
APPENDICES

for A 20-Year Review of the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board's
Capacity Investments

Table of Contents

Appendix 1. History of OWEB Funding Strategies.	2
Appendix 2. Service Providers and Supportive Organizations.	5
Appendix 3. Survey	8
A. Methods	8
B. Survey Questionnaire	9
C. Statistical Analysis	12
D. Council Databases	14
E. District Databases	19
Appendix 4. Case Studies	27
A. Methods	27
B. Case Study Interview Guide	30
C. Key Informant Interview Guide	31
D. Database of Case Study Organizations	33
Appendix 5. External Capacity-Building Programs Review	35
A. Program Highlights	35
B. Potential Recommendations	37
C. Summary of External Capacity-Building Programs Review.	38

Appendix 1. History of OWEB Funding Strategies.¹

Funding Strategy	Biennium	Description
Blanket Funding	1997 - 2003	Evaluation Criteria Evaluated based on the scope of work and description of accomplishments. There was no consideration of biological or geographic values or priorities. Funding Distribution Equally distributed across OWEB regions. <i>*For the 2001 - 2003 grant cycle, two regions had an increase in the number and amount of requests. New applicants in these regions were awarded half-time support.</i>
Categorical Funding	2003 - 2005	Funding Distribution Distributed grants based on funding categories. Each category had a pre-designated range of funds.
Decision Matrix with Ranked Scoring	2005 - 2007	Eligibility Criteria Council serves a unique geographic area (i.e., not within the bounds of another council OWEB grantee), the council reflects the balance of interests or actively seeking this, and the council has been designated by a local government. Merit Evaluation Criteria Elements included: (1) Council Organization, (2) Past Performance - Capital Projects, (3) Past Performance - Non-Capital Projects, and (4) Proposed Work Plan/Watershed Complexity. Reviewers looked for a balance between the two Past Performance elements. Review Process & Ranking System Review teams consisted of local and state perspectives. The review process consisted of reviewer evaluations, applicant interviews, and staff/reviewer discussions, followed by a review team assigning scores using a decision matrix to rank applicants. Applicants were ranked from significantly ineffective with limited accomplishments to highly effective with strong accomplishments. Funding Distribution OWEB provided funding based on a graduated point scale, using a standard formula, rather than a standard amount by category or a percentage of the funding requested by the applicant. Through this formula, the highest-scoring council received the highest base funding. Start of Umbrella Councils Some councils, i.e., “umbrella councils” received additional funding on top of the base award from 2005 - 2017.

¹ Sources include: OWEB Board Meeting Notes from 2005 - present and OWEB 2021 - 2023 Operating Capacity Grant Guidance.

		Umbrella councils were based on (1) "support and coordination of at least 3 groups, having a coordinating council, sharing staff and a single Council Support grant", (2) "providing services to a watershed area containing three or more 4th-field hydrologic units" or (3) both.
Modified Decision Matrix with Ranked Scoring	2007 - 2015	Eligibility Criteria Remains the same. Merit Evaluation Criteria Two categories (1) Council Organizational Structure and (2) Council Effectiveness. • <i>Council Organizational Structure criteria included:</i> Organization Make-up and Citizen Involvement, Organization Improvement Efforts, Management of the Organization, and Fiscal Management. • <i>Council Effectiveness criteria included:</i> Leadership Role in Watershed Activities, Planning Strategically, Working Collaboratively, and Accomplishments. Applications also included a "special circumstances" section to provide context for reviewers to keep in mind while looking at the accomplishments of each council. Councils could describe staffing situations and demographic and social issues that affected their work. Review Process & Ranking System Reviewers consisted of two teams with a representative from each OWEB region and two statewide representatives. After reviewers pre-scored the applications, they met for a facilitated "consensus scoring session". Following this, OWEB staff applied weighted factors that resulted in one merit score for each application. Council effectiveness and accomplishment criteria were weighted more heavily than council organizational structure criteria. Applications ranked by: Excellent, Very Good, Good, Satisfactory, and Needs Improvement. Funding Distribution Funding distribution remained the same, i.e., the highest-scoring council received the highest base funding. <i>*For the 2013 - 2015 biennium, councils received the same level of funding as the 2011-2013 biennium based on that biennium's review and merit category placement. The purpose of this was to support OWEB staff who were in the process of developing new Council Capacity grant rules for the 2015-2017 biennium.</i> Umbrella Council Awards Continue Umbrella Council awards continue until 2017.
Eligibility Criteria Focused	2015 - Present	Due to resource-intensive staff time and council time of the previous method, OWEB adopted new Council Capacity grant rules. Eligibility Criteria² Includes: (1) designated as a watershed council by a local government, (2) previously received a Council Capacity grant, and serves an area that covers the same or larger area served by a council or group of councils as of 2013 with only one

² https://secure.sos.state.or.us/oard/viewSingleRule.action%3BJSESSIONID_OARD=_VLon9LnJiAMJjKYNJha26rZ1ggeHDYseAQO-PWCFwak9LE4AU_-!-2132861245?ruleVrsnRsn=180686

applicant per geographic area and includes a minimum population size of 500 within its designated boundaries, (3) has an adopted action plan by a council-governing body that meets OWEB requirements, (4) is a 501(c)(3) registered with Oregon, or written fiscal sponsorship agreement with a 501(c)(3), SWCD, city, county, or tribal government, (5) Council's governing body has adopted bylaws or a charter that includes: (a) a declaration that the council's mission aligns with OWEB's purpose as described in the Oregon Constitution and statutes. At a minimum, the bylaws or charter shall indicate that a primary purpose of the council is to work collaboratively with communities and landowners to develop and carry out voluntary watershed protection, restoration, enhancement, and community engagement activities; (b) the eligibility, selection process, length of service, and powers for governing body and officers; officer titles, governing body's decision-making process, minimum number or frequency of governing body meetings; (c) a statement that the council intends its governing body to include a diverse range of geographic areas and community interests in the watershed in order to engage a balance of interested and affected persons within the watershed as required by ORS 541.910(2); and (d) a process for amending bylaws or charter. If the council is a membership organization, its bylaws or charter must also include: membership eligibility, when membership meetings will occur, the decision-making role of the membership, a process to remove members or terminate members' voting rights; and (6) the Council's governing body has adopted policies/procedures that include: (a) list of geographic areas and community interests the council intends to include on its governing body in order to engage a balance of interested and affected persons within the watershed pursuant to ORS 541.910(2); (b) policy that the council operates as an open and inclusive organization, including inviting the public to council meetings, and, upon request, providing the public with records of its meetings and decisions; (c) policy that the council, or its fiscal sponsor, uses Generally Accepted Accounting Principles; and (d) policy that the council does not rely on litigation to compel regulatory enforcement as a means to implement its mission.

