

Pacific City – May 10, 2012

Face to Face Session – Chart Comments

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

- Vital and stable watershed organizations – TEP, Councils, Districts
 - They are implementing restoration and basin management plans
- Measure success – OWEB sit down with partners – have they met their goals in their business plan?
- Whole watershed approach
 - Include all partners – implementers and funders
 - All partners meet to approach outcomes and work together as a whole watershed
 - Joint planning and implementation
 - Example: Nestucca USFWS – bring partners – ‘what is the plan for Nestucca?’
- In 10 years, estuaries are addressed coast wide – planning/all partners/lessons learned
- Need to define greatest needs/priorities for the watershed and measurable objectives. In 10 years make progress toward the objectives
- Regional approach – scaled up
- Councils, agencies, Districts, etc. – all at the table to discuss what is attainable in 10 years
 - Now, people don’t show up
- Education to build awareness in the community, e.g. ‘x’ amount of the watershed met water quality standards
- Increased returns of fish. Clean water.
- Local partners identify problems to fix based on watershed need and decided by community
 - E.g. Nehalem Conservation Action Plan – conservation within working landscapes
- Outcome is a well thought out plan including measureable outcomes and progress steps
- OWEB set better procedures to communicate to partners changes in laws, practices, regulations that affect restoration work. Including OWEB decisions, federal funding, etc.
- Measure the number of Council and District members’ education efforts – list of actions – encourage members to be educated.
 - E.g. Watershed Master Stewards. Standard for Council members so they are educated about issues, trained and able to make good decisions.
- Focus investments and restoration on medium/high quality habitat that is not completely altered. Result = intact habitat protected, maintained and restored with smaller amount of dollars spent.
- Metrics for direct/indirect economic and community results from OWEB and others’ investments.
- Educate/reach out to explain and publicize accomplishments, and why – more resources needed.
- Outcomes developed at watershed/regional level – they are different throughout the state
- Fund baseline of current conditions
 - Watershed study, then plan practices with all local partners – who does what? In 10 years you could show changes from baseline (# of landowners, streams, etc.)

- Watershed assessment is outdated. Need resources.
- Connect public lands, control watershed lands – result is broader, comprehensive approach – improved water quality and habitat
- How do we know we have improved water and habitat? What is the measurement? Important to identify what to measure and then monitor.
 - E.g. ocean conditions and salmon returns.
 - E.g. temperature and sediment?
- More interagency coordination with OWEB, ODFW, ODF, USFWS, BLM, and other agencies about data – what should be monitored, what is monitored, by who.
 - Share the data
- Measurable improvement of watershed literacy in all school districts.
 - Basic support structure – councils and districts
 - Basic hydrology, water quality, fish habitat science
 - Why it matters
- Educate the public
- Baseline data exists – ODFW does monitor restoration projects
 - Pre- and post-monitoring – 5 year and 10 year data
 - Data on Corvallis lab/ODFW/website (contact ODFW biologist)
 - Make data more accessible/raise awareness that it’s out there
- Determine the source of why a project is not achieving goals, through monitoring
 - Identify questions before monitoring
- How broadly do measures of success apply across the state? In every watershed, see improvement in 10 years throughout the state, not just in a few areas.
- Better functioning ecosystem with economic values addressed – no disconnect
- Implement educational models for life-long learning about the environment. Use curricula approach in the “21st Century Model” aligned with mandates for education using high-tech tools.
- Use part of OWEB investment for “incubator-like” investments in watershed health
- Outcome: See people immersed in the coastal environment. “Kids are muddy again.” Shift the culture to allow/encourage people and kids outdoors again. Connection with the watershed through recreation.
- Strive for a balance between community of interest and community of place. People come to the coast to recreate – people at the coast need to make a living.
- Look at dangers and threats to salmonids leaving and reentering our stream systems. We are sending out millions of fingerlings. Why are fish not returning?
- Look to partner more with Sea Grant.
- Have one place to go for data! There isn’t enough staff to pull together data in all the forms required now. Look at OOI model and Mathematica Software. We are not efficiently managing data between agencies for grant applications. Use available technology better – gain administrative efficiencies and have better use of data.
- Use the university system to help advance ideas that better integrate data entry and accessibility (e.g. Dr. Mary Bucy - Western Oregon University)

