

**John Day – May 8, 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?**

- Be even with ecological, community and economic results: Monitor ecological, social/economic – District has information. More listening sessions about results.
- 12 years of experience – what is important to state’s portfolio?
- Consistent resources for local infrastructure (SWCDs, WCs) for implementing communities – we have lost OWEB’s broad mission at local level. Baseline funding for coordination, outreach, vs. living project to project. Need resources for long term planning.
- Coordination between WC and SWCDs to address all resource concerns along with relevant agencies including capturing success. Disconnect between agency money and missions; communication missing. Cross-county lines an issue.
  - Harney – Weed/District/Council joint meetings – IMOT to deal with invasive species
- OWEB help counties (Wheeler, Grant) tell story of what done (west side doesn’t know)
  - Outreach to public about what is being done. Engaging, creative, thoughtful.
- Need scientific monitoring results (not possible on all projects); pick a few to show results. Not happening now. Needs a control/peer review/evidence. Multiple years/funding/pre and post
  - Example juniper
  - Outcome = functioning systems—difference on the land, benefits to communities, increased production
- Thriving wildlife, healthy watershed ridge top to ridge top
  - Vision statement: fewer weeds; landowner and ranchers keep land and livelihood reward for good stewardship
- Outcome – enable private landowner to have sustainable agriculture operations – treat causes of issues
- No longer degrading is a positive also – what would it have been.
- Whole watershed not always practical – landowners need to support harder to coordinate these. Is it more effective than cumulative random projects? Need flexibility.
- Watershed scale = will it cut out landowners (NRCS example). Look at it conditionally vs. geographically. Look at best bang for buck e.g. type of stream. Does this approach meet goals and outcomes you have targeted? Need honest conversation about priorities.
- Easier to measure whole watershed results
- Outcome = 50 years not 10.
  - Healthy environment compatible with working landscapes
- Wildlife/wild horses – need to address. Educate public about impact of wildlife/horses – OWEB discuss with ODFW about habitat and listed species and what agencies do
- Sees emphasis on fish habitat – not wildlife – fish get funding, wildlife not funded
- Once cut juniper, system self-maintaining – don’t have to go back
- In 10 years, did we meet the balance of triple bottom line? 3 indicators should be described

- Check in – were outcomes met? Did we do what we said we were going to do?
- Address uplands/root cause, not just symptoms
- Is the problem really being solved?
- Bang for buck – e.g. spring development on upland and help riparian
- 10 years – links upland and riparian
- Show what has been done
- OFRI publication example
  - success and history of accomplishments, pictures
    - OWEB different messenger
    - Network Atlas. OACD
- Entire watersheds
  - Now = grant or relationship driven acts
  - Landscape scale: partner/OWEB identify watersheds or resource based concern best benefit from landscape treatments; focused e.g. weeds on a regional basis
  - Projects focus on cause not symptom, e.g. habitat not just sage grouse
  - landowners are maintaining entire watersheds
  - Need ready landowner
  - Uplands work starts – opens door to stream work
  - After 10 years – some watersheds are functioning – “done” and sustainable
- Re: monitoring-Demonstrate improvements related to OWEB funding in natural resources
- Monitor and evaluate objectively, fairly, equitable – you can see the effects of the work.
- OWEB is currently doing an excellent job. Good management and water are the fundamental foundation of food stability, i.e. providing food supply to our people. OWEB is helping with this. Keep up the good work.
- Invest in innovation. Practitioners should be encouraged to try new practices when they are appropriately justified.
- Hope to see diverse practices over diverse landscapes.
- Operators have a broad pallet of tools to draw from.
- Avoid a single species focus.
- Better understanding of which approaches work and which do not.
- Need better understanding and better communication/education regarding the association between uplands and riparian. This understanding needs to be implemented. OWEB needs to internally understand this and spread the word to resource people and to the public – including children.
- OWEBs goal should be that 100% of the public perceives OWEB in a positive light.
- Step back on monitoring – rethink what we are currently doing. Currently monitoring is driven by agencies “far from the ground”. We need to question the indicators being used.
- Need good definitions of watershed. What is a whole landscape? We need to take holistic looks at problems.
- OWEB needs to examine the entities it is currently granting to and determine what is appropriate. There may be some who shouldn’t be funded.
- A water rights battle is coming. OWEB should be prepared to respond to this. All its programs are connected to this issue. Stay out in front. Educate now.

