MINUTES ARE NOT FINAL UNTIL APPROVED BY THE BOARD

Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB)
July 26, 2016
OWEB Board Meeting
Otter Rock, Oregon

MINUTES

OWEB Members Present	**OWEB Staff Present**	**Others Present**
Furfey, Rosemary	Barnes, Darika	Hayduk, Evan
Henning, Alan	Davidson, Ian	Morford, Shawn
Hollen, Debbie	Davis, Renee	Nicolescu, Jerry
Labbe, Randy	Dutterer, Andrew	Phipps, Lisa
Neuhauser, Will	Duzik, Katie	Robertson, Paul
Quaempts, Eric	Fetcho, Ken	Running, Mike
Thorndike, Dan	Greer, Sue	Schreiner, Ann
Wenner, Karl	Hartstein, Eric	Siebert, Paul
	Lobby, Sam	VandeWetering, Stan
	Loftsgaarden, Meta	Voelke, Katie
	McCarthy, Jillian	
	Shaff, Courtney	
	Williams, Eric	

The meeting was called to order by Co-Chair Dan Thorndike at 8:04AM. He observed there was no voting quorum and announced a follow up meeting of the Board on August 2nd at 3:00PM via conference call.

A. Board Member Comments

Board representatives provided updates on issues and activities related to their respective geographic regions and/or from their represented state and federal natural resource agencies.

B. Review and Approval of Minutes

Minutes of the April 26-27, 2016 Board meeting in La Grande were presented for approval. There was no discussion.

> *Due to the absence of a quorum, no motion was offered. Board members indicated support to approve the minutes with a vote to be held during the scheduled conference call to include a quorum of the members.*

Executive Director Meta Loftsgaarden briefly presented a request for a technical correction to the April 2016 Board actions in support of Focused Investment Partnership (FIP) Implementation and Capacity Building evaluation processes to provide efficiency by merging two separate awards into a single award.

> *Due to the absence of a quorum, no motion was offered. Board members indicated support to approve the technical correction with a vote to be held during the scheduled conference call to include a quorum of the members.*

C. Public Comment

Lisa Phipps from the Tillamook Estuaries Partnership addressed the Board about SB1517, which was signed into law during the 2016 Legislative Session. She said this bill established a pilot program in Tillamook County to address and balance conflicts between agriculture and tidal wetland restoration. She talked about the site-specific permitting process, and that the county is planning on conducting an inventory to assess which lands are best suited for wetland restoration and those that are most appropriate to remain in agricultural production. She said an advisory committee of stakeholders was formed and is working well together, led by the County Planning Department. They will evaluate current data, identify gaps, and hire a consultant to analyze data and fill in gaps. Phipps asked the Board to support them in this work because the outcomes may force a different look at the issues, including working lands on a smaller scale. She said if this works, it is a model that could be transferable up and down the coast, and possibly inland. Phipps sees this pilot program as an opportunity to break down barriers and advance the common mission of all groups involved. She will keep the Board apprised of developments and hopes for their support in the future, and she recognized Executive Director Loftsgaarden for her role in developing the pilot.

Loftsgaarden said that OWEB has already committed $30,000 from its operating budget to assist the process, which is expected to cost between $150,000 and $200,000 in total, and that OWEB and the Governor's office are helping the county find other sources of funding for the remainder.

Phipps said this pilot was part of the comprehensive county plan, and that it would result in modifications to the county plan. There was discussion about the importance of cataloging the inventory of land to assess conservation needs and how this fits in well with OWEB restoration activities. There was also discussion about lessons learned from Coast Coho recovery and incentives for landowner participation. Phipps said it will be important to have large public involvement, including agencies. She said Tillamook County is "land poor", and once agricultural land taken out of production, it cannot be replaced. Inventories will help understand how to balance agriculture uses and develop economic incentives. She said this project is about reconciling restoration and agriculture; they are quite compatible. She also said once the inventory is complete and there is a vision of what the land can look like, then the economic incentives for landowners will kick in, which will be both necessary and useful. She invited each Board member to participate in the process.

Mike Running from the Coalition of Oregon Land Trusts (COLT) provided copies of COLT's 2015 State of the Lands Report. He walked the Board through some highlighted projects. A discussion ensued on the topic of best management practices on working lands easements. Running stated that each property is unique, including the landscape, funding sources and landowners. He said a gap analysis, partially funded by OWEB, is looking at working land easements and what other states are doing, including best practices and communications with landowners.