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

- Land acquisitions program
- Partnerships with landowners for forest management agreements
- Funds for effectiveness monitoring
 - Evaluate projects to glean lessons learned and set future direction
 - Ecosystem perspective to evaluate– is there a science behind this?
- Flexibility around technical assistance
 - People on retainer (e.g. engineers)
 - Willingness to go in to design build projects so there are fewer applications
 - Single application for planning, implementation, monitoring and outreach
 - Online applications
- Provide economic incentives, e.g. land trusts, to do restoration – start with the best first
- Make sure reporting is consistent across all agencies – and share the information to avoid redundancies
- Find a way to be responsive to various implementation plan needs without being dominated by them
- Put planning efforts back on OWEB’s agenda – provide funding for these efforts
 - E.g. revisit watershed assessments
- Augment/adequately fund local capacity support
 - Regional support
 - Shared resources across local groups
 - Includes staff support so we can put our other funds on the ground
 - Basic logistical support
- Education and outreach need to remain a priority – make it more of a priority
 - Funding for local groups to do education and outreach
- Keep doing what you are doing!
 - Continue to support known problem areas
 - Frequent and consistent grants for restoration, technical assistance, monitoring and education
- Local Review Teams are a valuable tool – keep them!
- Provide a better mechanism for stakeholder input to OWEB Board about concerns
 - Regional representative on Board as a ‘go to’ person
 - Ombudsman
- Education
 - Youth education is important and valid
 - OSU Extension Master Watershed Stewardship Program (or mini course)
 - Work with OSU Sea Grant
 - Education about global climate change and other climate problems – and monitoring around this
- Clarify and communicate land acquisitions policies, share this information before entering an acquisition and make sure the policy aligns with other agencies
 - Selective thinning – is this an acceptable tool?
 - What about carbon credits?
- How can OWEB make fullest use of federal funding? Plan opportunities to do this

- E.g. through Acquisitions, restoration work
- Provide mitigation funds to landowners
- Broaden opportunities to help set annual conference agenda
 - Offer a regional conference?
- Hold pre-proposal meetings as opportunity for Q&A
 - Use webinars to connect people
- Use social media to educate – connect – collaborate
- Change fundamental watershed thinking in the state. OWEB should encourage other agencies at the state level to seek fundamental changes in watershed management. Adopt US Forest Service approaches such as avoiding clear-cutting in forests.
- Institutionalize education at the community level. Sponsor local education and interaction so as to encourage better understanding of the natural systems and management practices.
- Monitoring at basin scale including buffer zones.
- Keep to the core of what works well - capacity funding, restoration grants, and resulting job creation. Also education and effectiveness monitoring.
- Capacity funds in operating rather than grant funds.

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

- Tools to respond to climate change and other carbon-related problems
- More communication with local watershed organizations – what they are accomplishing and with the public
- Consider potential ecological value in addition to current value in scoring
- Provide a forum for local organizations to share and cooperate between groups (formalize)
- Respect education as an essential means of restoration and stewardship
- Consider upland projects as a contributor to overall watershed health
- Consider prioritizing projects statewide
 - Look at new ways to prioritize and fund the best project across the region
- When you purchase agricultural land, consider ways to keep it in agriculture
- Focus on fish and water, other benefits follow
- Projects may look haphazard based on ownership, but they are not
- In review process, view application process as an opportunity to build the best project possible
- Standardize review process across regions
- Provide more direction to review teams so they can help the Board make the best decisions possible
- In Acquisitions, consider different way of ranking for ecological value.
- Provide feedback loop during review process if grantee can improve restoration with landowner (project negotiation process)
- Field trips are excellent part of review for context
- Mini-SIP – smaller scale, that captures administrative efficiencies and stable funding
 - Salmon River Estuary; Siuslaw Basin Partnership; Siuslaw-to-Tillamook
- Update assessments to gain ability to measure benefits