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

- Consider changing grant cycle timing and time in between to allow more depth for projects
  - Include in grants an ‘economic impact’ reporting component
- Funding
  - Keep money for watershed councils, SWCDs and other local groups – provide staffing certainty, technical assistance and training
  - More money to manage weeds
- Monitoring
  - Fund measuring devices
  - Partner with others to do monitoring and research to gather real, usable data (e.g. juniper and other issues)
  - OWEB help develop a standardized protocol that shows results – in the long term; pre- and post-monitoring not just ‘snap shots’
- Diversity - TRT members to be balanced across interests and expertise
  - Internal education of OWEB so they have a good understanding of on the ground efforts
- Work with regulating agencies to help keep known on the ground successes moving forward – shorten the turn-around time
  - OWEB can help on all projects, not just OWEB funded
- Shift public perceptions
  - Share successes
  - Explain/emphasize complexity of watersheds
  - Be creative
  - Touch on all three triple bottom line benefits
- Public education
  - Provide money for education programs (e.g. OSU Extension) and tools, e.g. Weed books
  - Prevention education
  - Create and consolidate education materials for use by OWEB and its partners
- More money for small grants
  - Raise limits
- Shift in paradigm – flexibility – move away from passive to active management role
  - Invest in working landscapes
  - Work on the ground
  - Outcomes based – see CCOs as a model
- More technical assistance for CREP projects and follow-up with recipients to understand any problems encountered...technical or process
- Develop a non-chemical weed management options list
- Grants with less paper-work
- OWEB should develop trust re: competence of people on the ground to allow them to get from grant award to project completion. More flexibility should be given for project to achieve the ultimate outcome without the need for approval of modifications as often as currently required.

- OWEB should maintain/develop good relationships among its many partners and grass roots supporters. This network needs to get the word out about all the good projects and great work being done. Build a positive public image now so that when future public controversy strikes – you are ahead of it.

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

- Look at overall watershed function, not just fish
  - Application review and in setting local priorities
  - Increase acreage of upland treatment
- In application and in reporting at closeout, specifically report economic and social outcomes (jobs, etc.)
- Shift acquisitions to a local economic development fund for environmentally based jobs (pellet plant, slash-burning boilers, green projects) or restoration projects
- Shift some level of acquisition funding to easements –local ownership vs. public county revenues
- Put accomplishments in the news, promote more successful projects
- Increase funding for monitoring and provide tools and guidance – pre- and post-measurement
- Priorities should be region-specific and based on priorities locally – one size does not fit all – land and water
- Invest in restoration with active landowners
- Invest in/incentivize land-banking, ecosystem market payments
- Utilize research already done – what projects create jobs
- Use pilots to prove project success, then fund what works based on pilot (i.e. juniper)
  - Effectively monitor pilots programmatically
  - Address regulatory streamlining
  - Use template when we know what works – type of juniper per project/location
- Be smart enough to know where we need to spend time monitoring – what is the monitoring going to accomplish?
- Monitoring is different with different funders – find a way to simplify process – find ways that work for landowners
- Right now, monitoring is a snapshot – need to monitor for results
- Analyze small grant teams – are they able to spend funds? Are projects too focused? Should membership change? Is the geographic split appropriate?
- Make it clear the value of OWEBs programs. Tie them to real values to Oregonians. What is it actually achieving for our society? Specifically, how do OWEB’s programs contribute to “food security”, i.e. promoting a plentiful supply of food to Oregonians?
- OWEB needs to do a better job of planning and establishing goals or outcomes for projects that OWEB initiates, especially the large or complex ones. OWEB expects this for its grantees. An example of one project where this could have been better done is the IMW project – it lacks a sense of where it is going.
- OWEB should stay current with the most recent scientific information on tools, practices, etc. OWEB then should also keep its partners and grantees informed and promote “lessons learned” discussions.