Merit Evaluation Criteria

Criteria include: (1) Effective Governance and Management, (2) Progress in Planning, (3) Progress in On-the-Ground Watershed Restoration, and (4) Progress in Stakeholder Engagement for Watershed Restoration Purposes.

Review Process

OWEB staff evaluate Council Capacity grant applications based on the merit criteria described above as well as their institutional knowledge of the council, including the council's project performance history. Councils are not ranked, but rather each application is considered on its own basis to determine funding amount.

Funding Distribution

Funding levels include: (1) full funding if the council meets all criteria, (2) reduced funding if the council meets some criteria, and (3) do not fund if the council's performance is inadequate. **Additionally, if two or more councils have merged, they are eligible for additional funding on top of the base capacity grant award. These grant funds are used to help organizations merge together to address board and staff development, strategic planning, and other costs to support the transition from multiple organizations to a single entity. This amount varies depending on whether 2, 3, or 4 or more organizations are merging.*

Umbrella Council Awards Continue Umbrella Council awards continue until 2017.

Appendix 2. Service Providers and Supportive Organizations.

Organization	Description
OWEB Regional Program Representatives	• Represents OWEB's programs with councils and other local conservation partners. • Reviews, administers, and oversees the implementation of grants. • Promotes cooperation, participation, and funding from federal, state, and local public agencies; citizens; and interest groups to assess watershed conditions, develop priority actions, and implement projects to enhance watershed conditions (e.g., attend council board meetings to support councils experiencing management challenges and sharing grant opportunities). • Coordinates technical assistance with local partners, including councils, districts, landowners, and other stakeholders.
OWEB Capacity Coordinator ³	• Works with the Director to improve coordination and joint investment opportunities with external funders, including other state agencies, federal agencies, private foundations, and other funders of similar conservation work. Identifies opportunities for leveraged investment; develops materials to help other funders understand OWEB's role and the types of investments the agency makes. • Holds regular planning and coordination meetings with statewide organizations representing local organizations including, but not limited to the OACD, NOWC, OCEAN, and Coalition of Oregon Land Trusts. Works collaboratively to identify local partner problems and solutions. • Works collaboratively with OWEB Regional Program Representatives and Grant Payment Specialist to manage, coordinate, and troubleshoot funding request process of Council Capacity grants. • Leads coordination for Oregon Department of Agriculture to implement District Capacity program. • Coordinates program development, assessment, and implementation with program managers, regional field staff and other agency staff. • Develops and leads effective review teams to evaluate and makes funding recommendations for Operating Capacity grants. • Regularly communicates with applicants and trains on the application process and materials as needed. • Makes recommendations for other grant types that may be effective to improve local capacity.
ODA Regional Water Quality Specialists	• Provide districts with technical assistance in implementing the agricultural water quality management program. This is achieved through districts' scope of work (SOW) by "ensuring that farmers and ranchers help achieve water quality

³ Note: OWEB no longer has this position. This work has been incorporated into OWEB's Monitoring and Reporting Program Manager role.

	standards and meet the agricultural pollutant load allocations assigned by the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) in its Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs).”⁴ ● Reviews and approves districts’ SOW reporting and operational funds prior to districts’ receipt of payments. ● Attends district board meetings and works with funding partners to support districts in working with local partners and share grant opportunities. ● Meets monthly with the SWCD Operations Specialist to share concerns about lower-functioning districts and will sometimes ask peers of higher-functioning organizations to work with lower-functioning ones. Time spent on this can be included in a district’s capacity grant.
SWCD Operations Specialist	● Provides biennial regional board member trainings focused on newly elected or appointed board members on legal obligations of elected officials. ● Provides biennial regional district manager round-table trainings on a variety of topics (e.g., personnel management, ethics, public meeting laws). ● Offers individual onboarding training for new employees and board directors. ● Provides on-demand operational technical support (personnel management, legal obligations, ethics, public meeting law, etc.). ● Writes and updates a “District Guidebook” outlining legal and best management practices for operating a conservation district.
Network of Oregon Watershed Councils (NOWC)	● Nonprofit organization funded primarily by OWEB and membership fees, that engages in advocacy work at the state level, while also offering professional development and networking opportunities. ● NOWC Insider Webinar Series regularly features content experts who offer technical training and resources on a range of topics, including best practices for nonprofit management. ● Template Library of funding resources, sample templates, handbooks, and guides. ● Watershed Council FAQs covering meetings, contracts and bids, financials, hiring and onboarding, and community action. ● 2022 Funding Opportunities spreadsheet summarizing emerging (or enhanced) state and federal funding programs.
Oregon Conservation Education and Assistance Network (OCEAN) Connect + Conference	● Hosts the annual CONNECT conference for councils and districts with opportunities for peer learning and networking. ● Offers training and certification for districts on education and outreach training through universities, professional networks, and NOAA; as well as technical training, e.g., NRCS, GIS, and river restoration; and DEI trainings and toolkits.
Oregon Association of Conservation Districts (OACD)	● Nonprofit association of districts that partners and converses with state agencies, legislators, and statewide conservation organizations. ● Hosts the annual OACD conference which covers topics, e.g., funding opportunities, updates from partners, water quality programs, and conservation practices.

⁴ <https://www.oregon.gov/oda/programs/naturalresources/agwq/pages/agwqplans.aspx>

Oregon Conservation Partnership (OrCP)	• Hosts affinity groups to increase collaboration to improve conservation across councils, districts, and land trusts. Groups focus on: estuaries and tide gates, journal club for aquatic habitat restoration, pollinators, and protection of working lands and easements. • Offers monthly webinars covering fiscal management, restoration and conservation topics, outreach, partnerships, contracting, OWEB grants, and more.
--	---

Appendix 3. Survey

A. Methods

Development and Review

A survey was sent out online using Oregon State University's Qualtrics survey platform to all 58 councils and all 42 districts in Oregon that receive or have received Operating Capacity grants. The first set of questions focused on employees and shared staffing arrangements. The purpose of this was to frame the sampling of councils and districts using Dr. Margerum's "Reliance Model of Collaborative Capacity", which was developed through prior surveys of councils. This conceptual model provided a way to identify staffing models, arranging organizations into similar types. We used this to develop representative sampling for case study selection. After a discussion with key ODA staff, it was determined that this was an appropriate way to understand districts as well. Types include: (1) Board-Reliant, (2) Staff-Reliant, and (3) Partner-Reliant (Table 1).

Table 1. *Typology Classifications.*

Board-Reliant	Staff-Reliant	Partner-Reliant
Lower staff levels (< 3.0 FTE).	Higher staff levels (≥ 3.0 FTE).	Varied staffing that is shared with another organization (e.g., staff, coordinator).
Staff delivers primary capacity with greater reliance on a working board.	Staff fulfills most management capacity roles.	