- Use whole watershed model to plan and all partners invest in the plan
 - Includes outcomes, monitoring
 - Plan drives priorities
 - Takes a more holistic approach
 - Build on assessments
- Increase efficiency in administration by:
 - Re-organizing how budgets are structured
 - Turnaround time on acquisitions
 - Look at other grant sources to learn ways to consolidate and streamline grant applications
 - Online applications
- Fund grant-writing workshops
- Recognize where successful partnerships exist, learn from them and build on efforts
- Ensure funding is available to fund projects that have been evaluated and prioritized locally/regionally
- Increase emphasis on regional planning (comprehensive) and funding to implement
- How does OWEB measure its success against what the citizens voted for and the legislature approves? Does it make sense that less than 50% of dollars spent are on restoration? How does the spending match the mission? It seems that the percentage spent on restoration should be higher. Focus on grants – they are core to the mission.
- There is beneficial project work that could be done in the lower stretches of coastal watersheds. Currently permitting doesn't allow for work in these areas due to regulatory issues. OWEB should see regulatory relief to do projects in this area.
- Invest in more invasive species projects.
- Encourage a campaign for visitors to “Work a day, stay and play”. This would raise the OWEB profile and may help gain public and funding support. “Seaside Naturally” is a good example of this. Watershed council capacity funds support this.
- OOI example. Look at interactive system to allow the public to see hard to reach restoration projects.
- Help local organizations better use the educational tools to bring together diverse parts of the community toward shared learning and the development of common ground.
- Maintain land acquisition program. Expand the outreach and energy to help landowners move in this direction.
- Require all projects to have a collaborative component.
- Provide support, tools, information, research, and the capacity (staff) to support councils.
- People are available to conduct school programs – is there a way to use that to support/enhance local capacity.

Question 4: 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?

- Keep open enough to retain flexibility
 - E.g. better system for measuring outcomes—something more efficient for project implementation and staff, and can be communicated to public and constituents

- Current focus on project outputs; move to program and outcomes
- New program that specifically focuses on new and innovative ideas
 - Existing 90/10 split – use 10% on innovative, and any funds not utilized roll back to large regional projects
- Adaptive management:
 - New and emerging problems, e.g. climate change, weed program
 - Periodic or separate program to address these issues
 - OWEB take a role in these issues
 - Revisit Restoration Priorities every several years (e.g. 3 years) to keep fresh and relevant
 - Need mechanism to do this
- Effectiveness monitoring:
 - Increase expenditures to help tell the story
 - Board will benefit from knowing what works – useful product for evaluating successes
 - Accomplish goals and share lessons learned
 - Adaptive management requires this investment
- Baseline monitoring:
 - OWEB support larger designs not just program specific
 - Controls implementation
- OWEB fund peer review of grant application prior to RRT to identify new and innovative funds to evaluate likelihood of success
- New criteria from OWEB Board and stakeholders for new and innovative ideas
 - E.g. collaboration among highest priority investment OWEB Board – SWCDs, city government, Watershed council support – all local capacity gets highest support
- More investments in Small Grants because landowners take advantage
 - Currently, insufficient funds
 - Broaden scope of Small Grant activities, e.g. include education and outreach
- Focus on implementation goals – artificial structure that prohibits creativity
- Budget spending plan categories at watershed scale
- Promote retention continuity of staffing at local level to create trust/security with landowners
- Board view Measure 76:
 - As mandate: keep all grant programs fully statewide, adequate accessibility in every county and Legislative District
 - Alternatively, spend time and resources in best portions of the State where fish density, water quality and fish habitat can be addressed
 - These can be maintained that can be successful in acquisitions – in perpetuity
- OWEB involved in many projects and could be good messenger of effectiveness monitoring results
- What does restoration mean?
 - Preserve, Create, Restore, Creative
 - Board identify categories like this, describe Board’s interest/priorities, and apply funding accordingly

