

APPROVED BY THE BOARD January 26, 2016
Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board
October 27, 2015
OWEB Board Meeting
John Day, Oregon

Minutes

OWEB Members Present

Ron Alvarado
Rosemary Furfey
Mike Haske
Debbie Hollen
Doug Krahmer
Randy Labbe
Will Neuhauser
Lisa Phipps
Eric Quaempts
John Roberts
Dan Thorndike
Bob Webber

OWEB Staff Present

Meta Loftsgaarden
Renee Davis
Courtney Shaff
Eric Hartstein
Juniper Davis
Eric Williams
Ken Fetcho
Cammi Hungate
Katie Duzik
Mark Grenbemer
Liz Redon
John Amoroso
Karen Leiendecker
Sue Greer

Others Present

Anna Rankin
Conrad Gowell
Amy Stiner
Herb Winters
Amy Charette
Ryan Gordon
Jerry Nicolescu
Kelley Beamer
Claire Klock
Bryan Vogt
Sandy McKay
Debra Bunch

A. Board Member Comments

Board Members provided comments from their respective areas and agencies.

B. Minutes

Minutes of the April 28-29, 2015, Board meeting in Salem, and the July 28-29, 2015, Board meeting in Prineville were presented for approval.

Eric Quaempts moved to approve the April 28-29, 2015, and July 28-29, 2015, Board meeting minutes. Seconded by Lisa Phipps. Motion passed unanimously.

C. Public Comment

- Anna Rankin, Pudding River Watershed Council, was seeking guidance and gave a report on her watershed council. She urged the Board to look at Oregon Live article *Farmer vs. Farmer* to see the controversy about a reservoir being created for agricultural watering. Currently, fish passage is not feasible, but she wants to know if a waiver is needed, and is seeking advice on fish passage, water quality and water quantity on the Pudding River. She would also like to see a study of the effects of pesticides on macroinvertebrates.
- Ryan Gordon, Network of Oregon Watershed Councils (NOWC), and Jerry Nicolescu, Oregon Association of Conservation Districts (OACD), gave a brief update on the NOWC-OACD Partnership. Jerry commented in support of Agenda Items C and D. This was a great CREP application cycle and will result in good projects on the ground. He also commented in support of Strategic Implementation Areas from ODA and urged

Board approval. Jerry thanked the Board on behalf of the Districts for sage-grouse efforts. Ryan commented that there are many partnerships evolving in the collective efforts of the Oregon Conservation Partnership. He appreciates the support of OWEB and NRCS to develop this partnership. He plans to provide updates on the partnership twice a year. He gave kudos to the volunteers putting the conference together. He highlighted the “Upriver” documentary film.

- Amy Stiner, Upper South Fork Watershed Council, Herb Winters, Wheeler SWCD, and Amy Charette, Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs, commented on the John Day Basin Partnership. Amy gave an update on the plight of the John Day River basin, describing that there are more fish in the system than the river has carrying capacity for. More restoration opportunities exist than there are funds available. They plan to apply for a Focused Investment Partnership Capacity Building grant and plan to create a strategic action plan in 2016.
- Amy Charette, Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs, commented on the John Day Strategy document and provided copies to the Board. The program is BPA funded and she described their process and the Tribes’ prioritization development.

D. Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program Technical Assistance (CREP TA) -- Approval to Receive Program Funding

Juniper Davis, Partnerships Coordinator, provided the Board an update on the CREP TA grant program. Staff request the Board consider awarding supplemental funding from the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) in support of CREP TA and delegating authority to the Executive Director for distribution of these funds.

John Roberts asked about landowner obligations and length of enrollments. Juniper Davis responded that agreements covered 10-15 year periods, and that agreements required landowners to reimburse CREP funds if terms are violated. Will Neuhauser asked if the Legislature needs to delegate funds to OWEB. Director Loftsgaarden explained that legislative approval is required to apply for grants. In this case, there is no grant application, so legislative approval is not required at this stage, but approval will be required to accept the funds. Lisa Phipps would like to put effort toward making this program more appealing to coastal landowners.