The second set of questions focused on the level of agreement or disagreement with statements identifying factors that build or reduce organizational capacity to obtain a consistent source of quantifiable information across council and district grantees since much of the existing data sources were inconsistent. Survey questions were informed by recurring themes from key informant interviews and discussion with the Core Project Committee.

Recruitment Process

We collected emails and phone numbers for the executive director, coordinator, or district manager, for all councils and districts using the organization's websites for councils and the annually updated Oregon SWCD Directory for districts. The survey took place between April - May 2022. The research team contacted potential respondents three times, either via email or phone call, while the Core Project Committee promoted the survey through their networks. To ensure that only qualified individuals completed the survey, we included a screening question to verify respondents were employed by a council or district and able to answer questions about their organization's staffing and capacity.

Data Analysis

Data was downloaded, cleaned, and organized in Microsoft Excel. We did not include responses that were incomplete for applying the capacity typology or for identifying factors that built or reduced organizational capacity. To categorize grantees by the capacity typology, we asked about staffing levels over the past 12 months for the executive director, district manager, or coordinator; permanent staff; contracted staff; and temporary (e.g., seasonal) staff. We then totaled these to determine whether an organization was staff- or board-reliant. There were 3 councils and 6 districts that fell on the dividing line of board-reliant vs. staff-reliant. For those, we looked at the organization's self-description and discussed with the research team what seemed the most

appropriate designation. For partner-reliant, we used the organization’s self-description of its relationship with other organizations, and to what extent they shared staff and/or physical location with another organization. Additionally, we asked whether board members served on another related local organization’s board and if board members or other community members (e.g., volunteers) took on essential administrative tasks. For the statements focused on organizational capacity factors, we used descriptive statistics to examine the percentage of respondents in each response category by: (1) councils and districts, (2) board, staff, and partner-reliant councils as well as districts, and (3) taxing and non-taxing districts. Additionally, the categories of “strongly agree” and “somewhat agree” were simplified into a single category “agree”. This was done for the “strongly disagree” and “somewhat disagree” categories as well. Furthermore, for the capacity typologies, we calculated the average (mean) response for each of these questions to determine if there was a statistical difference between types. For the open-ended questions, we coded them qualitatively for repeated themes to find connections with the statements on organizational capacity factors.

B. Survey Questionnaire

The following questions focus on FTE and staffing arrangements.

1. What has been your organization’s staff FTE at its highest level over the past 12 months for the following categories? (FTE = Full Time Equivalent. For example, two half-time positions = 1 FTE).
 - a. Total permanent staff FTE (NOT including contract or temporary staff)?
 - b. Total contract staff FTE?
 - c. Total temporary staff FTE (e.g., seasonal)?
 - d. Executive director, district manager, or coordinator FTE (as either employee or contractor)?
2. If your organization shares any staff with another organization(s), what is the shared staff FTE for each of the following categories?
 - a. Total permanent staff FTE (NOT including contract or temporary staff)?
 - b. Total contract staff FTE?
 - c. Total temporary staff FTE (e.g., seasonal)?
 - d. Executive director, district manager, or coordinator FTE (as either employee or contractor)?
 - e. What is the name of this organization(s)?
 - f. Is there anything else you would like to explain about how you share staff and work with this organization(s)?
3. If any of your board members serve on another related local organization’s board, which of the following do they serve on?
 - a. ☒ Soil & Water Conservation District.
 - b. ☒ Watershed Council.
 - c. ☒ Another organization that is fiscally, or otherwise important to supporting your operational capacity.
 - d. What is the name of this organization(s)?
4. Do any of your board members or other community members (e.g. volunteers) take on these tasks?
 - a. ☒ Staff administrative tasks.
 - b. ☒ Grant writing.
 - c. ☒ Strategic planning.
 - d. ☒ Other _____ (please explain).

The following questions focus on finding out what factors help keep your organization functional and healthy.

1. We're interested in learning about how your organization operates. Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements for your organization. (Strongly Agree = 1, Somewhat Agree = 2, Neither Agree nor Disagree = 3, Somewhat Disagree = 4, Strong Disagree = 5, Unsure = unranked).

Our board members have clear position descriptions describing their roles and responsibilities.
Our board receives training on financial management, facilitation, and personnel management.
Our board takes initiative and actively engages in helping manage our organization.
We have written personnel and operational policies.
We implement our personnel and operational policies.
Our board members have term limits. <i>*Since district board members are elected, we did not ask districts to respond to this.</i>
We have succession planning for board members in our strategic plans and/or other documents.
We have succession planning for lead staff (district manager, coordinator, and/or executive director) in our strategic plans and/or other documents.
We have mentorship structures in place to introduce new coordinators/directors to the community, agency contacts, and board members to support relationship building.
Our staff has clear position descriptions describing their roles and responsibilities.
We have competitive staff salaries and benefits compared to councils, districts, or similar types of organizations.
Our organization has high retention rates for our lead staff (district manager, coordinator, and/or executive director).
Our staff receive training on key operational capacities (e.g., project management, contracting, and administrative tasks).
Our staff receive training on technical skill-building (e.g., GIS).
We have adequate equipment/ technology for virtual meetings.

2. We're interested in learning about how your organization operates with other councils, districts, or other local partners. Please rate how often your organization works with other organizations based on the following statements. (Most of the time = 1, Some of the time = 2, Seldom = 3, Never = 4, Unsure = unranked).

We are working with councils, districts, and/or other local partners.
We share office space and other administrative costs with councils, districts, or other local partners.
We share staff expertise between councils, districts, or other local partners (e.g., technical, GIS, outreach to landowners, farmers, etc.).

We actively seek out opportunities to leverage OWEB Operating Capacity grants to acquire stakeholder engagement, monitoring, technical assistance, and restoration grants to implement projects on the ground.

We actively seek out opportunities to leverage OWEB Operating Capacity grants to build cooperative partnerships with councils, districts, or other local organizations.

We actively seek out opportunities to leverage OWEB Operating Capacity grants to obtain additional funding for capacity building (e.g., hiring additional staff, providing staff skills training, and improving administrative management).

3. (Optional): Please explain anything important that has helped keep your organization healthy and functional.
4. (Optional): What has been your most significant challenge for sustaining the work of your council/district?

C. Statistical Analysis

Table 2. Statistical Analysis of Council Survey Results.