- Intentional and transparent without preventing opportunity
-

Pacific City – May 10, 2012 Written Comments

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

- Clean, healthy water and good quality habitat are measured by appropriate scientific measures of water and habitat health. These measures may have to be developed and should be reviewed regularly to make sure they are actually measuring what we want them to. Better monitoring and evaluation tools.
- Water quality improvement. Will take time for trees to shade to lower temps.
- Clean water – good fish runs. Well educated population about what is being done and how to give feedback. Local infrastructure to facilitate. Hire local firms to accomplish the task.
- Objectively measureable improvements in watershed function/health in area 4th field HUC (hydrologic unit code). Measurable improvement in watershed literacy in all school districts. Effective monitoring program. Stable local groups with adequate support.
- Focus on protection of “best” habitat - go where fish numbers and water quality are conducive to maintaining viable populations of salmonids or other valuable resources.
- More LWD available to streams. Upward trend on escapement of fish to ocean. Upward trend in area of nursery/juvenile habitat. Monitor all three.
- Measure the success and goals of your partners in each watershed.
- Turn to successful partnerships that are well-formed and already exist to learn where to go in the future – learn from the past. Better tell the story of success. May need to raise funding toward effectiveness monitoring.
- Look into land acquisition of key parcels in community watersheds and develop management agreements/plans in areas where acquisition isn't feasible. Achievement can be recognized by mapping watersheds and ownership/management thereof.
- I believe that education our youth through programs and hands-on projects, then years from now, OWEB will be able to see how their investment in education will impact the watersheds. As these youth grow, their views and knowledge will play the role of jobs and community.
- Ecosystem connectivity. Education the public. Project evaluation and feedback.
- Restoration of significant miles and wetland acres of coastal/stream and other salmonid habitat in high priority sub-basins of coastal watersheds. Protection and restoration of intact or med/high quality habitat. Knowledgeable residents who understand watershed health basics, salmonid and other native species habitat – needs and how their actions impact that. A restoration economy – contracts and jobs resulting from restoration projects.
- Projects actively accomplishing pre-determined outcomes. Supporting the active districts and councils to continually assist and monitor project ensuring continued progress.

- Investment in education and outreach -> supported programs for communities, assistance with advertising and assistance with interpretation (i.e. funding support for workshops, community events, informational signs, brochures & flyers) -> increased community involvement and buy-in. Better support of monitoring and adaptive management of projects -> support more extensive and robust pre and post monitoring efforts at project sites to allow for a better understanding of effectiveness and techniques. Allow for and support adaptive management of project sites over time -> increased effectiveness of projects, raise success of future projects and raise understanding of techniques.
- With adequate council support each watershed should be able to identify 5-10 year targets/focusing in specific restoration. It is hard to imagine setting standard achievement goals statewide since certain watersheds are facing very specific issues.
- Outcomes should include, but no be limited to: increased number of upland management including pasture management (can be measured by the number of nutrient management plans and conservation plans by SWCD), support education and outreach and measure the number of individuals reached on a quarterly basis, and obtain a baseline/continuing water quality and soil quality monitoring system.
- Assist in acquiring, restoring and protecting water sources and habitats. Evaluate program based on acres acquired, important connectors that tie together large protected areas (i.e. areas within watersheds in public ownership/control), improvements in water quality (quantifiable).
- Grants should require setting of outcomes and 3-5 year follow-up.
- How do you know you are doing what the legislature and voters approved? Achieve the outcomes outlined for the statute that created you and what the voters approved. Areas restored and fish stocks increase to acceptable levels – set a specific goal for acres restored. No net loss of wetlands in that county.
- Something truly innovative either tool or process that can be used in Oregon and exported nationally/worldwide that can be used to enhance watershed health and increase the awareness of brand Oregon. Now do you know Nobel Prize
- Protected and restored habitats and water quality. Fish runs, TMDL, long term vegetation retention along rivers. Support for community of interest and community of place for work and council.
- I'd like to see local capacity grants move to the 35% operating fund category. I'm glad that noxious/invasive weeds are funded. I'd like to see local capacity included in that (either in SWCD or WSC or other entities) & keep doing what you are already doing.
- Education
- Educated (informed) landowners who manage their land in ways that result in clean, non-toxic, water
- Outcomes should improve watershed habitat via restoration projects with local partners. Achievement is measured by number of projects completed. These include number of trees added to streams, number of culverts replaced, number of miles of riparian planting, number of acres protected via purchase or easement. Beyond physical metrics, direct and indirect economic impacts can now be estimated with some accuracy. Vital and stable a good one!
- Vital and stable watershed councils/organizations implementing best practices for watershed health. Estuary health.