Katie Voelke from the North Coast Lands Conservancy (NCLC) talked about a recent conservation success story, which she said began in the 1920's with the work of Sam Boardman, Founding Director of Oregon State Parks. Katie provided a brief history of Sam Boardman's career, starting with his time as an employee of ODOT's Wayside Program where he planted trees for shade to help cool down cars. He was inspired by the Oregon coastal landscape and so

he went up and down the coast talking to landowners, sharing his vision to bring land into protection for the benefit of all the public. Voelke suggested that many state parks are the result of this work, and land trusts are now building off that foundation. She said in 2011 a landowner came to NCLC and asked if they would be interested in purchasing Boneyard Ridge, which is directly adjacent to Ecola State Park and provides additional access to the park. It is also adjacent to Circle Creek, another NCLC conservation property. The three contiguous parcels create a landscape-scale conservation corridor for Oregonians for all time. She thanked the Board for their commitment to conservation and for helping NCLC continue the legacy. She closed her comments with an announcement of the Boneyard Ridge property closing (8/28/16), with the help of a $500,000 OWEB grant.

D. 2015-2017 Spending Plan Update

Executive Director Loftsgaarden provided a brief history of the 2015-2017 Spending Plan and presented two requests for the Board's consideration to add funds to the spending plan. The first request was for Board approval for distribution of the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery funding (PCSRF) award available for grants in the spending plan categories identified in Attachment B, totaling $5.1 million. Deputy Director Renee Davis explained the eligible uses of these funds, and Loftsgaarden described distribution of these funds in the Open Solicitation grant program: $2.9 million in Restoration, $1.2 million in Technical Assistance, and $1 million in Land and Water Acquisition. There was discussion about the way OWEB's fiscal office conservatively tracks and controls the funds with the option for a ramp down of up to five years should the PCSRF ever cease. This was followed by discussion of the complementary work of Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife utilizing PCSRF to conduct monitoring. Will Neuhauser asked if PCSRF funding could be used for Focused Investments and Loftsgaarden described that only FIPs with anadromous fish are eligible.

The second request concerned funds recaptured from grants that were either canceled or completed under budget. Loftsgaarden reminded the Board of their request at the April 2016 Board meeting that staff come to the July meeting with three options for use of recaptured funds for a Board spending plan decision, and explained that an additional $1 million was added to recaptured funds since the April Board meeting. Loftsgaarden described Option 1 as the distribution of the recaptured funding into Open Solicitation grant categories. Loftsgaarden described that the Board requested to review an Option 2 in order to fund Implementation FIPs that received a reduced award in January, 2016. Now that recaptured funding is $2 million, Option 2 allowed for FIPs to be fully funded with the remainder of recaptured funding going to Open Solicitation. Meta described Option 3 as the placement of recaptured funds back into the category from which they were unspent. OWEB staff determined Option 3 was challenging to implement and would require a long process to map recaptured funds back to the original sources and develop a process for re-granting funds, but would proceed with making the calculations if the Board members wanted to see the figures.

There was a general sense from the Board that they did not want to pursue Option 3.

Loftsgaarden explained Options 1 and 2 in more detail and fielded questions from the Board. There was discussion about what percentage of the total budget FIPs should be and how that impacts the Open Solicitation grant program. There was further discussion about the benefits

of restoring each of the six Focused Investment Implementation awards to the amount they had initially requested.

Due to the absence of a quorum, no motion was offered. Board members indicated support to reserve $5.1 million of additional PCSRF funds to the 2015-2017 spending plan for the purposes described in Attachment B of the staff report with a vote to be held during the scheduled conference call to include a quorum of the members.

In addition, Board members indicated support to distribute recaptured funds as outlined in Option 2 in Attachment B to the staff report with a vote to be held during the scheduled conference call to include a quorum of the members. Specifically, two non-voting members supported Option 1, and five voting members and one non-voting member supported Option 2.

E. Intensively Monitored Watershed – Funding Request

Deputy Director Renee Davis presented to the Board a request to approve $52,708 for socio-economic monitoring activities as part of the Upper Middle Fork John Day River Intensively Monitored Watershed (IMW). Davis provided a background of the region and presented the intent of the IMW to conduct monitoring over a larger geography and longer time period to determine a trajectory of change in salmon and steelhead populations and their habitat. This request would study the socio-economic impact of the IMW. Davis pointed out this project is the only one in the region looking in detail at the social-economic metrics, asking the Board to fund the next step to support University of Oregon researchers to accomplish the work. There was discussion about collaboration with other agencies. There was also discussion about whether the work would be peer reviewed. Eric Quaempts suggested that 1/3 of OWEB's mission is economic, and that it might be a good idea to incorporate this into the strategic plan update.