Council Responses	Staff-reliant	Board-reliant	Partner-reliant	All
	N=27	N=17	N=3	
Clear Board Position Descriptions	1.78	2.18	2.67	1.98
Board Training	3.00	3.00	3.67	3.04
Board Initiative*	2.22†	2.06¥	3.33†¥	2.23
Written Policies¥	1.19*	1.47*	1.33	1.30
Implement Policies	1.41	1.65	1.33	1.49
Board Term Limits	2.74	3.06	2.67	2.85
Board Succession Planning	3.30	3.29	3.67	3.32
Lead Staff Succession Planning	3.70	3.41	4.33	3.64
New Lead Staff Mentorship	3.22	3.13	2.33	3.13
Clear Staff Position Descriptions	1.52*†	2.12*¥	1.00†¥	1.70
Competitive salaries	2.44*	3.07*	2.33	2.64
Lead Staff High Retention Rates*	1.93†	2.53¥	1.00†¥	2.09
Training–Operational Capacities	2.22	2.50	3.00	2.37
Training–Technical Skills	2.44	3.06	3.33	2.72
Virtual Meeting Equipment	1.93*	2.69*¥	2.00¥	2.20
Work with Councils, Districts, Others	1.15*	1.41*	1.33	1.26
Share Office Space	3.19†	2.88¥	1.00†¥	2.94
Share Staff Expertise	1.56	1.88	1.33	1.66
Acquire OWEB Grants for Implementation	1.33	1.69¥	1.00¥	1.43
Build Cooperative Partnerships	1.48†	1.69	2.00†	1.59
Additional Funding for Capacity Building	1.67	1.94	1.67	1.76

* statistically significant difference between Staff-reliant and Board-reliant Councils

† statistically significant difference between Staff-reliant and Partner-reliant Councils

¥ statistically significant difference between Board-reliant and Partner-reliant Councils

Table 3. Statistical Analysis of District Survey Results.

District Responses	Staff-reliant	Board-reliant	Partner-reliant	All
	N=28	N=5	N=5	N=38
Clear Board Position Descriptions	2.00	2.40	2.20	2.08
Board Training	2.82	2.60	2.60	2.76
Board Initiative	2.21	2.60	2.40	2.29
Written Policies	1.32	1.80	1.40	1.39
Implement Policies	1.29	2.00	1.20	1.37
Board Succession Planning	3.38	3.40	3.40	3.39
Lead Staff Succession Planning	3.00	3.40	3.40	3.11
New Lead Staff Mentorship	3.36	3.20	3.00	3.29
Clear Staff Position Descriptions	1.32	2.40	1.40	1.47
Competitive salaries	1.89*†	4.40*	3.00†	2.37
Lead Staff High Retention Rates	2.04	1.80	1.80	1.97
Training—Operational Capacities	1.93	2.40	2.00	2.00
Training—Technical Skills	1.79	2.20	2.20	1.89
Virtual Meeting Equipment	2.04	2.60	2.00	2.11
Work with Councils, Districts, Others	1.04	1.40	1.20	1.11
Share Office Space	1.79*	2.80*	1.60	1.89
Share Staff Expertise	1.25*	1.80*	1.80	1.39
Acquire OWEB Grants for Implementation	1.19	1.60	1.20	1.24
Build Cooperative Partnerships	1.54	1.80	1.40	1.55
Additional Funding for Capacity Building	1.54	1.80	2.00	1.63

* statistically significant difference between Staff-reliant and Board-reliant Districts

† statistically significant difference between Staff-reliant and Partner-reliant Districts

D. Council Databases

Table 4. Capacity Building Factors by Councils.

		Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Unsure
Clear Board Position Descriptions	Percent	40%	38%	9%	9%	4%	0%
	Number	19	18	4	4	2	0
Board Training	Percent	9%	36%	13%	28%	15%	0%
	Number	4	17	6	13	7	0
Board Initiative	Percent	26%	45%	13%	15%	2%	0%
	Number	12	21	6	7	1	0
Written Policies	Percent	72%	26%	2%	0%	0%	0%
	Number	34	12	1	0	0	0
Implemented Policies	Percent	70%	19%	4%	4%	2%	0%
	Number	33	9	2	2	1	0
Board Term Limits	Percent	32%	17%	15%	6%	30%	0%
	Number	15	8	7	3	14	0
Board Succession Planning	Percent	11%	19%	21%	26%	23%	0%
	Number	5	9	10	12	11	0
Lead Staff Succession Planning	Percent	11%	6%	26%	23%	34%	0%
	Number	5	3	12	11	16	0
New Lead Staff Mentorship	Percent	11%	21%	32%	13%	21%	2%
	Number	5	10	15	6	10	1
Clear Staff Position Descriptions	Percent	53%	30%	11%	6%	0%	0%
	Number	25	14	5	3	0	0

Competitive Salaries	Percent	21%	26%	21%	21%	6%	4%
	Number	10	12	10	10	3	2
Lead Staff High Retention Rates	Percent	49%	19%	15%	9%	9%	0%
	Number						
Training – Operational Capacities	Number	10	20	7	7	2	1
	Percent						
Training – Technical Skills	Percent	13%	45%	15%	17%	6%	4%
	Number	6	21	7	8	3	2
Virtual Meeting Equipment	Percent	34%	36%	13%	4%	11%	2%
	Number	16	17	6	2	5	1

Table 5. Councils: Working with Local Partners and Leveraging Capacity Grants.

		Most of the time	Some of the time	Seldom	Never	Unsure
Work with Councils, Districts, Other Local Partners	Percent	74%	26%	0%	0%	0%
	Number	35	12	0	0	0
Share Office Space	Percent	21%	11%	21%	47%	0%
	Number	10	5	10	22	0
Share Staff Expertise	Percent	45%	49%	2%	4%	0%
	Number	21	23	1	2	0
Acquire OWEB Grants for Implementation	Percent	68%	23%	0%	6%	2%
	Number	32	11	0	3	1
Build Cooperative Partnerships	Percent	68%	11%	11%	9%	2%
	Number	32	5	5	4	1
Additional Funding for Capacity Building	Percent	43%	43%	6%	6%	2%
	Number	20	20	3	3	1

Table 6. Capacity Building Factors by Council Typology. (Note: B-R = Board-Reliant, S-R = Staff-Reliant, P-R = Partner-Reliant).

		Strongly Agree		Somewhat Agree		Neither Agree nor Disagree		Somewhat Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Unsure	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Clear Board Position Descriptions	B-R	7	41%	4	24%	3	18%	2	12%	1	6%	0	0%
	S-R	11	41%	13	48%	1	4%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%
	P-R	1	33%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%
Board Training	B-R	2	12%	5	29%	3	18%	5	29%	2	12%	0	0%
	S-R	2	7%	11	41%	3	11%	7	26%	4	15%	0	0%
	P-R	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%	1	33%	1	33%	0	0%
Board Initiative	B-R	5	29%	8	47%	2	12%	2	12%	0	0%	0	0%
	S-R	7	26%	12	44%	4	15%	3	11%	1	4%	0	0%
	P-R	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%	2	67%	0	0%	0	0%
Written Policies	B-R	10	59%	6	35%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	S-R	22	81%	5	19%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	P-R	2	67%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Implemented Policies	B-R	10	59%	4	24%	2	12%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%
	S-R	21	78%	4	15%	0	0%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%
	P-R	2	67%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Board Term Limits	B-R	3	18%	3	18%	5	29%	2	12%	4	24%	0	0%
	S-R	11	41%	4	15%	2	7%	1	4%	9	33%	0	0%
	P-R	1	33%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%
	B-R	3	18%	1	6%	6	35%	2	12%	5	29%	0	0%