- Improved water quality and water quantity and improved ecological function of watersheds by looking to make fundamental changes in practices that impact watersheds and fisheries.
- Levee and riverbank stability – reduce erosion, sediment and over/out of bank salmonid impacts.
- Property acquisition – once it is gone into development there won't be another chance. Invasive weed control of/in watersheds to protect and maintain. Watershed council support, cleaner guidance of boards and fiscal start up, projects that continue to involve the public and partners.
- Clean water – Drinking – Recreation – Biodiversity/ecological health. Access to clean water for drinking/recreation. All of these measured by common water quality indicators, species numbers/health, public recreation numbers

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

- Support for community planning of watershed and habitat work through support of local groups (staff, participant training and education etc.) focused on that work. Grants for restoration, acquisition, education. Research on best techniques, best practices, best measures of effectiveness.
- Grants for the items listed in #1 above. Grants for staff on the ground to make this happen.
- Monitor cow and farm waste. Keeping banks clean. Beyond that I am not that familiar with what tools are available to achieve this.
- More support for local capacity. More and differently delivered technical assistance. Adequate funding of restoration, education, monitoring grant programs.
- Provide the economic incentives to maintain good habitat – fund monitoring efforts that address question one.
- Riparian planting of conifers. CRP – like program/acquisitions in lower river reaches. Keep culvert/passage dollars coming, LWD funding. Training for fish passage installation -> how to properly install a culvert to provide fish passage, for example.
- Financial and technical support grants. On the ground funding. Guidance for scopes of work.
- Better outreach and communication about successes. I am technically skilled, and design/implement restoration projects often fall short telling the story to the public. I would like better education/awareness of what we are accomplishing and a better understanding of the natural processes at work.
- Land acquisition, management agreements/partnerships.
- In order to achieve the goal of watershed education, funding will play a vital part in keeping these programs going strong. As an individual who went through Mapleton's watershed program, graduating college and returning to educate students, I can really see how impactful these programs can be.
- Project success – specifically looking at restoration success and evaluating what works and what doesn't work and how we could change to make restoration successful.
- Frequent and consistent grant opportunities for restoration, monitoring, TA, education grants. Consistent council support funding.