Eric Quaempts moved to approve receipt of \$150,000 in supplemental funding from NRCS and delegate authority to the Executive Director to enter into appropriate agreements with an award date of October 27, 2015. Seconded by Doug Kraemer. Motion passed unanimously.

E. Oregon Department of Agriculture (ODA) Strategic Implementation Areas Funding Request

Eric Hartstein, Senior Policy Coordinator, and John Byers, Agricultural Water Quality Program Manager for ODA, provided an update to the Board and described an OWEB grant program on Strategic Implementation Areas (SIAs). The Board considered a funding request for this grant program and to delegate authority to the Executive Director for distribution of these funds.

- Will Neuhauser asked if restoration included irrigation conversion and Eric Hartstein said that it had to directly improve water quality. He was concerned about the connection between open solicitation water quality projects and the SIAs, and wondered if it would make sense to transfer funds to the SIA pool for all water quality projects. Meta Loftsgaarden explained that the goal was to accelerate the investment in this area and not

decelerate it in other areas. She also explained the process for distribution of funds after the Board approves the funding.

- Lisa Phipps asked if ODA will move forward if there was not support from the SWCDs. John Byers explained that they are working with SWCDs and those efforts continue to gain support from SWCDs. The seven SIAs were chosen this time in close coordination with the SWCDs. There was concern from the Board about the addition of these funds to the budget. Meta Loftsgaarden clarified that these are additional dollars available based on the success of the agency in the PCSRF competitive granting process.
- Rosemary Furfey encouraged ODA to use recovery plans as additional resources.
- Randy Labbe asked for an electronic version of the presentation. Meta Loftsgaarden said they would be available online after the Board meeting and that a link would be provided.
- Will Neuhauser would like a discussion in the future on shifting money from focused investment funds to SIAs for agricultural water quality. Meta Loftsgaarden said that based on success of this program, OWEB can go back to the Legislature and ask for increased funding for these types of programs.

Dan Thorndike moved to add \$1 million of PCSRF funding to the 2015-2017 spending plan. Seconded by Randy Labbe. Motion passed unanimously.

Dan Thorndike moved to utilize \$1 million for Strategic Implementation Area grants in coordination with the Oregon Department of Agriculture and delegate authority to the Executive Director to enter into appropriate agreements with an award date of October 27, 2015. Seconded by Doug Kraemer. Motion passed unanimously.

F. Funding Request for the Upper Middle Fork John Day Intensively Monitored Watershed (IMW)

Ken Fetcho, Effectiveness Monitoring Coordinator, provided an update to the Board on the monitoring activities of the IMW. The Board considered a funding request for this program from the Programmatic Effectiveness Monitoring for Open Solicitation line item in the 2015-2017 Spending Plan and delegated authority to the Executive Director for distribution of these funds.

- John Roberts asked why three universities were being used, and whether the project would be more efficient using one university. Ken Fetcho stated that each university brings different areas of expertise to the project.
- Lisa Phipps asked why this is not a line item in the budget since it is a known long-term monitoring project. Meta Loftsgaarden explained that the funding is subject to annual federal appropriations and we do not know how much to expect each year. Meta also noted that a number of different programs might apply for programmatic monitoring, and since we do not know how much requests may be, a separate line item would be difficult to establish. It was noted that OWEB has always supplemented this Effectiveness Monitoring, and the Board motion would be increasing this amount.
- Eric Quaempts asked if there was a centralized data management system for these projects. Ken Fetcho confirmed that there is a password-controlled access database available.
- Eric Quaempts also asked if the students at the universities can obtain higher degrees with this project. Ken Fetcho explained that there are opportunities for the students, but recommendations of the program and final reports are still being created.

- Dan Thorndike stated that this was the ninth year of a ten year project, and asked what happens next. Ken Fetcho responded that we will need justification for future funding requests, and that NOAA likes this project. The data already obtained provides a roadmap for future monitoring.
- Dan Thorndike stated that this dataset is very valuable historically.