Board Succession Planning	S-R	2	7%	7	26%	4	15%	9	33%	5	19%	0	0%
	P-R	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%	1	33%	1	33%	0	0%
Lead Staff Succession Planning	B-R	3	18%	0	0%	6	35%	3	18%	5	29%	0	0%
	S-R	2	7%	3	11%	6	22%	6	22%	10	37%	0	0%
	P-R	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	67%	1	33%	0	0%
New Lead Staff Mentorship	B-R	2	12%	2	12%	6	35%	4	24%	2	12%	1	6%
	S-R	1	4%	8	30%	9	33%	2	7%	7	26%	0	0%
	P-R	2	67%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%
Clear Staff Position Descriptions	B-R	6	35%	6	35%	2	12%	3	18%	0	0%	0	0%
	S-R	16	59%	8	30%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	P-R	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Competitive Salaries	B-R	2	12%	4	24%	3	18%	3	18%	3	18%	2	12%
	S-R	7	26%	7	26%	7	26%	6	22%	0	0%	0	0%
	P-R	1	33%	1	33%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%
Lead Staff High Retention Rates	B-R	7	41%	2	12%	3	18%	2	12%	3	18%	0	0%
	S-R	13	48%	7	26%	4	15%	2	7%	1	4%	0	0%
	P-R	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Training – Operational Capacities	B-R	4	24%	6	35%	1	6%	4	24%	1	6%	1	6%
	S-R	6	22%	12	44%	6	22%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%
	P-R	0	0%	2	67%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%
	B-R	3	18%	6	35%	1	6%	3	18%	2	12%	2	12%

Training – Technical Skills	S-R	3	11%	14	52%	5	19%	5	19%	0	0%	0	0%
	P-R	0	0%	1	33%	1	33%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%
Virtual Meeting Equipment	B-R	4	24%	4	24%	4	24%	1	6%	3	18%	1	6%
	S-R	12	44%	10	37%	2	7%	1	4%	2	7%	0	0%
	P-R	0	0%	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Table 7. Council Typology: Working with Local Partners and Leveraging Operating Capacity Grants.(Note: B-R = Board-Reliant, S-R = Staff-Reliant, P-R = Partner-Reliant).

		Most of the time		Some of the time		Seldom		Never		Unsure	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Work with Councils, Districts, Other Local Partners	B-R	10	59%	7	41%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	S-R	23	85%	4	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	P-R	2	67%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Share Office Space	B-R	2	12%	5	29%	3	18%	7	41%	0	0%
	S-R	5	19%	0	0%	7	26%	15	56%	0	0%
	P-R	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Share Staff Expertise	B-R	5	29%	10	59%	1	6%	1	6%	0	0%
	S-R	14	52%	12	44%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%
	P-R	2	67%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Acquire OWEB Grants for Implementation	B-R	11	65%	2	12%	0	0%	3	18%	1	6%
	S-R	18	67%	9	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	P-R	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Build Cooperative	B-R	12	71%	0	0%	1	6%	3	18%	1	6%

Partnerships	S-R	19	70%	4	15%	3	11%	1	4%	0	0%
	P-R	1	33%	1	33%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%
Additional Funding for Capacity Building	B-R	7	41%	5	29%	2	12%	2	12%	1	6%
	S-R	12	44%	13	48%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%
	P-R	1	33%	2	67%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

E. District Databases

Table 8. Capacity Building Factors by Districts.

		Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Unsure
Clear Board Position Descriptions	Percent	42%	34%	5%	11%	8%	0%
	Number	16	13	2	4	3	0
Board Training	Percent	11%	39%	21%	21%	8%	0%
	Number	4	15	8	8	3	0
Board Initiative	Percent	34%	32%	5%	29%	0%	0%
	Number	13	12	2	11	0	0
Written Policies	Percent	71%	24%	3%	0%	3%	0%
	Number	27	9	1	0	1	0
Implemented Policies	Percent	71%	26%	0%	0%	3%	0%
	Number	27	10	0	0	1	0
Board Succession Planning	Percent	11%	13%	24%	24%	24%	5%
	Number	4	5	9	9	9	2
Lead Staff Succession Planning	Percent	13%	24%	16%	24%	18%	5%

	Number	5	9	6	9	7	2
New Lead Staff Mentorship	Percent	11%	26%	16%	18%	29%	0%
	Number	4	10	6	7	11	0
Clear Staff Position Descriptions	Percent	68%	21%	8%	0%	3%	0%
	Number	26	8	3	0	1	0
Competitive Salaries	Percent	39%	24%	13%	8%	16%	0%
	Number	15	9	5	3	6	0
Lead Staff High Retention Rates	Percent	55%	21%	3%	13%	8%	0%
	Number	21	8	1	5	3	0
Training – Operational Capacities	Percent	47%	24%	16%	8%	5%	0%
	Number	18	9	6	3	2	0
Training – Technical Skills	Percent	47%	34%	8%	3%	8%	0%
	Number	18	13	3	1	3	0
Virtual Meeting Equipment	Percent	45%	29%	8%	8%	11%	0%
	Number	17	11	3	3	4	0

Table 9. Districts: Working with Local Partners and Leveraging Operating Capacity Grants.

		Most of the time	Some of the time	Seldom	Never	Unsure
Work with Councils, Districts, Other Local Partners	Percent	92%	5%	3%	0%	0%
	Number	35	2	1	0	0
Share Office Space	Percent	58%	16%	5%	21%	0%
	Number	22	6	2	8	0
Share Staff Expertise	Percent	74%	16%	8%	3%	0%

	Number	28	6	3	1	0
Acquire OWEB Grants for Implementation	Percent	82%	11%	3%	3%	3%
	Number	31	4	1	1	1
Build Cooperative Partnerships	Percent	63%	24%	8%	5%	0%
	Number	24	9	3	2	0
Additional Funding for Capacity Building	Percent	63%	18%	11%	8%	0%
	Number	24	7	4	3	0

Table 10. Capacity Building Factors by District Typology. (Note: B-R = Board-Reliant, S-R = Staff-Reliant, P-R = Partner-Reliant).