Due to the absence of a quorum, no motion was offered. Board members indicated support to award up to $52,708 in support of socio-economic monitoring in the Upper Middle Fork John Day River Intensively Monitored Watershed from the Open Solicitation Programmatic Effectiveness Monitoring line item in the spending plan with a vote to be held during the scheduled conference call to include a quorum of the members.

F. Intensively Monitored Watershed – Funding Approval

Effectiveness Monitoring Coordinator Ken Fetcho and Deputy Director Davis presented to the Board a request to approve receipt of $291,000 from the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission (PSMFC), and delegate authority to the Executive Director to enter into agreements with partner organizations implementing the Upper Middle Fork John Day River Intensively Monitored Watershed (IMW) project. Fetcho listed the partnering agencies and explained how funds are received from NOAA and then provided to OWEB for projects.

Rosemary Furfey asked if there is sharing of information among all of the IMWs. Fetcho cited the past and upcoming Pacific Northwest Aquatic Monitoring Partnership (PNAMP) IMW workshops as providing opportunities to share information. A November 2016 workshop is being organized among the states of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho with a focus to contribute to a synthesis report. Board members asked questions about factors external to the watershed

and how they affect the outcomes. Alan Henning asked if there was any benefit to merging this report with the socio-economic report discussed during the previous agenda item, and Davis said that is the intent.

> *Due to the absence of a quorum, no motion was offered. Board members indicated support to receive $291,000 in funding from the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission for the projects associated with the Upper Middle Fork John Day River Intensively Monitored Watershed with a vote to be held during the scheduled conference call to include a quorum of the members.*

G. Tidegate Effectiveness Monitoring – Funding Request

Deputy Director Davis and Effectiveness Monitoring Coordinator Fetcho discussed the recent activities of the Board's newly reconfigured Monitoring Subcommittee in their review of past and current monitoring investments to help ensure results of the work will inform policy and program direction for the agency. They provided a brief summary of the tidegate projects funded by the Board. They requested Board approval of funding in the amount of up to $40,000 to initiate the first phase of programmatic effectiveness monitoring on tidegate restoration projects. Rosemary Furfey asked about future phases and for a sense of what is coming to keep the whole project in perspective. Davis responded that this first phase of the project is scoping and literature review that will help inform what future phases may involve. . Randy Labbe asked about the length of time expected for the first phase. Fetcho identified the team leading the project and the work expected through a literature review and summary of OWEB-funded projects. He said the timeline will be laid out, but would likely be approximately six months.

Alan Henning asked if the project scope could be expanded to include lessons learned. Fetcho said it would be easy to do if lessons learned are included in the literature review, but would be more difficult if researchers had to be contacted for lessons learned. Karl Wenner suggested that tidegates are a growing concern, with an equally growing effort to address the concerns. He wanted to know if OWEB could play a role in the coordination of the data-gathering efforts to ensure there is not a duplication of efforts. Fetcho and Davis discussed how this is the first foray into understanding the issue, and foresee the need to develop an advisory committee on the issue. Eric Quaempts talked about the responsibility to prioritize based on biological performance. Debbie Hollen said she is hearing from Board members a request for a "preamble" that puts tidegates in context and how they fit into the ecological landscape, thinking it will help to answer some of the questions held by the Board.

> *Due to the absence of a quorum, no motion was offered. Board members indicated support to award up to $40,000 from the Open Solicitation Programmatic Effectiveness Monitoring line item in the spending plan for Tidegate Effectiveness Monitoring with a vote to be held during the scheduled conference call to include a quorum of the members.*

Karl Wenner recommended going to Leo Kuntz's website for a great presentation on tidegates and how they work. (http://www.nehalemmarine.com/west-coast-salmon-summit/)

H. FIP Program Solicitation Schedule Approval

Grant Program Manager Eric Williams and Capacity Coordinator Courtney Shaff reviewed and discussed options for future FIP solicitation schedules and funding options. Shaff described a FIP Capacity-Building solicitation schedule that would begin in January 2017 with a Board award in October 2017. Shaff presented two proposed changes to the application process. The first change would replace a letter of intent with a pre-application conversation between staff and potential applicants to ensure an understanding of the grant purpose and answer questions. The second change would shift the responsibility of making a recommendation to the OWEB Board from the FIP Subcommittee to OWEB staff.

Williams presented a revised FIP Implementation schedule that would offer the next solicitation beginning in January, 2018 with a Board award in July, 2019. There was Board discussion on how this may impact potential FIP Implementation applicants that may have wanted to apply for the 2017-2019 biennium. Williams and Executive Director Loftsgaarden described that outreach to potential applicants has occurred and no comments opposing the proposed solicitation cycle have been submitted.