Eric Quaempts moved to award up to \$100,874 in support of the Intensively Monitored Watershed from the Programmatic Effectiveness Monitoring for Open Solicitation line item in the 2015-2017 spending plan and delegate authority to the Executive Director to enter into appropriate agreements with an award date of October 27, 2015. Seconded by Lisa Phipps. Motion passed unanimously.

G. Pending Regular Grant Applications

Introduction

Prior to hearing public comment, Courtney Shaff, Capacity Coordinator, provided background information on the April 2015 grant cycle.

- Lisa Phipps asked about the Salmon Plate projects and how the projects were chosen. Eric Hartstein and Courtney Shaff provided an overview of the selection process.
- Bob Webber asked about signage of Salmon Plate funded projects. Eric Hartstein stated that signage was discussed for public access, but it has to be included in the project budget.

Public Comment

Public comment on pending restoration and technical assistance grant applications to be considered for funding was heard by the Board.

- Conrad Gowell, Mid Coast Watersheds Council (North Coast Region), commented in support for North Creek fish passage TA 216-1010 (October 2015 cycle 216-1037). OWEB funds are needed to do a geotechnical survey. Five plus miles of salmon habitat are affected. There are many passage barrier issues at this site. This highly igneous site, with a small amount of sandstone, provides all the water quality and water quantity benefits of the igneous geology. This site may act as a climate shield which would protect the salmonid habitat. Downstream water quality issues could be a problem if this stream crossing should fail. There is a lot of public support. The Council received a \$100,000 grant from the US Forest Service (USFS) for construction, which must be used within two years.
 - John Roberts asked why the landowner did not contribute financially. Conrad Gowell stated that the landowner is the US Forest Service, who contributed \$100,000 toward the project.
 - Randy Labbe asked about USFS match and he had concern about the total project cost estimates.
 - Dan Thorndike asked about the necessity and urgency of this project. Conrad Gowell stated that the other grant funds received (not OWEB) have a 2-year expiration date.
 - Lisa Phipps said that the distinction of the landowner vs. the user of the road could have been made clearer in the application. She also had concerns that the removal of downstream weirs should have been clearer in the application. Conrad

Gowell stated that it was addressed in comments after the regional review team meeting, along with the letter of support.

Board Consideration of Pending Regular Grant Applications

The Board considered grant applications submitted by the April 20-21, 2015, application deadline for restoration and technical assistance grants. Proposals, supporting materials, and funding recommendations were discussed and acted on by the Board.

Region 1 – Attachment E

- Lisa Phipps said that the review team decided to fund #216-1010, but it fell below the funding line and was seeking clarification on why. Courtney Shaff stated that the review team felt this did have high ecological value, but they were uncertain how future restoration efforts would go forward. The review team did receive a letter from the lessee stating that they could not provide any monetary support for projects. Katie Duzik stated that some of the comments that Conrad Gowell brought forth would change how the project is reviewed. Courtney informed the Board that this project has been submitted in the October 2015 grant cycle.
- Dan Thorndike stated that seeing why the review team ranked the projects how they did was beneficial.
- Randy Labbe inquired about the resubmitted grant application #216-1010. Meta Loftsgaarden replied that the project has to be funded now or wait for the resubmitted application review.
- Will Neuhauser asked Katie Duzik if there were barrier prioritization assessments occurring in the North Coast. Katie invited Conrad Gowell back up to confirm that this is happening.
- Rosemary Furfey asked about the watershed priority. Katie Duzik deferred to Debbie Hollen to provide clarification on the USFS watershed priority process.
- Bob Webber stated that ODFW has fish passage as a priority, but understands that funding is limited and tough decisions have to be made.

Lisa Phipps moved to approve funding for Project #216-1010 in Attachment E to the staff report. Seconded by Randy Labbe. Motion failed 4:4.

Dan Thorndike moved to approve funding for Project #216-1008 in Attachment E to the staff report. Seconded by Randy Labbe. Lisa Phipps recused herself for a conflict of interest. Motion passed unanimously.