		Strongly Agree		Somewhat Agree		Neither Agree nor Disagree		Somewhat Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Unsure	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Clear Board Position Descriptions	B-R	0	0%	4	80%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%
	S-R	13	46%	9	32%	1	4%	3	11%	2	7%	0	0%
	P-R	3	60%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%
Board Training	B-R	0	0%	3	60%	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%
	S-R	3	11%	10	36%	7	25%	5	18%	3	11%	0	0%
	P-R	1	20%	2	40%	0	0%	2	40%	0	0%	0	0%
Board Initiative	B-R	1	20%	1	20%	2	40%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%
	S-R	10	36%	10	36%	0	0%	8	29%	0	0%	0	0%
	P-R	2	40%	1	20%	0	0%	2	40%	0	0%	0	0%
Written Policies	B-R	2	40%	2	40%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	S-R	22	79%	5	18%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%
	P-R	3	60%	2	40%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Implemented Policies	B-R	3	60%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%
	S-R	20	71%	8	29%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	P-R	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Board Succession Planning	B-R	0	0%	1	20%	2	40%	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%
	S-R	3	11%	3	11%	7	25%	7	25%	6	21%	2	7%
	P-R	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	1	20%	2	40%	0	0%
Lead Staff Succession Planning	B-R	0	0%	2	40%	1	20%	0	0%	2	40%	0	0%
	S-R	4	14%	6	21%	5	18%	8	29%	3	11%	2	7%
	P-R	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	1	20%	2	40%	0	0%
New Lead Staff Mentorship	B-R	1	20%	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	2	40%	0	0%
	S-R	1	4%	9	32%	5	18%	5	18%	8	29%	0	0%
	P-R	2	40%	0	0%	0	0%	2	40%	1	20%	0	0%
Clear Staff Position Descriptions	B-R	2	40%	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%
	S-R	21	75%	5	18%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	P-R	3	60%	2	40%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Competitive Salaries	B-R	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	4	80%	0	0%
	S-R	15	54%	6	21%	3	11%	3	11%	1	4%	0	0%
	P-R	0	0%	2	40%	2	40%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%
Lead Staff High Retention Rates	B-R	4	80%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%
	S-R	14	50%	7	25%	1	4%	4	14%	2	7%	0	0%
	P-R	3	60%	1	20%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%
	B-R	2	40%	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%

Training – Operational Capacities	S-R	15	54%	5	18%	4	14%	3	11%	1	4%	0	0%
	P-R	1	20%	3	60%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Training – Technical Skills	B-R	2	40%	2	40%	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%
	S-R	15	54%	9	32%	1	4%	1	4%	2	7%	0	0%
	P-R	1	20%	2	40%	2	40%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Virtual Meeting Equipment	B-R	3	60%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	40%	0	0%
	S-R	11	39%	11	39%	2	7%	2	7%	2	7%	0	0%
	P-R	3	60%	0	0%	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%

Table 11. District Typology: Working with Local Partners and Leveraging Operating Capacity Grants. (Note: B-R = Board-Reliant, S-R = Staff-Reliant, P-R = Partner-Reliant).

		Most of the time		Some of the time		Seldom		Never		Unsure	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Work with Councils, Districts, Other Local Partners	B-R	4	80%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%
	S-R	27	96%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	P-R	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Share Office Space	B-R	1	20%	1	20%	1	20%	2	40%	0	0%
	S-R	18	64%	4	14%	0	0%	6	21%	0	0%
	P-R	3	60%	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%
Share Staff Expertise	B-R	2	40%	2	40%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%
	S-R	23	82%	3	11%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%
	P-R	3	60%	1	20%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%
Acquire OWEB Grants for	B-R	4	80%	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%
	S-R	23	82%	3	11%	1	4%	0	0%	1	4%

Implementation	P-R	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Build Cooperative Partnerships	B-R	3	60%	1	20%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%
	S-R	17	61%	8	29%	2	7%	1	4%	0	0%
	P-R	4	80%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%
Additional Funding for Capacity Building	B-R	3	60%	1	20%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%
	S-R	18	64%	6	21%	3	11%	1	4%	0	0%
	P-R	3	60%	0	0%	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%

Table 12. Capacity Building Factors by Taxing vs. Non-Taxing Districts.

		Strongly Agree		Somewhat Agree		Neither Agree nor Disagree		Somewhat Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Unsure	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Clear Board Position Descriptions	Taxing	4	40%	2	20%	1	10%	2	20%	1	10%	0	0%
	Non-Taxing	9	50%	7	39%	0	0%	1	6%	1	6%	0	0%
Board Training	Taxing	1	10%	3	30%	3	30%	1	10%	2	20%	0	0%
	Non-Taxing	2	11%	7	39%	4	22%	4	22%	1	6%	0	0%
Board Initiative	Taxing	2	20%	5	50%	0	0%	3	30%	0	0%	0	0%
	Non-Taxing	8	44%	5	28%	0	0%	5	28%	0	0%	0	0%
Written Policies	Taxing	8	80%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	Non-Taxing	14	78%	3	17%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%	0	0%
Implemented Policies	Taxing	7	70%	3	30%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	Non-Taxing	13	72%	5	28%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	Taxing	1	10%	1	10%	2	20%	2	20%	3	30%	1	10%

Board Succession Planning	Non-Taxing	2	11%	2	11%	5	28%	5	28%	3	17%	1	6%
Lead Staff Succession Planning	Taxing	2	20%	3	30%	1	10%	1	10%	2	20%	1	10%
	Non-Taxing	2	11%	3	17%	4	22%	7	39%	1	6%	1	6%
New Lead Staff Mentorship	Taxing	1	10%	0	0%	2	20%	3	30%	4	40%	0	0%
	Non-Taxing	0	0%	9	50%	3	17%	2	11%	4	22%	0	0%
Clear Staff Position Descriptions	Taxing	8	80%	1	10%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	Non-Taxing	13	72%	4	22%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Competitive Salaries	Taxing	7	70%	2	20%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	Non-Taxing	8	44%	4	22%	2	11%	3	17%	1	6%	0	0%
Lead Staff High Retention Rates	Taxing	6	60%	1	10%	0	0%	3	30%	0	0%	0	0%
	Non-Taxing	8	44%	6	33%	1	6%	1	6%	2	11%	0	0%
Training–Operational Capacities	Taxing	7	70%	1	10%	0	0%	1	10%	1	10%	0	0%
	Non-Taxing	8	44%	4	22%	4	22%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%
Training–Technical Skills	Taxing	6	60%	3	30%	0	0%	0	0%	1	10%	0	0%
	Non-Taxing	9	50%	6	33%	1	6%	1	6%	1	6%	0	0%
Virtual Meeting Equipment	Taxing	7	70%	2	20%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	Non-Taxing	4	22%	9	50%	1	6%	2	11%	2	11%	0	0%

Table 13. Taxing vs. Non-Taxing Districts: Working with Local Partners and Leveraging Operating Capacity Grants.