- More education for watershed and SWCD members for example, Master Watershed Stewardship courses, workshops, field trips, etc.
- Funds to employ and retain valuable employees and prevent turn over or highly educated employees from using districts as a training ground for experience.
- Council (watershed) support to expand community support and capacity to do restoration projects. Pre and post monitoring grant support. Adaptive management support. Long term maintenance support. Monitoring for changes in watershed to keep a pulse on changes.
- Council support for individual watershed councils. Logistical support/training for coordinators. Specific logistical support may be shared between local/neighborhood councils in the form of accounting assistance, outreach, grant writing support.
- Funds for soil and water quality monitoring before and after projects, funds to assist in pasture management including noxious weed removal and control. (Farmers will apply herb/pesticides, but SWCSs can encourage best management practices and alternatives). An openness to natural resource management and utilization of resources while mitigating effects.
- Need money to acquire land and/or easements with in watershed as opportunity arises. Share with project applicants acceptable tools, carbon credits, selective thinning (yes or no?), to augment OWEB funds.
- Whole system approach with all ecosystem services considered.
- Watershed habitat restoration a priority. Cost share dollars to make other federal, state & private dollars go further.
- Do a good deed a day: Have small programs/kiosks that invite the local resident and visitor to help improve the health of the watershed they are in (tourism)
- Funding of watershed councils and staff. Dollars for restoration (in-stream and beyond streams) – including monitoring. Collaborative efforts in communities that create jobs.
- Program development for k-12 schools.
- Restoration is important but protection is equally important and probably won't be achieved without education and in some cases land acquisition and maintenance.
- Capacity grants and s grants are winners! Limit SIPS to the existing (Willamette taking all). Partnerships are critical with federal, state and private, so keep encouraging them.
- Funding, give the coast a SIP too. Continue to provide funds for acquisition, restoration, TA, outreach in one way or another. Effectiveness monitoring would be useful as well.
- Support at the state level for fundamental changes in agency thinking.
- Funding riverine deep pools in lower rivers.
- Streamline/computerize application and reporting processes. Simple database usage at the local level for tracking and organizing (Filemaker Pro). Skype options for connecting/networking – getting everyone to meetings is costly: can waste valuable time.
- Buffer zones. Water quality monitoring. Education. Access! (protection/public)

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

- Consider projects' potential to become great ecologically, rather than only current ecological value.

- Enable projects outside riparian buffer; enable funds to be allocated to road and animal crossing maintenance and support SWCDs as an educational and information avenue for the public. Support not only riparian restoration but sustainable agricultural/forest practices to mitigate sediment/nutrients.
- Formalize a strategy for communication between organizations.
- Support education and outreach to a MUCH larger degree. Support more robust monitoring. Support restoration for wildlife (wildlife corridors etc.)
- Adequately fund districts to work with landowners, build trust, get projects on the ground. By building funding for districts to administer, recruit and keep a strong employee force (even if it is only one). Land owners often complain about getting familiar with employee then the funding is gone and not wanting to work with the next employee because they will be gone with the next funding cycle.
- Ramp up education and outreach to get communities discussing and planning for global climate change and other carbon related eco-problems. Establish a method of evaluating and encouraging education of watershed council and soil and water district members. Perhaps have a standard membership educational requirement.
- Value the significant and strategic restoration projects and results from coastal councils and provide consistent and significant funding opportunities for our projects.
- Look at the effectiveness and success of the projects/programs OWEB funds---from ecological, social and economic viewpoints. Consider the entire ecosystem benefit when determining what projects to fund.
- Recognize that these three categories are intertwined and that every piece of a watershed is more deserving than a label of “moderate ecological importance.
- I would hope this question does not imply inadequacies of OWEB since 1999. I am often amazed by all OWEB/GWEB has accomplished in the state of Oregon. Having been involved with so many watershed councils over the years I am often taken aback at the diversity of the people working together for the common goal of restoration.
- Maybe institutionalize funding for watershed councils and SWCD’s?
- NA
- Grants program needs some restructuring for large complex restoration projects. Better approaches to technical assistance.
- I’m not all that familiar with all that’s being done now. The bits and pieces seem good – but more education about OWEB (and local) programs is a must. Explain the science behind the projects.
- For the most part keep doing what you do presently.
- More communication with local watershed organizations. Find ways to make more use of federal monies. More education at state and local level with partners whenever possible. More support for clear measures of habitat restoration effectiveness, through research.
- I do not know enough about past efforts to comment on “contrast”, i.e. what to do differently...
- Simplify, organize, computerize. Reach out to bigger partners: retirees, DOI project. Get the kids more involved.
- Juvenile escapement

