might be OK but send the funds through the communities.

<u>Question 4:</u> If you were in charge of designing OWEB's investment strategy, how would you design it to be specific and focused, while allowing opportunities to support new and creative?

- Solicit experts at the local level (define 'local')
    - Adaptable over time – 5-10 year basis
- Be responsive to locally derived ideas – deliver to Board
- Encourage partnerships and collaboration to achieve more ecological and economic success – for efficiencies and leveraged funding
- OWEB take active role in sharing new innovative ideas and successes with other basins/areas
- Continue monitoring especially effectiveness monitoring to determine what works – and make that information and data available to others – large scale/program
- Continue education and outreach grants efforts
- OWEB adopt priorities at high level (what you want to achieve) and allow local entities to create creative ideas for how to get there. Present regional priorities and methods
- Start a specific program to find new and creative ideas
    - Allow overall outcomes to be determined locally/regionally
    - Ensure project results are exportable
    - Consider Small Grants program as a model to achieve this
- Board adopt a few specific major goals to act as vessels to capture lower scale actions
- Define 'restoration' especially within current context of place, time and opportunity
- Board develop comparable criteria to OWEB's ecological criteria for social/community benefits
- Consider specific programs/investments that are higher risk than existing programs – e.g. beaver reintroduction
- Emphasize/grow programs that encourage or use focused specific goals
    - Follow up with monitoring
- Invest in larger scales: organizations, geographic coordination and related projects; integrate organizations and ideas – new and innovative
    - Integrate SIP and non-SIP projects

    - Capitalize on larger partnerships to inform and help smaller organizations, which can be hot beds of innovation
- Be aware that Small Grant program elements have some rigidity
- Recognize new and innovative opportunities should be flexible in program make up and delivery
- Adopt as high priority water in river; encourage regional collaboration to be implementers through funding
- Fund competitive grant to watershed councils and others to create programmatic ideas and direct for LIIs and other far reaching programs

---

Bend – May 9, 2012
Written Comments

<u>Question 1:</u> Looking 10 years into the future, what outcomes should OWEB achieve through its investments and how will we know we have achieved them?

- Concentrated investment resulting in clearly visible landscape level changes. You will know because you recognize this healthy watershed/stream when compared to less disturbed reference. You no longer pursue random acts of kindness that don't add to system resiliency either ecologically or socially
- Fewer streams not meeting water quality standards. Minimum flows met in main streams for fisheries and recreation
- I think that monitoring the fish to have measurable outcomes is important. However, those outcomes can take many shapes. When dealing with the environment, hard and fast outcomes are difficult to define. What are the measureable results?
- In ten years, OWEB should have clear place-based strategies developed in each of its major watersheds around the state and have agreements negotiated with local institutions, people and partners to implement the strategies. The strategy should not be simply a list of projects but a suite of coordinated actions to better achieve OWEB's mission. Furthermore in ten years, OWEB and its partners should be implementing these place-based strategies and generating ecological, social and economic benefits for the regions in which they operate.
- In 2022, we will have well-functioning, efficient WS councils continuing to implement cost effective projects on the ground. OWEB is till the leader in WS restoration
- A significant OWEB activity should be the development of a program that will allow a broad base of local citizens to determine the limitations for fishery restoration, recreation development and water utilization for economic development
- Completed watershed restoration projects – visible. Establish long term education and outreach – watch for change in values.
- Project evaluation – not a written report at the end of year one.

- Improve stream flow and fisheries habitat. Educate public about why this is important/ which areas need help and what can happen with restoration.
- Regionally directed goals (basin – scale in Eastern Oregon) broad rather than the current, opportunistic approach that leads to diffuse actions. Need to do dedicated effectiveness monitoring with both site specific and cumulative monitoring sites. Need to identify measures appropriate to actions rather than granting periods.
- On the ground projects
- Make river systems "whole" and functional again. Sustain agricultural economy and recreation economy and enhance fisheries – salmon and steelhead in the river indicators.
- Establish coherent strategies for large scale ecosystem restoration, with benchmarks that can be evaluated. Programs/projects need to be judged by how they move that strategy forward.
- Tremendous popular/political support at the state level for strong, continued investment by the state in watershed health and the related restoration economy. We're not going to get everything done in ten years.
- Land management strategies from urban to agriculture will work in consideration of the watershed effects.
- Continued "on the ground" projects, including appropriate TA assistance. Education and outreach must continue to reach new people, educate the young and to keep healthy environments in from of the public and not let it get to the back burner.
- Post project funding ->lesson learned database
- Bring in new land owners, improve uplands, better at sharing information

<u>Question 2:</u> Picture your watershed: What tools and programs can OWEB provide in its toolbox to help you achieve your goals?