		Most of the time		Some of the time		Seldom		Never		Unsure	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Work with Councils, Districts, Other Local	Taxing	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	Non-Taxing	17	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Partners											
Share Office Space	Taxing	7	70%	1	10%	0	0%	2	20%	0	0%
	Non-Taxing	11	61%	3	17%	0	0%	4	22%	0	0%
Share Staff Expertise	Taxing	8	80%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	Non-Taxing	15	83%	1	6%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%
Acquire OWEB Grants for Implementation	Taxing	8	80%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	Non-Taxing	15	83%	1	6%	1	6%	0	0%	1	6%
Build Cooperative Partnerships	Taxing	5	50%	4	40%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%
	Non-Taxing	12	67%	4	22%	1	6%	1	6%	0	0%
Additional Funding for Capacity Building	Taxing	6	60%	2	20%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%
	Non-Taxing	12	67%	4	22%	1	6%	1	6%	0	0%

Appendix 4. Case Studies

A. Methods

Case Study Selection

For the organizations that responded to the survey, we crosswalked the capacity typology with Oregon Watershed Restoration Inventory (OWRI)⁵ and OWEB Grant Management System (OGMS)⁶ data, from 1997 to 2019, to identify grantees with lower, low to medium, medium to high, and higher levels of obtaining and leveraging resources. To define these, we added up the total cash spent and in-kind contributions for each organization and then used quartile statistical breakpoints. We compared councils to councils and districts to districts, since each differed in their organizational structure, and as such, were distinct units of measure. We also accounted for organizations' name changes to ensure we included their entire history of funding obtained. We also noted which districts received local taxes. The only districts with a tax base fell under the staff-reliant typology, which validated the data based on the working assumption that once a district obtained a tax base, they were able to operate at a higher level because of increased staffing.

Initial Document Analysis

We sampled 20 organizations, (i.e., 10 councils and 10 districts; see Table 14), using selection criteria in the following order: representative across typologies, a representative proportion of resources obtained and leveraged, and representative across urban and rural. Lastly, we consulted with the Core Project Committee to identify which of these organizations would be more likely and able to participate. For each of the selected 20 organizations, we reviewed available data from OGMS grant documents⁷ and OWRI data from 1997 to 2019, as well as SOW and FAAP from 2015 to 2019, OWEB FIPs and P-TA, and other organizational documents accessible on council and district websites to create in-depth organizational profiles. These profiles summarized the history and trajectory of each organization relative to the following capacity dimensions:

- Internal governance and operational practices (e.g., organizational documents, changes in staffing and board over time, changes in organizational structure and processes)
- Adaptive governance (e.g., mention of succession planning in organizational documents)
- Resources obtained and leveraged (e.g., funding sources used most frequently, acquisition of regionally competitive funds)
- Types of partners engaged (e.g., landowners, public agencies, private, nonprofit, and research entities worked with most frequently)
- Partnership types engaged in (e.g., involvement in OWEB FIPs and P-TA, NRCS RCPP, and cross-boundary partnerships)

⁵ OWRI included projects voluntarily reported that may or may not have received OWEB restoration grants. However, the purpose of this data source was to determine how many resources grantees obtained overall. Furthermore, despite the voluntary nature of reporting, this data source contained a fairly comprehensive listing of councils and districts self-reporting from 1997 to 2019.

⁶ OGMS data included OWEB grants for technical assistance, monitoring, education, outreach, and stakeholder engagement from 1997 to 2019. Since the initiation of OWEB's restoration grants, grantees have been required to report receipt of these to OWRI. Therefore, we did not include restoration grants to avoid duplication.

⁷ OGMS grant documents included council support, restoration, technical assistance, monitoring, education, outreach, and stakeholder engagement from 1997 to 2019. For districts that served as fiscal sponsors to a council, we also looked at council support grant documents for councils to better understand how they work together.

Table 14. *Grantees Selected for Initial Document Analysis.*

Councils	Districts
Coast Fork Willamette WC	Clackamas SWCD
Malheur WC	Clatsop SWCD
Nestucca - Neskowin WC	Crook SWCD
North Coast WA	Curry SWCD
Powder Basin WC	Douglas SWCD
Rogue River WC	Grant SWCD
South Fork John Day WC	Marion SWCD
Tualatin River WC	Siuslaw SWCD
Upper Deschutes WC	Wallowa SWCD
Walla Walla WC	Wheeler SWCD

In-depth Interviews

To select case study organizations for in-depth interviews, we developed a spreadsheet of the sampled 20 organizations, noting highlights from each capacity dimension to identify organizations that seemed likely to offer insights into these topics based on their specific experiences. Additionally, we ensured that the organizations we selected were roughly representative of a diversity of types and locations as per our selection criteria for the initial document analysis. Lastly, we considered which councils and districts were involved in the FIP Partnership Learning Project to not over-burden potential participants in a simultaneous research study. We selected 7 organizations for case study interviews in consultation with the Core Project Committee (Table 15). Interview questions were informed by the in-depth organizational profiles and discussion with the Core Project Committee. Prior to conducting interviews, we shared the organizational profile we developed with lead staff (e.g., coordinator, executive director, or district manager) for validation. Interviews were semi-structured and questions were slightly adjusted in the course of the interview based on what organization they worked for, as well as based on the expertise and role of the interviewee. Interviewees included: current and past lead staff (i.e., executive directors, coordinators, district managers), 1 to 2 other staff (e.g. project managers, administrative assistants), 1 to 2 board members (e.g., board chair/president or vice chair/vice president), and 2 to 3 top partnering organizations.⁸

⁸ It was difficult to contact previous staff or board members for interviews since they were less available to participate, while some organizations were not sure of who past staff were. Interestingly, some organizations have relied on past staff during times of staffing transitions, which increased the likelihood of their participation. Additionally, when it was not possible to obtain partner contacts of a council or districts' top partnering organization because they were going through their own lead staff transition, we interviewed the organizations who were available to participate.

Table 15. Grantees Selected for In-depth Interviews.

Organizations	Number of Interviews
Coast Fork Willamette WC	7
North Coast WA	5
Powder Basin WC	6
South Fork John Day WC	7
Curry SWCD	7
Marion SWCD	6
Wheeler SWCD	4
TOTAL	42

Interview Analysis

Interviews were recorded on Zoom or by hand-held recorder for phone interviews, and transcribed using Rev transcription service. For individuals that preferred to not be recorded, we took detailed notes. Data collected during the interviews was linked only to participant names by password-protected key sheets kept on the researchers' institutional computers and password-protected cloud file sharing. Using NVivo qualitative analysis software, we analyzed the interviews by using themes related to the capacity dimensions, as well as by how grantees' used the Operating Capacity grants to identify what built or reduced organizational capacity (Table 16). Additionally, we triangulated this data with the key informant interviews that took place in 2020 with OWEB Regional Program Representatives and ODA Regional Water Quality Specialists, as well as the organizational profiles we developed in the initial document analysis, to validate findings from the case study interviews. Lastly, we discussed the findings with the Core Project Committee to verify what we found with their institutional knowledge and long history of working with councils and districts.