Dan Thorndike moved to approve the remaining staff funding recommendations as shown in the gray-shaded sections of Attachment E to the staff report. Seconded by Randy Labbe. Motion passed unanimously.

Region 2 – Attachment F

- Lisa Phipps asked if #216-2012 could be broken into phases, and Mark Grenbemer stated that it could not be.
- Dan Thorndike wanted more discussion on why #216-2012 was a number one priority. Mark Grenbemer stated that this is a rare and unique project. It has all the elements of what a restoration project should look like. It is shovel ready once funding is approved.

- Bob Webber stated that project #216-2012 is the type of project with puzzle pieces that have to take place in order otherwise it won't work.

Dan Thorndike moved to approve the staff funding recommendations as shown in the gray-shaded sections of Attachment F to the staff report. Seconded by Will Neuhauser. Motion passed unanimously.

Region 3 – Attachment G

- Lisa Phipps noted that she appreciates the new staff report format. Will Neuhauser agreed, particularly the maps. Eric Quaempts would like to see a statewide map of projects.

Dan Thorndike moved to approve the staff funding recommendations as shown in the gray-shaded sections of Attachment G to the staff report. Seconded by Doug Kraemer. Motion passed unanimously.

Region 4 – Attachment H

- Lisa Phipps noted that only two TA proposals were received in Region 4 and both were recommended for funding. She asked whether they were recommended because there were only two proposals, or because they were good proposals. Courtney stated that these were very well done TA applications and are similar to other successful TA grants completed by the same applicants in the past.

Dan Thorndike moved to approve the staff funding recommendations as shown in the gray-shaded sections of Attachment H to the staff report. Seconded by Bob Webber. Motion passed unanimously.

Region 5 – Attachment I

- Randy Labbe asked Karen Leindecker how she thought partnerships were in Harney. She is confident in these partnerships.
- Eric Quaempts asked Karen Leindecker if tribal culture food plants were being considered. She does not know, but is sure that the Burns-Paiute Tribe is working with partners on this.
- Will Neuhauser wanted more clarification about project #216-5001. Staff responded that the proposal creates five new pastures out of one to move cattle away from the stream, provides fencing, and will provide useful data on cattle grazing rotation and wildlife exclusion. There was discussion about funding projects on federal lands.
- John Roberts asked whether the applicant holds water rights. Karen Leindecker answered affirmatively.
- Lisa Phipps appreciates the LiDAR funding and would like to see this continue and complemented the program representatives on using LiDAR in their presentation.

Dan Thorndike moved to approve the staff funding recommendations as shown in the gray-shaded sections of Attachment I to the staff report. Seconded by Randy Labbe. Motion passed unanimously.

Region 6 – Attachment J

Dan Thorndike moved to approve the staff funding recommendations as shown in the gray-shaded sections of Attachment J to the staff report. Seconded by Lisa Phipps. Motion passed unanimously.

H. Public Comment

- Kelley Beamer from Coalition for Oregon Land Trusts (COLT) commented on Agenda Item J Land Acquisitions. COLT expresses support for the Land Acquisition program revisions. She said that there is a lot of moving pieces and the outside match (not from OWEB) might not necessarily align with OWEB's grant cycles and the transparency and flexibility is much appreciated.

I. Water Acquisitions Program Refinements

Renee Davis, Deputy Director, and Eric Hartstein, Senior Policy Coordinator, proposed refinements to the water acquisitions grant program to the Board based on lessons learned from the 2013-2015 test pilot.