- Provide/support development of tools that all grantees can use. Many are re-creating the same wheels, but not having enough resources to really make efforts successful.
- Corporate database. Funding watershed restoration projects.
- I think the tool that OWEB has to offer is money. There are plenty of folk in the watersheds that know what is wrong and how to fix it. Our biggest challenge is a consistent flow of money to finish projects that are sitting and waiting to get funded.
- The Deschutes Basin has developed a number of innovative tools for both land and water conservation to advance OWEB's mission. The "tool" we lack is the one that will more easily allow us to create regional solutions instead of simply developing worthwhile projects. From the perspective of the DWA, an entity that strives to develop a regional water management plan, the planning tools are lacking as is the local capacity/funding to develop and sustain the needed regional planning processes.
- Multiple sources with funding that fit the strategic plans and local priorities.
- Community outreach and voter referendum programs for proposed OWEB funded projects at the county level.

- Funding for restoration to support projects. Funding and resources to enhance outreach and education.
- Play more of an educator role – monitoring help with monitoring equipment. "A community tool program"
- Research and outreach about what certain streams could look like if flows were restored. Accurate information about how water users are affecting stream health.
- Providing as much funding for restoration as possible is very important for my watershed. Local capacity funding is also important.
- Regional listing of directed goals (basin – scale in Eastern Oregon). Regional listening of geographical focus areas (Basins HUCs)
- Specifically identified funding pools for pre and post monitoring. Training and protocols for volunteer monitoring. Dedicated funding for data analysis (short and long term)
- Putting funds where they can be partnered with other groups to address total picture. Utilize existing groups to get funds on the ground.
- Provide capacity grants, restoration grants, and technical assistance grants that support restoration and stewardship of whole watersheds – not just focused on in-stream and riparian components.
- Prioritize acquisition and restoration funds; include appropriate levels of funding for assessment and education.
- Facilitation of strategic initiatives. Encourage public use at appropriate level of restored/protected areas, so that the public can see, experience and develop a sense of ownership in OWEB's work
- Every watershed is different and needs different tools. OWEB heeds to support full diversity of options to allow each to succeed.
- Highlight what works well for the watershed considering the economics, social and environmental elements – leaving a legacy of caring for the soil and water for future generations to build on.
- Recognition of the importance of upland projects continuing education of school age as well as the public. Stable infrastructure/funding for councils and districts. Perhaps have less focus on acquisitions. I think there will be a new/intense focus on monitoring to prove that good work is being done.
- Larger small grants program
- Improved uplands grants, shared information, better incentive programs to attracting new land owners, small grant for offsite waters

<u>Question 3:</u> What does OWEB need to do differently to achieve the benefits (ecological, social/community, and/or economic) that are important to you?

- Try to remove some of the fear that funding will/may go away?
- Recognize how to work with the natural elements. Riparian areas are resilient if given the opportunities.
- Work with stake holder groups to tell the many success stories more effectively. Help support partners efforts to tell their stories – both at the state level and at the community level.

- Be more strategic in your investments. Require local groups to develop local strategies and move away from one-off projects that don't contribute to a longer goal/objective.
- Honestly, from my limited time perspective (5 years in the region) OWEB has targeted/funded some very important projects; let's figure out how to get more irrigated water piped.
- OWEB needs to think beyond restoration aimed at undoing legacy damage and look at ways to reduce the stress on water sheds that will come from future land and water use. Prevention is cheaper that restoration.
- Make sure something is gained in return for investment. I.E. water returned to stream, land in trust…..
- Be strategic and directed in funding projects. Do not be driven by legal (fear of legal issues rather than known legal issues) or political issues in project selection.
- I think providing the local community/stake holders more of an opportunity to choose where funding should be invested would help us meet our goals.
- Not very familiar with how OWEB currently operates.
- The OWEB technical review team is out of touch. Technical review should happen locally with experts that understand all of the issues and complexities of the local area.
- Become more educated about ongoing outdoor education programs and the impact this could have on creating an ethic of stewardship and sense of place.
- Get away from hap-hazard funding of almost random grant requests
- If we are to hit a scale that can actually be meaningful to ecology, community and economy, OWEB needs to move beyond its focus on individual projects and look to helping local constituents develop watershed enhancement programs that can be sustained over the long term. For example, one issue of particular importance to the DWA is water conservation. How do we help communities and irrigation districts manage water more efficiently so the uses of water both in-stream and out-of-stream can be expanded? Individual projects have increased our understanding of how to use water conservation tools. Now we need a conservation program that can invest at a larger scale in multiple places simultaneously. This will allow us to reach a larger agreement among local partners and to obtain matching investments from multiple sources, greatly leveraging OWEB's investment.
- Historically, OEB has done a wonderful job of assisting with getting projects done One way to improve would be to have a way to access money over multiple years. To have some sense of stability in funding. It is difficult to complete a large project in sections. If there were a way to have money available as match was secured it would help.
- Gain better understanding of entire system – groundwater – surface water relationship throughout the state.
- View granting as a program and provide the support services that all you grantees need. Access to IT/GIS, better tracking of projects, streamlined fiscal management that is more like online banking. Need to have regionally focused priorities to inform granting decisions.
- More monitoring