- The OWEB board should think about a level of funding for scientific investigation.
- Collect information /stories about challenges or negative impacts to grantees caused by projects. This can be used to improve programs or as “lessons learned” for others. Example – Biological insect control work causing loss or organic farming certification for a period of time.
- To get the word out about the benefits coming from OWEB – Develop education packages, conduct workshops, use information networks such as email, etc. Find ways to communicate that work. Ask yourself... Are there “3” outstanding projects in Oregon that people don’t know about. If yes, there is work to do.

**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?**

- Whole watershed approach
  - Leadership from Board’s staff, RPRs
  - Be aware of local capacity to do coordination
  - Vision, message
  - Within, preserve flexibility for high value/low cost, good projects
- Focus on uplands and don’t lose sight of linkage to riparian, wetlands, in stream, etc.
- Focus on root causes – not symptoms
  - E.g. juniper, noxious weeds – ask WHY we have them
  - Prevention
- Technical assistance to local groups to provide root cause information for landowners
- Effectiveness monitoring
  - Adoption of guidelines, protocols, methods
  - Training – ultimately to landowners
    - Weeds
- Long term management plans, e.g. juniper
- Ensure connection to local conservation plans, recovery plans, watershed actions
- Increase small grant program to hit on high value, low cost projects
  - increase cap and add funds
  - One large grant cycle to hit on whole watershed ideas, combined with more small grant opportunities
- Allow for risk – create innovative untested ideas projects
  - Would need to be developed, not a big part of OWEB’s portfolio
- Research
  - Pilot programs – new and different
    - Opportunity for linkage to NRCS GIS
    - Each region different – allow for that flexibility
- OWEB catalyst for coordination and conversation
  - State and federal agencies including NOAA
  - State initiatives and incentives
  - Strategic conversation and coordination and implementation with ODA/SWCDs 1010 Program
- Outcomes based priorities

- Coordinate with other state and federal agencies
  - Satisfy multiple outcomes
  - Avoid OWEB budget sliding – budget can be limiting factor to accomplishment – try to prevent that through goal setting
  - Rule out OWEB nixing projects approved by local teams
  - Education of OWEB staff
  - Recognition of successful programs: applications and other relief to good actions
  - Consider replacing restoration grant program with small grants and whole watershed type projects
    - Use efficiencies of small grants as a model
  - Consider changing the approach to granting/budgeting from the current administrative categories to ecological outcomes (e.g. upland systems, forests, etc). To deliver the outcomes, proposers would describe what is needed to achieve the outcomes. Avoid redundancy in processes – don't be afraid to take some risk. You would have to explore the landscape scale at which this would work. The approach would encourage creativity. Consider how accountability would be provided. If this cannot be done for all grantees, consider it for a more limited group that OWEB could “recognize” for high success in the past and thus allowing them this greater level of flexibility.
  - OWEB, ranchers, watershed councils, NRCS districts, funding organizations should all stay ahead of controversy. Despite the good work, OWEB will always be subject to criticism as well as support. As a firewall to head off future challenges work together to get the word out about the benefits of what is being done, build support. Remember that the potential exists for fallibility in projects. Preparation ahead of time will make it easier to get past any mistakes or challenges made to what is being done.
- 

## **John Day – May 8, 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?**

- Gains in all of the above categories – some parts of the state will move faster – monitoring will help – I guess a few more “listening sessions”
- Provide opportunities for landowners to improve their natural resources in a manner that benefits the land and wildlife while also creating sustainable agricultural operations.
- Stream restoration through upland investment – less looking at symptoms and more focus on cause of degradation. Take a holistic approach. I expect some watersheds to be pretty well restored with minimal additional funding needed