- Dan Thorndike expressed concern that emerging programs would not be successful due to capacity issues, and asked what would keep them in the game. Renee Davis responded that we have not seen serious inquiries from emerging programs, and that the Board may want to tackle this issue by the end of this biennium. Dan then asked whether organizational capacity review is enough to invite all applicants. Renee responded that we may start with a few leases, particularly with the expanded eligible costs. Lisa Phipps said that there was merit in not fully aligning with National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF) because of its certification process and the uncertainty of benefits to applicants going through that process. She also wanted clarification on the process for emerging programs. Lisa wanted to know if an applicant that didn't have a track record behind them could still be offered the acquisition opportunity and if OWEB would help with structure. Renee clarified that there are baseline questions that will portray that applicants have some baseline capacity.
- Rosemary Furfey asked whether another bullet could be added about how to become an emerging program and how OWEB would work with them. Meta Loftsgaarden stated that OWEB will not provide start-up funds to create organizational capacity. Renee stated that OWEB's next steps would be to flush out what the emerging programs should look like and create sideboards and guidelines.
- John Roberts asked whether applicants could ask for funding from both NFWF and OWEB. Renee Davis responded that applicants could apply to both through separate applications.
- Eric Quaempts asked about the Water Resources timeline. Eric Hartstein said that OWEB is working with Water Resources through this biennium.
- Bob Webber questioned the use of the NFWF certification process and why an applicant could not meet their certification. Renee Davis explained that the applicants to date do meet NFWF criteria, but others that might apply do not have a proven track record and therefore, opportunities would be limited for them.

- Will Neuhauser asked if applicants could work with a proxy. Renee Davis responded that they could, but some organizations have limited service areas. There are places that are capacity limited.
- Dan Thorndike noted that Freshwater Trust is not geographically limited and has historically achieved results. He is comfortable with the recommendations.

Dan Thorndike moved to approve the refinements to the Water Acquisitions Program guidance outlined in Section IV of the staff report. Seconded by Will Neuhauser. Motion passed unanimously.

J. Land Acquisitions – Process

Renee Davis, Deputy Director, requested Board approval to the land acquisition review process.

- From staff’s understanding, OWEB would be the only granting agency that would allow for a check-in on grants midway through the process to see if more due diligence work had been completed. Debbie Hollen clarified that the Board is not committing to *do* the midpoint check, but that the Board is agreeing to *look* into it.
- Lisa Phipps asked that the pre-application process involve a few more people.
- Mike Haske wanted clarification on the public hearing process. Renee Davis clarified that currently, it is for just the applications that the Board subcommittee has selected, but staff propose it would be for all applications. Renee also noted that public hearings would happen closest to the acquisition. Meta Loftsgaarden noted that those both favorable and unfavorable toward acquisitions support the public hearing process.
- Will Neuhauser stated that he liked how the process revisions were approached.
- Kelley Beamer, representing the Coalition of Oregon Land Trusts commended OWEB on its adaptive management process and supported the proposed process revisions. She noted that land trusts initially flagged the need for a mid-point check-in.
- Renee Davis informed the Board that, in this grant cycle, there are three applications asking for just over \$3 million

Eric Quaempts moved to approve the refinements to the Land Acquisition Program guidance outlined in Section IV of the staff report. Seconded by Lisa Phipps. Motion passed unanimously.

K. Land Acquisitions – Extensions

Eric Williams, Grant Program Manager requested deadline extensions for the Hayden Island, Southern Flow Corridor, and Joyce Carnegie Trust land acquisitions.

Dan Thorndike moved to extend the closing deadlines for the following land acquisition projects: Joyce Carnegie Trust (grant #215-9900) to January 31, 2016; Hayden Island (grant #215-9904) to May 31, 2016; and Southern Flow Corridor (grant #215-9903) to May 31, 2016. Seconded by Lisa Phipps. Motion passed unanimously.

APPROVED BY THE BOARD January 26, 2016
Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board
October 28, 2015
OWEB Board Meeting
John Day, Oregon

Minutes

OWEB Members Present

Ron Alvarado
Rosemary Furfey
Mike Haske
Debbie Hollen
Randy Labbe
Will Neuhauser
Lisa Phipps
Eric Quaempts
John Roberts
Dan Thorndike
Bob Webber

OWEB Staff Present

Meta Loftsgaarden
Renee Davis
Courtney Shaff
Eric Hartstein
Juniper Davis
Eric Williams
Ken Fetcho
Cammi Hungate
Katie Duzik
Liz Redon
John Amoroso
Karen Leiendecker
Sue Greer