A Board discussion followed on how FIPs fit into the overall spending plan, with attachment C of the staff report providing graphs for different funding options for the Board to consider in their discussions.

> *Due to the absence of a quorum, no motion was offered. Board members indicated support for the proposed schedules for FIP Capacity-Building in Attachment A to the staff report and FIP Implementation awards as outlined in Attachment B to the staff report with a vote to be held during the scheduled conference call to include a quorum of the members.*

M. OWEB Statute Revisions-Legislative Concept

Senior Policy Coordinator Eric Hartstein informed the Board about a legislative concept under development for the 2017 Legislative Session which seeks to update OWEB's statutes with approval of the Governor. He provided an overview concept which includes general statutory clean-up and discussed two proposed substantive changes: 1) adding U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as an ex-officio member to the OWEB Board, and 2) removing language that allows the Department of Administrative Services to provide liability coverage for watershed councils. He said the proposed revisions to OWEB statutes would be drafted by Legislative Counsel over the summer with staff providing revisions, and he pledged an update to the Board on this process at the October 2016 meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at noon by Co-Chair Dan Thorndike.

MINUTES ARE NOT FINAL UNTIL APPROVED BY THE BOARD

Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB)
July 27, 2016
OWEB Board Meeting
Otter Rock, Oregon

MINUTES

OWEB Members Present	OWEB Staff Present	Others Present
Armstrong, Ed	Barnes, Darika	Aunan, Lauri
Brandt, Stephen	Davidson, Ian	Blake, Haley
Furfey, Rosemary	Davis, Renee	Carpenter, Dan
Henning, Alan	Dutterer, Andrew	Hayduk, Evan
Hollen, Debbie	Duzik, Katie	Hoffman, Wayne
Labbe, Randy	Fetcho, Ken	Marcoe, Sheila
Neuhauser, Will	Hartstein, Eric	Morford, Shawn
Quaempts, Eric	Lobby, Sam	Nicolescu, Jerry
Thorndike, Dan	Loftsgaarden, Meta	Phipps, Lisa
	McCarthy, Jillian	Pickering, Debbie
	Shaff, Courtney	Rankin, Ann
	Williams, Eric	Robertson, Paul
		Running, Mike
		Schmeirer, Ann
		Siebert, Paul
		Trenholm, Mark
		Westgate, Dave
		Wozniak, Owen

The meeting was called to order at 8:00AM by Co-Chair Dan Thorndike. Ed Armstrong was introduced as a new member of the OWEB Board representing the Environmental Quality Commission. He spoke briefly about his background and experience.

I. Subcommittee Updates

Rosemary Furfey spoke about the recent activities of the Monitoring Subcommittee, including reconstitution of its membership. She discussed the approach of the committee and described the conversations at its last meeting. She presented four questions the committee will use to evaluate monitoring: 1) How do we gauge whether programs are effective? 2) How do we characterize what OWEB has done? 3) How do we assist long-term monitoring for FIPs? 4) How do we define monitoring goals and indicators of success?

Will Neuhauser spoke about the Focused Investments Subcommittee's work, which was discussed at the Board meeting yesterday.

Randy Labbe spoke on behalf of the Executive Committee. He said the Strategic Plan timeline has been discussed and would be presented to the Board in Item K. He then recapped some highlights from his May trip to Washington D.C. with Co-Chair Dan Thorndike and Executive Director Loftsgaarden to visit with Oregon's congressional delegations and federal agency representatives.

J. Public Comment

Debbie Pickering addressed the Board on behalf of the Oregon Central Coast Estuary Collaborative, which ranges from Tillamook Bay to Siuslaw. She talked about this partnership of 25 participating groups to advance conservation activities and share goals. She thanked the Board for providing a technical assistance and a FIP Capacity-Building grant to the collaborative.

Paul Robertson introduced himself as the President of an 80-member organization, the Oregon Lakes Association. He invited interested parties to a fall gathering October 14-16 at the Columbia Gorge Discovery Center in The Dalles, and to visit the website www.oregonlakes.org. He said this association was founded to promote lake-watershed ecosystems in Oregon and is working with connect with watershed councils and soil & water conservation districts.