- Co-existent local infrastructure should be developed and maintained to provide tech, financial and educational resources geared towards local factors and issues affecting the management of natural resources.
- Working to improve water quality and get a baseline of monitoring in most regions the first part of 10 years and the last part monitor again and see what is the difference.
- Restoration requirements are huge, and often extremely complex and political. I believe in landscape scale projects, which we have been able to accomplish, with OWEB funding for cooperators, and which has also leveraged federal funding for public lands. Would like to see much more of a larger scale and multiply invested partners. Still need to address field/stream/watershed restoration at the key purpose.
- Book/DVD/Brochure product that relates success. The logic, history and accomplishments at OWEB. OFRI as an example (Oregon Forest Resource Institute magazine/book). Utility and ecology of juniper management.
- Measurable advancement in de-listing Mid C steelhead. When we do a review in 10 years, people believe there is a reasonable balance in the three indicators. We can see a difference on the land and communities have tangibly benefitted.
- Healthy functioning watersheds and data to support it.
- Thriving wildlife, healthy watershed – ridge top to ridge top. Few weeds – more grass, shrubs, trees and landowners and ranchers are able to keep their land and lively hoods, encouraging and rewarding good stewardship.
- Starting now – in long term effectiveness monitoring program should be implemented for the John Day Basin – an upland juniper long range plan should be developed. Ultimately range land hydrological cycle.
- Taking land that has limited to no use and restoring it to achieve a higher production level. The outcome can be measured through visual monitoring and/or animal use.
- Improved ecological function of watersheds. Improved relationships with partners
- Complete “restoration” projects – or all inclusive of all resources by looking at past projects, results and discussion with local offices. Not just fish! Entire watershed approach.
- Promoting watershed health, assisting water users small and large to do better and more viable operations (economics, resource protection, efficiency, etc.) Assisting with the viability of communities and the state. Promotion of SWCD’s, resource projects, restoration projects, water improvement projects, efficiency projects. Seeing better habitat, upland, AG production viability, water resources management. Monitor success – document improvements, water measurements, weed status, grazing/upland health etc.
- Water quality – range land hydrologic cycle. Broadening focus – actually looking at the whole watershed -> top to bottom.
- Water rights intervention. People are encouraged to try new practices – ecological, social and economic if they have the justification. Diverse projects over diverse landscapes. Plan. Broad understanding of what works and what doesn’t. Uplands/watershed interaction – understanding at all levels of public and private. Operators have a broad palette of tools with which to work. Holistic looks at problems. What is a whole landscape? Across the board – positive upbeat perspective of OWEB. Appropriate monitoring tools and practices. Definition of grantees and what they should be doing – identify level of specialization. Look beyond the single species focus.

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

- Enough money to fully facilitate our council so we can meet OWEB deliverables and also expand our activities and projects.
- Funding opportunities for on the ground implementation, research and technical assistance, and monitoring of projects.
- Greater emphasis on upland projects. Consistent funding (capacity for WC & districts)
- Provide greater local control of investments in priorities identified by the communities they will benefit.
- Monitoring. Outreach – to prove that domestic livestock is not the only thing that can cause problems in watershed. There is nature, wildlife, human for recreation, feral horses.
- Funding. Understanding and guidance, education to address complexities and growth, connectivity with multiple stakeholders and partners. Need to understand watersheds, not just green lines – they are ultimately connected.
- Solidify utility of fire to manage juniper without conversion to cheat grass etc. Small grant funding increased.
- More support for tech. assistance. More support for training and networking ideas. Consider tec. Assistance for 2 grant cycles in a row. Small orgs – watershed councils lack skills, yet get involved with complex, multi-year projects.
- Look at the whole watershed health, uplands and other non-riparian areas are important to the overall watershed function. Monitoring funding and assistance available.
- Continued and possible increase in upland funding. If the uplands aren't healthy there won't be fish.
- Three percent research we need to be able to quantify how much water we are re-introducing into the system with juniper removal projects. Updated watershed assessment manual.
- Allow each project to be managed at the local level without middle management interference. Specifically small grants. Provide education to contract personnel with in OWEB on natural and range land resources and how they work together – each part is important. Consider noxious weed control as restoration. Does not always fall to OSWB. More consideration to local folks and resource limitations.
- Fund SWCD and projects, diversion replacement projects, water efficiency projects, uplands management, weed control, measuring devices for water management. Improved water management (funding of people for that purpose). Other agency support for positions, stock water options – funding for legal options for people who need stock water alternatives other than open ditches.
- Outreach publication. Workshops – funding easier to secure? Research – help secure funding on a state level for incentives for aftermarket juniper products.
- Create or consolidate educational materials. Non-chemical comprehensive weed options. Grants with less paperwork. Freedom to move from point of grant award to point of completion.