Others Present

Gail Beverlin
Clair Klock
Chris Gannon
Brad Nye
Todd Heisler
Ryan Houston

H. Public Comment

- Gail Beverlin, North Fork John Day Watershed Council, thanked the Board for past support and provided an overview of their education program. They did a program last year on beavers and their role in the watersheds. They provide summer youth conservation crews, creating bike trails and installing fencing. They had 37 kids to create seven crews. Lisa Phipps asked if it was challenging to get into the school district because there is so little time for outdoor activities; Gail confirmed this challenge. Gail said that they were starting a program on the timber industry this year.
- Clair Klock, Klock Farm/Clackamas SWCD, commented on OWEB support on federal and state land and had a historical observation/comment. He was concerned about OWEB providing funds for USFS infrastructure. Historically, the streams were just battered and he wants to congratulate the conservation efforts that have taken place on the John Day River. He also gave kudos to the university collaborations.

L. Deschutes Special Investment Partnership (SIP) Summary Report

Renee Davis, Deputy Director, and Ken Fetcho, Effectiveness Monitoring Coordinator, presented the Deschutes Special Investment Partnership (SIP) Accomplishments Summary Report, which highlights accomplishments made since SIP investments in the partnership began in 2008. *After the initial presentation, project partners (Chris Gannon, Brad Nye, Todd Heisler and Ryan Houston) joined OWEB staff to answer questions.*

- Will Neuhauser appreciated the report and the level of detail. He noted that one of the key limiting factors is salmon moving into the opened up reaches. All this restoration allows a place for the fish to go. Ryan Houston said that they are looking at a 50-year

adaptive management program and they are only about two fish generations into the process. One thing the DSIP is doing is preparing the environment for fish.

- Randy Labbe is optimistic that the issues in dam management will be addressed in the future. He noted that the water quality in the Crooked River is a limiting factor and this needs to be addressed. The public needs to be more informed about the water quality and the water in the reservoir should be spotlighted. Todd Heisler stated that water quality does need to be addressed and raise public awareness of the problem because it affects the entire system. He urged the Board to realize that it was not just the money; it was the partnerships and entities working together and saying, “Yes.” He appreciates that OWEB allowed for flexibility and letting them be very strategic in implementation.
- Dan Thorndike raised the issue of the continuation of projects like these. There should be a continuation of collaboration and support of all parties involved.
- John Roberts said that the Water Resources Commission views the SIP as a model and he wants to know how much compromise they were able to achieve with the irrigation districts. Todd Heisler said that each irrigation district is different and once those things are known, a proposal and agreement can be reached. The conversation has started around the policies that are in place and work is being done to update those.
- Eric Quaempts thinks the report is great. It would have been nice to have more information in the community section; he would like to ensure that authors and photo contributors are credited.
- Todd Heisler said that the reliability and predictability of funding allows for better negotiations to occur. It is not how much money is available; it is the predictability which is most helpful. It is not about the competition because there is a need for everyone to succeed. Brad Nye said that the momentum of the SIPs will hopefully continue into FIPs. A science-based outcome plan is a key fundamental element.
- Lisa Phipps applauds the group for setting a very solid and high bar for how FIPs should function. She stated that it is ok to talk about their “warts” and this could potentially help elevate their accomplishments. She asked hypothetically, if the funding were not secured, would they still remain a partnership. Todd Heisler said they are a partnership with or without funding. OWEB has been a major cost-share partner and they have been doing this long enough to have their roles established.
- Rosemary Furfey liked that on page 11, that she could see the progress toward project outputs and ecological outcomes. Ryan Houston said that they have started with macroinvertebrates and plan to start monitoring fish soon. To give perspective, the graph took about 14 years and \$70,000 a year. Investing in monitoring is critical, especially to establish a baseline from the very beginning. Brad Nye said that they are looking at the monitoring parameters and if they want to expand it and what they want to accomplish.
- Ron Alvarado complemented them on being a model partnership.
- Debbie Hollen complemented the bar graphs in the report. She asked if outcomes vs. outputs in the development of the SIP would be the same. Ryan Houston said that the outputs are easy to capture, it is the outcomes that are harder to capture and they would do the same thing.