Haley Blake addressed the Board as the Council Coordinator for the Nestucca, Neskowin, and Sand Lakes Watershed, and as a partner from the Salmon Superhighway Project. With support from Lisa Phipps, she talked about the Salmon Superhighway as a broader ecosystem approach to reconnect historic habitat, reduce chronic flooding, and improve recreation opportunities. She explained how this collaborative project has listed 93 vetted and prioritized barrier removal projects that will open 178 miles of habitat for six major rivers of Oregon's North Coast. She said they are working with many partner agencies to leverage state funds with private funds. She thanked the Board for their past support and wanted to inform them of this new project partnership.

Dan Carpenter from the Siuslaw Watershed Council provided the Board a summary of recent conservation work with statistics about the productivity of the Siuslaw basin. He talked about the Siuslaw Coho Partnership, which is a focused strategic action plan combining 150 years of experience from BLM, SWCDs, WCs, NOAA, USFWS, and Tribes. He was grateful for the OWEB investment that he said will make this partnership stronger than ever as they develop a new strategic action plan with a focus on Coho recovery.

Jerry Nicolescu (OACD), Shawn Morford (NOWC), and Mike Running (COLT) addressed the Board about their commitment to the Oregon Conservation Partnership (OCP), promoting collaboration and cooperation. Nicolescu thanked the Board for making it possible to enter the partnership, citing the increase in value of the partnership as their numbers increase in the future. He also thanked the Board for their discussion of Item D, and how to spend recaptured funds. Nicolescu said he appreciates the thought and effort put into the discussion.

Morford introduced herself as the new Executive Director of the Network, and provided background on her experience and history. She talked about making contact with watershed councils and districts and shared her early observations from the first few months in her position. She said the main message she is hearing is "don't forget us" -- the lower capacity, small offices that still need resources. She said they would like help coordinating insurance, large purchases, templates for contracts, RFP's, and more. Morford said her focus will continue to be sharing knowledge and resources. Rosemary Furfey thanked Shawn for coming and encouraged her to return to Board meetings with reports from Watershed Councils, which are the foundation of the restoration work happening in the state.

Running talked about the composition of the OCP and the 150 groups they work with and represent around the state. He said this group formally became the Oregon Conservation Partnership, which also includes the Oregon Conservation Education and Assistance Network

(OCEAN). He said COLT secured a grant to hire a consultant to help the partnership develop a partnership agreement. He said three themes came out of this initial meeting to help them work together more effectively: understanding the policy arena, coordinating better training for staff and member organizations, and expanding funding to support existing and future voluntary conservation efforts.

Owen Wozniak came to thank the Board for their contribution toward the purchase of Hayden Island, which was acquired in December 2015 after a 4-year effort. The property, almost 300 acres on the main stem Willamette River just upstream from Salem, was acquired by the Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife in April and was named the "Gail Achterman Natural Area." He presented a framed photo of the area to the Executive Director and Board in gratitude for their support and funding.

Esther Lev from the Wetlands Conservancy talked about a 1,500 foot dike removal on a local slough property purchased with OWEB funds. She talked about the complexity of estuary work and some of the challenges of meeting the requirements of many different agencies, using this dike removal project as an example. She then provided an update on the Harney County FIP and talked about how the recent occupation has brought the FIP partners together. She talked about an 8-minute video clip from PBS about the collaborative, which she promised to share with Executive Director Loftsgaarden. She thanked the Board for their continued investments and commitment to conservation.

K. OWEB Strategic Plan Update

Executive Director Loftsgaarden introduced Sam Lobby, OWEB's Hatfield Fellow from Portland State University, who assisted the development of the timeline for the Strategic Plan. Loftsgaarden discussed the history of OWEB's Long Term Investment Strategy and the background on the development of the last Strategic Plan in 2010. She walked the Board through a timeline for OWEB's strategic planning process and the scheduled update of the Strategic Plan. Loftsgaarden said there will be at minimum three opportunities to hear about the plan before it becomes final. She said more detailed information will be developed once a facilitator is hired to assist with the process, with the goal of a final strategic plan being adopted in April 2018. However, there will be an opportunity to do more work on it if needed, and vote in October 2018 if the need is indicated in the planning process. In the meantime, as indicated in the timeline, there will be several retreats scheduled outside of regular Board meetings, multiple public listening sessions, and six stakeholder advisory group sessions, which will include representative members from across the state identified once a facilitator is hired.

Rosemary Furfey asked about a subcommittee for the strategic plan, and whether there were any lessons learned from the last strategic plan process. Loftsgaarden explained the Executive Committee, which is made up of members from each committee, could fill that role and did not recommend forming a new committee. Regarding lessons learned from development of the 2010 Strategic Plan, Loftsgaarden replied that ensuring an adaptive management process was a lesson learned and the timeline before the Board reflects that.