- OWEB needs to be more of a coordinating agency, working more closely with other agencies to make sure they understand how their decisions impact water quality, water quantity and ecological function streams.
- Outreach and education funds could be a priority rather than a place to cut.
- Quit fiddling with application forms “put the process online”. Communicate the cost and value of extensive monitoring versus cost of project.
- Land acquisition should be continued (ecological). More education of landowners and other state/local agencies involved with ecological matters.
- Invest in innovative, hands-on education programs.
- Support high functioning councils – reward for work. Focus on highest importance watersheds.
- Over ½ of your dollars are being spent on other fish restoration – but should it be that low? Maybe shoot for 60%. Has there been “creep” away from restoration over time, federal and other state funds are getting less over time.

Question 4: 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?

- Is restoration the only goal? How about preventative, mandatory, enhancing, etc?
- Minimize pre-conceived judgments/rules in favor of working with proposers to craft the optimal plan for a property.
- Allocate more dollars to small grant teams. More effective projects, more landowners, more community and partner involvement.
- Council support
- Allow us to monitor – even if it does not lead to a project dealing with climate change and other carbon related issues so we can respond as needed. Fund education, fund monitoring.
- From the ground up. Fund districts adequately to administer to retain strong employees to build local trust accomplishing projects. Giving landowners security enabling the willingness to accomplish projects.
- I think there should be a specific effort to recognize and respond to emergent ecological problems in order to reduce future restoration requirements. E.g., climate change and carbon.
- Keep funding available for all types of projects (traditional grant types) and small portion set aside.
- Need more context – do not fully understand question.
- I would design the strategy to give highest priority to those endeavors that bridge all three categories rather than weighing one category as more important than another.
- Continue focused partnership opportunities in areas where “the stars align”, so to speak. For instance, area like the Salmon River Estuary. Be careful not to carve too much off the top in other arenas. Consistency and perseverance prevail.
- Direct funding to local on the ground organizations to offer funding to its partner of the local watershed.
- 45% restoration, 15% effectiveness monitoring, 15% local capacity, 25% other

- Pick up and purchase water rights as available.
- Set minimum funding levels for competitive grant program. Limit larger regional investments (SIPs) to funds over (1). Design some “mini SIP” rules for projects with 2-5 year horizons, OWEB investment of \$500K - \$1500K.
- More awareness. Most people here seem to be directly involved with OWEB or local affiliates – not much from general public (should tell you something).
- I can’t think of new ideas. I like what you have now. I am old, but still a farmer at heart. If you keep doing what you do now the social and economic benefits will come. Save ag land as much as possible. OWEB is a good department. Thank you for coming to Pacific City.
- Regularly ask for communication from OWEB board and stakeholders on new criteria for grants. Provide an “experimental” category (with a small amount of grant money) for new grant applications that don’t fit the traditional categories (i.e. restoration, acquisition, education).
- High priority on matching other funding sources for watershed restoration. Be careful of new and creative ideas that reduce the funding of good restoration activities.
- Make it a requirement that all projects have a collaborative component.
- Stable, predictable council funding.
- Seek to develop relationships within affected areas to create lifelong learning bonds with learners of all ages.
- Make a commitment to encourage and fund creative restoration activities.
- 90% existing programs. 10% new programs for new emerging issues
- SIPs = more wide spread maybe?
- Need to work/lobby other agencies to start thinking at the 50,000 food level to change their (various agencies) fundamental strategies that impact the ecological function of watersheds.
- High water side channels and upper storage. Maintain river water flows, lower rivers.
- Games – computer – to educate students
- Promote outdoor recreation/education on water resources.... Purchase easements for conservation/access. Build infrastructure (physical/policies/curriculum) for clean water economy.