M. Executive Director Update *This occurred before Item L due to the arrival time of Deschutes SIP presenters.*

Meta Loftsgaarden, Executive Director, updated the Board on agency business and late-breaking issues.

M-1. Legislative and Budget

- Mike Haske asked if working lands easements and the clean water partnership would be new initiatives coming out of existing funding. Meta Loftsgaarden discussed the lottery funding and that OWEB would need to seek additional funds for new initiatives.
- Lisa Phipps supports getting the Board involved in budget decisions because it involves the Board more and gives OWEB staff support as well. Goals of habitat restoration and clean water should be thought of outside the box and really focus on the details when it comes to implementing them. She is disappointed that the clean water fund didn't get funded because it could have been a game changer, especially on the coast.
- Randy Labbe had a question about the development of the budget, ODFW specifically. Bob Webber responded that the ODFW budget task force is currently being set up.

M-2. KPM Update Process

Meta Loftsgaarden, Executive Director, engaged the Board in a discussion about Key Performance Measures (KPMs) the agency should propose to the Legislature in the 2017 Legislative Session. The agency received approval by the Joint Ways and Means Natural Resources Subcommittee to propose changes in the next session. In July, the Board received general information and provided feedback about KPMs to consider. In October, staff presented more specific options for feedback and discussion.

Generally, Board members recommended directly aligning KPMs with OWEB's Strategic Plan.

Agency Effectiveness and Efficiency

Existing: Percent of total funding used for agency operations.

Will Neuhauser asked how we will find a way to carve those out. Meta Loftsgaarden explained that there are some other state examples to base a target on. We have to be really explicit how we arrived at that number.

Existing: The percentage of complete grant payment requests paid within 24 days.

Proposed: Percent of grants executed within one month after board award or director delegation.

Meta Loftsgaarden clarified that this would be getting the grant agreement to the applicant. Lisa Phipps gave kudos to OWEB for the turnaround time on awards.

Board members suggested the word 'agreements' be added to the statement.

Proposed: Number of submitted applications compared with number recommended for funding.

Board members suggested this as an item to track, but not at the level of a KPM.

Proposed: Percent of projects completed within established grant timelines without extension or reinstatement.

Board members agreed this should be internally measured and is somewhat outside of OWEB's control.

Proposed: Number of applications, new and closing grants.

Board Effectiveness

Proposed: Percent of total best practices met by the Board.

Meta Loftsgaarden noted this is a requirement in other agencies with Boards and that OWEB would look to those agencies for appropriate guidelines.

Leverage

Existing: The percentage of funding from other sources resulting from OWEB's grant awards.

Lisa Phipps raised the idea of setting a target percentage of OWEB funds, but this is something that is out of our control. Renee Davis provided historical information on the 150 percent target. Mike Haske said that even if we hit 100 percent, we should still report on the 25 percent match the agency requires. Board members also recommended that the report should address leverage in addition to match.

Proposed: Percent of funding the agency distributes from sources other than Lottery or Salmon Plate Revenues.

Will Neuhauser is concerned that if the Legislature does not make the dollars available, then OWEB would not have control over the distribution. Meta Loftsgaarden noted that OWEB does have some element of control, but there is always the risk that the agency would not reach the targets.

Funding Demand

Proposed: Number of applications recommended for funding compared with number funded.

Board members recommended adding both number and dollar amount.

Other Metrics (not KPM): Funding available for conservation per capita compared with surrounding states.

Ecological Effectiveness of Restoration Projects as Implemented

Generally, Board members recommended using Ecological Outputs for the title, rather than Ecological Effectiveness.

Existing KPM: The percentage of OWEB watershed restoration investments that address established basin and watershed restoration priorities.

Existing KPM: The percentage of monitored native fish species that exhibit increasing or stable levels of abundance.