L. Governor's Priorities Update

Lauri Aunan from the Governor's Natural Resources Office provided updates on four of the Governor's Priorities that receive OWEB funding. She thanked the Board members on behalf of

Governor Kate Brown for supporting Oregon's continued leadership in voluntary cooperative watershed protection and restoration, particularly in the areas identified as priorities by the Governor. She said funding provided by the Board has been critical in the accomplishments that have happened under the Governor's initiatives.

1. **SageCon – Sage Grouse/Sage-Steppe Habitat Conservation**
   Aunan talked about the success of Oregon's Sage Grouse Action Plan and how this plan encapsulates the State's commitment to habitat protection and improvements. She talked about how the Action Plan exemplifies the "power of partnership" between state agencies, federal agencies, and local partners. She said we should continue to see this power of engagement and leveraging of resources now that this plan is in implementation phase.

2. **Oregon Agricultural Heritage Program (OAHP)**
   Aunan provided an update on the progress to date for the OAHP Work Group, identifying the current partner organizations and summarizing the experience and expertise contributed by current team members. She said this team will work with and seek input from landowners, tribal governments, agencies, and other interested organizations to identify additional voluntary tools to keep Oregon's working farms and ranches working. She said the Board's funding of this project has been essential to moving this effort forward. Communication is critical and a facilitator has been hired to also help move things forward in the most constructive way. Aunan identified a suite of tools to support OAHP's dual goals of keeping the working lands productive while supporting fish, wildlife and natural resources, including Working Lands Conservation Easements, stewardship agreements, long-term contracts, and integrating working lands conservation with Oregon's land use laws, which do more to reduce development threats to working lands than laws in most other states. She also talked about a schedule of informational meetings over the summer and listening sessions around the state in the fall to seek input on the concepts and tools that will help landowners with succession planning and relevant tax and financial issues.

3. **Clean Water Partnership (CWP)**
   Aunan spoke briefly about the history of the CWP initiative and its focus on increased coordination and partnerships for clean water improvements. She said this includes identifying priorities, engaging the broader community, and monitoring and reporting on water and habitat quality trends in areas of coordinated partnership investments. She reported on the addition of Jamie Damon as the project manager for the CWP, bringing leadership and experience from the Sage-Con project. Aunan said key state agencies involved in this work are OWEB and the departments of Agriculture, Environmental Quality, and Fish and Wildlife. The CWP team is now engaging additional partners including other state agencies, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), and non-governmental conservation, agricultural, and ranching organizations with further outreach to tribal governments and other potential partners this summer and fall. She said the CWP is about to embark on a series of external meetings to engage this broader partnership and leverage the work and experience of each group involved.

Alan Henning asked for a description of the connection between the OAHP and CWP. Aunan explained that while there will be similar groups in both efforts; OAHP is more about providing leverage and tools for landowners related to working lands. The CWP is focused on water quality. She agreed there needs to be collaboration and sharing of information.

Randy Labbe mentioned other states with established partnerships similar to the CWP. He wanted to know if there had been outreach for best practices. Aunan said the partner agencies will be able to provide some of that insight in the future.

Will Neuhauser talked about his perception of the struggle between the small family farm and industrial farming, and the economic pressure the smaller farmer is facing. He asked to what extent, if any, the opposing dynamics and needs will be addressed. Aunan said the group is focused on common needs and goals; however, this will evolve and the issue may be part of a larger conversation in the future.

Eric Quaempts asked, in reference to "voluntary tools," what the untapped federal funds are and what will be done to compete for those. Executive Director Loftsgaarden said federal funding for working lands easements is through the NRCS Agricultural Conservation Easement Program, and OWEB is not always a good match for those funds as the mandate of Lottery funding is conservation of native fish and wildlife habitat and not working lands. An additional challenge is the lack of capacity of local organizations to deliver those projects.

Rosemary Furfey asked about Oregon Department of Agriculture's (ODA's) Strategic Implementation Areas (SIA), which OWEB is funding, and how this is feeding into the CWP, particularly for Coho on the coast. Aunan replied that ODA will get into SIA specifics in the following presentation.

Ed Armstrong asked if part of the work of the OAHP will be to help develop the local markets for small local farmers. Aunan said the discussion at this time is focused on working lands with conservation values. In the long term, this may be an issue that the program can address.

Dan Thorndike said the Governor's regional priorities process in SW Oregon addresses this issue in creating opportunities for smaller farms to get into other markets, which has ties with conservation benefits.