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

- Composition of review teams more diversified? Willing to look above the stream
- Measuring device funding, encourage legal use of water rights -> put more water in stream. Not just project based but maybe open to small grant program. More funding for SWCD's and small groups that perform SWCD functions. Broaden funding for diversified options to assist watersheds – one size doesn't fit all. Monitor effectiveness of projects – uniformity. Share/publish success. Education – public, PR options, agencies, etc.
- Provide OWEB staff education, consider projects and each component for the benefit of the entire project. Consider noxious weeds prior to any restoration efforts by involving local weed program supervisors at the county level.
- Do not focus the restoration efforts so much on fish habitat within the riparian zones, consider the effects the uplands have on both fish and wildlife.
- I believe making a noticeable impact in each community throughout Oregon should always be OWEB'S goal. Teaching people why restoration is critical and showing how it benefits all three of the above topics.
- Re-think upland project prioritization, re-think the grazing plan requirement. Make range land hydrologic cycle a major priority and make project implementation requirements feasible for land managers. Listen sessions for practitioners.
- Re-structure and re-focus small grant teams. Sometimes team members are inflexible and too focused on the fish.
- Look at whole watershed function; that proper grazing management and uplands health impacts healthy streams. Focus on monitoring – there needs to be more emphasis on monitoring of conditions and projects and funds available to support that.
- Not sure
- Put accomplishments in the news and not in some forgotten canyon. Increase acreage of upland treatments. Low tech solutions: surveys vs. GPS maps. Grasp fire as a tool.
- Perhaps require more background and follow up for grants/programs to address social and economic as well as ecological. Monitoring resources, guidance.
- To treat most areas as equal – what may need to be done in the John Day valley may be different than the other watershed, but you should be equal for money in each area. If you need more money in one area the first year – then maybe less the next several years.
- Increase direct cooperation with local communities and incorporate their priorities at a more specific level.
- Look more at the whole watershed not just the stream. Examine true causes of non-functioning systems and address those issues. The in stream/riparian projects are pretty but may not be the best small investment.
- Trade in the acquisitions budget for an economic based funding program.
- Fund our council at the level it needs. We could experience difficulty waiting until 2015 funding levels.
- Better planning at the ground level. In some way get involved in the research and science. Remove veil for general public

**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?**

- Put a cap on large grants? Focus on restoration and education: More focus on small grants -> more adaptive, quicker to get money on the ground.
- Maybe allocate some funding to “non-standard” ideas so they don’t have to compete against all the other projects for funding? Focus on tried and true programs that work and have a proven track record – i.e. projects that give a definite return for the investment. Smaller projects that give a minimal return then may take a lower priority ranking. Just ideas? Make processes easier – don’t work independently but combine efforts – coordination of efforts with other agencies and feds.
- Education of the board and internal OWEB staff. After monitoring standards to be the same across agencies (OSWEB/OWEB/USFWS). Use the expertise of local on the ground folks before making a major project decision.
- I would look at ridge top to ridge top conservation practices
- Start with projects at the top and work down. Bottom up projects should also be encouraged if the uplands are considered first.
- I would like to see more funds in small grants to put on the ground projects funded by local priorities. One grant cycle with larger funds and more feedback on projects.
- Starting with the ecological mandate, use community/economic aspects as key criteria in funding projects. Assume that projects selected have multiple benefits, i.e., partners, landscapes, etc., over single benefit projects. Tie projects to local planning priorities and also bigger picture priorities with in watersheds and basins. Reduce randomness in project selections. Provide for more networking of ideas, encouraging adaptation and creativity.
- Active grant process continues with set-aside for “radical” ideas. Each grant cycle gets a “cherry bomb” fund a “miracle” or a chance to really leap/learn.
- Kind of covered in 1-3 above. Root causes – not symptomatic. Increase small grant amounts available anytime. Once per year for large grants.
- New and creative ideas need to be used for education because the new and creative ideas usually are turned down – so they need to be demonstrated.
- Define an agency strategy that allows for adjustments to be defined by a designated local entity. Reward positive outcomes.
- High priority areas that address true causes of non-functioning systems.
- Provide significant levels of funding for proven restoration activities, but also allow a smaller percentage of funding for research, trials, monitoring, etc.
- I would concentrate on getting projects on the ground – less process – overhead is \$\$ taken from fish. OWEB application/paperwork is onerous. Some additional ideas and issues were forced out of me during the 4 sessions so I guess it was a positive experience.
- Watch out for redundancy. Don’t be afraid to take risks.