- More small grants thus putting a cap on grants

<u>Question 4:</u> If you were in charge of designing OWEB's investment strategy, how would you design it to be specific and focused while allowing opportunities to support new and creative ideas to achieve restoration outcomes?

- Good question…this process is a good start.
- OWEB does a great job now – but reaching out with a positive attitude for all/ no fear.
- Well defined grant categories need to be offset by opportunity funds for innovation. OWEB – serious work with stakeholders to determine where innovation is most needed. The innovations that result can help focus future programmatic goals and grant programs.
- Compel local watersheds/regions to develop their own strategies that work in their local communities. It will lead to greater stakeholder buy-in, leverage and creativity.
- Again, from my limited perspective, the model appears to work. Perhaps there could be more near-term and short-term emphasis on building capacity
- OWEB has specific ecological criteria for their investments. For strategic reasons, OWEB should also have methods for evaluating the "human capacity" (partnerships, social agreement, contractor capacity, etc.) in place to ensure OWEB investments are efficient and effective. This goes beyond SWCD and watershed council capacity – it is about community capacity.
- Look for opportunities to partner in areas with the most potential for ecological improvement for dollars spent.
- Strategic, inter-agency alignment of priorities on a geographic basis. Once this is defined, use local community input to define priority action areas. Have a strong, defined plan for the next 10 years in place.
- I would ask for local groups to provide a work plan/local strategy and then provide equal amounts of funding for each area and give local groups an opportunity to prioritize the funding. Similar to small grant program.
- Identify priority areas/goals, and allow applicants to develop methods to achieve goals.
- Realize that a new concept in restoration is not necessarily wrong. Realize that landowners (in some areas) drive the restoration effort and maybe a project that results in 70% benefit is better than no project.
- In the Deschutes Basin the partnerships in place are achieving on the ground restoration at a great level which should be held up as a model for other parts of the state. However, I believe, education of our youngest generation should become more of a priority of the investment strategy in order to help the on the ground work reserved and sustained.
- Solicit input from knowledgeable local partners, rely on their expertise to direct funds, be flexible.
- We acknowledge that many studies have already been conducted to assess the problems facing watershed health and to propose solutions. Despite these would science-based studies, we lack the "social contracts" with local people to systematically address both the limiting factors and opportunities in our

watersheds. OWEB should invest a portion of its resources in the development of place-based strategies. By these we mean strategies that address the limiting factors identified in Watershed Assessments and Sub-basin Plans, but which do so within the local context, in a manner appropriate for and acceptable to local people. Once a good place-based strategy has been developed, OWEB should invest in its implementation through a matching grant program that draws other investment into the basin. Over time OWEB should shift its investment emphasis away from responsive grants to integrated strategies and programs. OWEB should always maintain a responsive grant program to capitalize on fast-emerging opportunities, but it should be a small proportion of OWEB's total investment portfolio than it is today.

- New and creative ideas should come from the fold in the watersheds doing the work. Seems like these ideas can come through the grant application process. If the grant application process is focused on achieving specific goals, then there should be room in the process for creativity.
- Re-establish beaver. The new goal of reducing the risk of climate change is problematic. Restoring watersheds and beaver may keep water longer in the year on the landscape. A social or economic response to climate change might be more reservoirs and hydropower. This could be counter-productive to other goals. Cutting juniper may increase local water flows. But retaining and promoting juniper may sequester more carbon. This trade-off needs more analysis.
- Work with funder to develop a strategy that focuses in central places with people that can get the job done. Reduce or stop investing in groups/things that aren't providing results (ineffective SWCDs and councils, water quality monitoring – punt to DEQ for statewide approach, limit monitoring to things that provide weight of evidence indicators. Ecological monitoring difficult to get statistical rigor given timeframe of change.
- I think you are doing a good job of this now. I would require more standards and grading of projects; user friendly database to look at what is done, where, results etc.