Existing KPM: The percentage of improved riparian stream miles of the total number of stream miles in Oregon.

Existing KPM: The percentage of native fish, where monitoring needs have been quantified, that were monitored to a level considered adequate under the Oregon Plan Monitoring Strategy and ODFW's Native Fish Status Review.

Randy Labbe noted that this is out of the agency's control and would like a conversation in the future around developing this.

Existing KPM: The percentage of potential aquatic salmon habitat made available to salmon each year.

Proposed: Percent of restoration funding invested to address threatened, endangered or species of concern.

Board members generally agreed that, if added there needs to be a better mechanism in place to capture projects other than sage-grouse, salmon and steelhead. They noted that it is difficult to tease the pieces out, especially because some projects are focused on improving ecosystem structure, process and/or function. For barrier removal, do you count it now, or later? Renee Davis stated that getting a better handle on those nuances, and validating applicants' claims and estimates, is an important role with the review team process.

Proposed: Percent of OWEB-funded water quality projects that address concerns within 303(d) listed streams.

Board members suggested that the percent of funding to address threatened, endangered or species of concern be combined with the percent funded for water quality, as it would be difficult to set a separate target for each type.

Other Metrics (not KPMs)

Percent of projects where accomplishments meet or exceed proposed metrics

Reports/recommendations produced and distributed to grantees and relevant agencies as a result of OWEB Effectiveness Monitoring (example target: 2/year)

- *(General Comments on this category)* Lisa Phipps questioned why the fish numbers were proposed to be removed as a KPM and it was clarified that OWEB does not have control over it.
- Randy Labbe suggested that we develop metrics such as water temperature, flow, reaches opened up, and that other organizations working on quantification tools could help with this. Meta Loftsgaarden said that the FIP program is heading in this direction with metrics for specific FIP programs, but that it would be difficult to develop agency-wide.
- Dan Thorndike agrees with the proposed KPM because the Legislature is the primary "customer" for this information and these are topics in which they are interested.
- Will Neuhauser asked how the percentages would be set and Meta Loftsgaarden explained that it is based on where we are now and the trajectory of where we want to be.
- Rosemary Furfey noted that OWEB could have a KPM focused on what we are working toward, rather than only reflecting the way it is now. She also asked about metrics that NOAA uses to gage OWEB's "success" related to PCSRF funds, and if these could be useful as part of this discussion.

Local Organizational Capacity

Existing KPM: The extent to which watershed councils funded by OWEB accomplish their work plans each biennium.

Proposed: Percent of OWEB-funded watershed councils that demonstrate organizational effective governance and management using OWEB merit criteria.

Will Neuhauser asked if the measures are pass/fail. Courtney Shaff related that their funding would be reduced based on their eligibility criteria.

Community and Economic Impacts of Restoration Grants

Proposed: Percent of Oregon communities that benefit from an agency-managed grant program.

Proposed: Number of positions local supported by Operating Capacity Funding.

Other Metrics (not KPM): Percent of projects by land-use type (forest, urban, range, ag) compared to percent of land of that type in the state.

Customer Service

Existing KPM: Percent of customers rating their satisfaction with the agency's customer service as “good” or “excellent”: overall customer service; timeliness, accuracy; helpfulness; expertise; and availability of information.

Lisa Phipps said that the outreach by the Board to the customer (e.g., listening sessions) should be taken into account and captured. Renee Davis stated that we do not have a way to capture, but there is the ability to tell that part of the story in the narrative when reporting on KPMs.

1) Spending Plan

2) LTIS (Measuring Our Mission/ Online Grants)

Lisa Phipps said that with the online application process, there is no signature requirement, so there is no accountability and could turn into a key flaw. Online applications are hard for project partners to review and edit. Renee Davis gave some insight on the online process and functionality, including e-signature.

3) FIP

Lisa Phipps noted that the Central Coast Estuary Collaborative proposal was incorrectly labeled “Central Coast Coho Collaborative.”

Having no further business, the meeting was adjourned.