Will Neuhauser asked about whether the large amount of funding OWEB provides for water quality/irrigation efficiency projects ties into the CWP. Aunan replied that the Water Resources Department's (WRD) Integrated Water Resources Strategy involves local planning and prioritization of projects. WRD also has new funding for piping projects. While piping projects impact water quality, they have not been a high priority for ODA. This may change with the CWP, as it may be well positioned to address multiple issues. Loftsgaarden added that through WRD programs, CWP, SIA, and FIP programs, there is a deliberate focus on locally prioritizing projects, including irrigation. Loftsgaarden also noted that the cost for these rural infrastructure projects is large, and it is important for the state to address.

Eric Quaempts asked if there would be an opportunity to address the Governor's green energy portfolio of agricultural lands that are marginal quality or with water supply problems. He offered the idea of converting them to solar arrays, among other possibilities, as a way to help owners do something productive with their land. Aunan appreciated the creativity of this idea.

4. **Strategic Implementation Areas**
   OWEB Partnerships Coordinator Jillian McCarthy introduced Sheila Marcoe, ODA's Water Quality Program's Natural Resource Policy Specialist, to provide the Board an update on the SIAs and the grant program at ODA for water quality. Sheila spoke briefly about the voluntary aspect of the program with compliance backstops to maintain trust with landowners, and discussed outreach and technical assistance programs conducted by Soil and Water Conservation Districts (SWCDs) in small, focused geographic areas. She walked the Board through a presentation of the SIA selection process, with seven SIAs currently identified in the state. She said $1 million was received through OWEB and the legislature for this process, and discussed the most recent grant cycle through which five grants were received. Two of the grants were fully funded and three were asked to resubmit within 90 days with additional information. Following this, the next grant cycle will be held in January 2017.

Alan Henning asked about the difference between the SIA projects and SWCD funded projects. Marcoe replied that the SIA projects are similar to other projects completed by SWCDs in focus areas, although there is different prioritization. It is also important to acknowledge that there is a regulatory firewall between focus areas and SIAs. With SIAs, there is a regulatory component and focus areas are broader.. Executive Director Loftsgaarden added if a grantee is placed into an enforcement action, they are no longer eligible to utilize OWEB grant funding Henning noted challenges he sees in the scope of the SIA process and how the program might fit into SB 1010 plans. Marcoe replied that the updates to the SB 1010 plans are occurring, with a focus on measuring outcomes of work.

Rosemary Furfey said she appreciated the data layers identified on the map, but was surprised to find so few agricultural areas identified on the coast, which are necessary for the success of the Oregon Coast Coho Recovery Plan. Marcoe said there has been discussion with the Governor's Natural Resource Office and the Clean Water Partnership regarding where ODA should move in and focus their outreach and resources at this time. Loftsgaarden added that a lot of rural land on the coast is not necessarily identified as being in agriculture and that there are other ways to conduct work on these lands (e.g., Coast Coho Business Plan).

5. **Coast Coho Partnership and the Coast Coho Business Plan**
   Mark Trenholm, Senior Program Manager from the Wild Salmon Center came to speak on behalf of a number of agencies and organizations (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, OWEB, and the Wild Salmon Center) who put together the Oregon Coast Coho Business Plan. He presented many challenges of the program, and a number of shared goals. He talked about how OWEB funding was utilized to develop a framework of goals, and then test it in three areas: the Nehalem, the Siuslaw, and the Elk watersheds. He walked the Board through the Business Plan approach, the timeline, and the priorities for a second round of Business Plan development.

Randy Labbe asked Trenholm to make his presentation available to Board members. Loftsgaarden assured the Board that all presentations will be made available online.

Dan Thorndike asked about the project prioritization exercise and how it might impact grant applications submitted to OWEB. Loftsgaarden said that the applicant can point to the strategic action plan, and how it identified the project as high priority.

Rosemary Furfey asked about fish population diversity, and whether it was from the perspective of hatchery fish or life history diversity. Trenholm said that one criterion was life history diversity. Furfey also wanted to know if there were lessons learned from the three completed projects. Trenholm said because the capacity of SWCDs and watershed councils is so limited and the geographic scope is so large, they are guiding each project to have a laser-sharp strategic focus and then build a partnership around that focus, rather than a scattershot approach towards project selection. Some groups utilize a more opportunistic approach towards restoration, and are not as comfortable with such a tight focus. The other lesson learned is on the data side. There were a number of sources they thought would be applicable and easy to use, but the data sets turned out to be disparate and in poor shape. The last lesson learned was that it was a large process and they need more project managers.

Randy Labbe mentioned The Nature Conservancy's (TNC) development of a survey for an inventory of tidegates coast-wide and wondered if the Coast Coho Partnership would be coordinating with them on that opportunity. Trenholm said he will and would follow up with TNC to check on the specific status of the survey to bring the information into the partnership's strategic action plans.

Alan Henning asked about whether the partnerships are also looking at habitat loss that may be occurring. Trenholm said no, this plan is focused on restoration and the net benefit it will provide. He said those regulatory questions definitely need to be asked in the right forum where these issues can be looked at systemically, but the Coast Coho Business Plan is not the right forum.

Randy Labbe said he hoped that eventually a consortium of partners would meet to brainstorm the incentive packages and the benefits would be articulated to working landowners. Trenholm said the strategic action plans will address the systemic challenges by looking at landowner incentives, and not from the regulatory side.

N. Executive Director's Update

Executive Director Loftsgaarden introduced the topics of discussion in the Director's Update and the presenting staff.

1. **Online Grant Applications Systems**
   Deputy Director Davis provided an update about the launch of OWEB's online grant applications system, which was made available to grantees on July 18 for OWEB's four primary application types: Restoration, Technical Assistance, Monitoring, and Outreach grants. She walked the Board through the online application process and said internal testing by staff and external testing by grantees and reviewers throughout the state provided valuable feedback to ensure the system is intuitive and usable. She also talked about companion materials to assist grantees in the application process, including a guidance document for all applicants and Word templates for those applicants who use a collaborative grant-writing process prior to the entry of data into the system. Capacity Coordinator Courtney Shaff further described efforts of the application to improve

consistency. She referred the Board to Attachment A for a list of eight training dates and locations around the state over two weeks which have been scheduled in August and September, along with 2-hour webinars for applicants in September and October. The webinars will be recorded for use by those unable to attend.

Loftsgaarden acknowledged OWEB's information technology staff that implemented the system and all OWEB staff had contributed in some way to the final product.

Ed Armstrong asked if examples of grant applications will be available. Davis replied that the information buttons/guidance documents will provide this information initially, but good examples may be available after the October Open Solicitation grant cycle.

Alan Henning asked about technical support for grantees, including weekends. Davis said they will get a better feel for work needs after the trainings provide some feedback. She also identified a feedback mechanism within the program.

Eric Quaempts suggested this program; in additional to being helpful to applicants, has a lot of potential to be a good reporting tool. Davis agreed and talked about continued scoping and prioritizing within the agency.

2. **Council Capacity Update**
   Loftsgaarden said that after analysis from OWEB's 2015 PSU intern, it was decided, in cooperation with the Operating Capacity subcommittee, to drop from the guidance document for the 2017-19 grant cycle the idea of a sixth merit criteria related to strategic collaboration.

3. **Existing FIP Implementation and Capacity Building Awards**
   Loftsgaarden talked about the six-question online survey sent to all FIPCapacity-Building grantees to capture baseline information, and said these same questions will be asked at the conclusion of the grant. She said many grantees are hiring facilitators and are excited to move forward. She talked about a similar survey for FIP Implementation grantees sent to each partnership, and said these same survey questions will be asked at the conclusion of the grant. The OWEB Board is doing some very innovative investing. Staff want to be able to capture, for purposes of adaptively managing OWEB investments, how investments are working in those partnerships. This model is very interesting to other grant-makers, who have expressed interest in hearing about successes, challenges, and lessons learned.

4. **Effectiveness Monitoring**
   Loftsgaarden directed the Board to Attachment A, explaining the list of monitoring initiatives that are moving forward. She said OWEB's Davis and Effectiveness Monitoring Coordinator Fetcho could answer specific questions from the Board on any project in the list.

O. Tillamook Southern Flow Corridor – Restoration Grant Adjustment

Partnerships Coordinator McCarthy presented a request to the Board for an adjustment to April 2015 Board actions in support of tidal restoration activities for the Tillamook Bay Wetlands Acquisition and Restoration Project by adjusting the state and federal award amounts for the

acquisition and restoration portions of the Southern Flow Corridor – Landowner Preferred Alternative.

> *Due to the absence of a quorum, no motion was offered. Board members indicated support for a transfer of$85,000 of recaptured Lottery funds from acquisition grant #214-9903-11013 to restoration grant #215-8007-12713 and reduce $85,000 of Federal Coastal Wetlands funds from award #FP11AP00490 in support of tidal restoration activities for the Tillamook Bay Wetlands Acquisition and Restoration Project with a vote to be held during the scheduled conference call to include a quorum of the members.*

Having no further business, the meeting was adjourned by Co-Chair Dan Thorndike at 11:35AM.