Table 16. Primary NVivo Codes.

Primary Codes	Description
Operating Capacity Grant Program	How organizations used the Operating Capacity grants, comments on the role of OWEB/ODA staff in supporting organizations, and comments about grant application or reporting requirements.
Governance	Organizational management and challenges (e.g., roles and relationships between board and lead staff, fiscal management, succession planning), strategic plans, board recruitment, staff and board transitions, and on-boarding and training for staff and board.
Partnerships	How organizations build relationships to develop partnerships with agencies, tribes, councils, districts, or other local partners to work on joint projects; sharing staff or technical skills or knowledge with these entities; involvement in OWEB FIPs, P-TA grants or NRCS' RCPP grants; and participation in regional coordination and other information-sharing groups.
Resources	Discussion of how OWEB grants have helped organizations acquire non-OWEB funding sources; how they learned about these funding sources; participation in group networks to learn about and coordinate funding; access to stable funding; geographic and other differences in funding opportunities.
Interviewee Role	Position's title and length of employment; daily tasks and level of oversight with board and staff; and past work or volunteer experiences with councils, districts, or other jobs that led them to this position.

B. Case Study Interview Guide

Introductory Question

1. What's your role in your organization? How long have you been in this position?

Operating Capacity Grant Program

For this section, we want to hear your thoughts on how to improve OWEB's Operating Capacity grant program.

2. Is there anything about the Operating Capacity grant program that you think needs to change to be more supportive of your organization?
3. Are there aspects of the Operating Capacity grant program that help or hinder your ability to build more capacity?

Internal Governance & Operational Practices

For this section, we're hoping to learn more about how your organization functions, how it has evolved over time, and what factors have contributed to your organization's resilience.

4. We have some questions about the role and culture of your board.
 - a. Is your board more of a working board or a strategic board?
 - b. How engaged is your board in the management of the council?
 - c. Have you used onboarding or continuing education processes for your board?
 - i. *PROMPT:* e.g., orientation, position descriptions, division of duties?
 - d. What challenges have you had in board recruitment? What strategies have you used to overcome these?
5. *Plan to reference organizational profile:* Do you have a strategic action plan? How are you using it to build your organizational capacity? To sustain and build partnerships?
6. Can you tell me about a time when your organization faced challenges and you were able to respond to these challenges effectively?
 - a. *PROMPT:* What helped make that response effective? Leadership, partners, staff?
7. Can you tell me about a time when you faced difficulties that your organization had difficulty responding to or recovering from?
 - a. *PROMPT:* What made the response challenging? Capacity, board, partners, staff?
8. Has your council/district faced any challenging staffing or board changes?
 - a. *Follow-Up:* Were these expected or unexpected changes?
 - b. *Follow-Up:* Were these individuals key players in running the organization and/or had they been a part of the organization for a long time?
 - c. *Follow-Up:* How did your organization navigate staffing/board transitions?
9. What kinds of strategies, resources, or guidance do you have for succession planning?
 - a. *PROMPT - IF PARTNER-RELIANT:* I've heard of some organizations that work with a district or other entity as a fiscal sponsor will sometimes share staff. Does your organization do this? If so, do you have this written up in your organizational documents, or is this more informal, based on when the need arises?

Partnerships

For this section, we're hoping to learn more about how your organization partners with other organizations to build capacity in terms of skills, knowledge, and leveraging financial resources. We're also interested in learning about the types of partners you engage with on projects.

10. How do you partner with neighboring councils and/or districts to share services to meet skill and/or knowledge gaps to build capacity?
 - a. *PROMPT:* For example, working with a district that has an engineer on staff and can share technical assistance, while council staff focuses on outreach or education?
11. Who are the top 3 organizations that are your most important partners? How familiar are they with how your organization functions? *(We're planning to reach out to interview these organizations to help us learn more about how your organization operates. This will give us additional insight into what builds or reduces capacity.)*
 - a. *Follow-Up:* How did those partnerships develop?
12. Have you lost any partnerships recently?
 - a. *Follow-Up:* Do you know why it ended?
13. *If they received an OWEB FIP or P-TA grant:* How has the use of Partnership TA or FIP grants assisted your organization in building partnerships?
 - a. *PROMPT:* Based on looking through the OGMS grant applications, it seems like you had already built relationships with partners through past work together. Did anything change through the act of developing organizational documents and/or strategic action plans for P-TA grants? Did these working relationships become more intentional or was it just writing down what you were already practicing?

Resources Obtained & Leveraged

For this section, we're hoping to learn more about how your organization has leveraged funding from other sources and what challenges you've faced in acquiring those resources. We are also interested in understanding how your relationships with other organizations affect your ability to obtain funding.

14. Can you discuss how your non-OWEB funding sources have been developed and maintained?
 - a. *PROMPT:* Was it personal relationships with others, networking, or informal information sharing?
 - b. *PROMPT:* Has this been through staff outreach? Board connections?
15. How have OWEB Operating Capacity grants helped to leverage these other resources?
16. What kinds of ecological or regionally specific funds has your council/district received (e.g., BEF, BPA, NOAA, Meyer Memorial Trust, stewardship contracting from national forests)?
 - a. *Follow-Up:* What do you think has led to your success in capturing those grants?

Closing

17. Is there anything I didn't ask you about that you think is important to this discussion?

C. Key Informant Interview Guide

1. I'd like to start by knowing about the major or most common trends in the top priorities that councils/districts deal with in your area and how this has changed over time. Can you tell me about some of the key characteristics/what is unique in your region?
2. Can you identify two or three "types" of councils/districts in your region in terms of staff size, stability, etc.?
3. What are the different needs and challenges that each "type" is confronting? How do you think they would best be supported?
 - a. How do the necessary types and combinations of capacity for a council seem to vary depending on the organizational development stage, staff size, local partnership ecology, and their primary focus?

- b. If needed as another way to get them to talk about this: Walk through a story of a “high functioning” anonymous council/district in your area. How and why is it high functioning?
 - c. If needed: Walk through a story of a “low functioning” anonymous council/district in your area. How and why is it low functioning?
- 4. What are the differences, if any, in the challenges and opportunities faced by municipal corporations (districts), nonprofits, other non-government structures (councils), or hybrid council/district organizations in your region?
- 5. Are there any specific ways you have seen capacity funding used in your region that have improved organizational and partnership capacity?
- 6. Are there any specific ways you wish you saw capacity funding being used in your region?
- 7. Can you think of any possible ways that OWEB could track and share quantitative and qualitative capacity measures to better support councils and districts in your area in overcoming capacity challenges?
- 8. What intangible or difficult-to-quantify impacts do you think that OWEB Operating Capacity grants have had on organizations that have received them?
- 9. Have you seen that receiving OWEB funding has led to any unintended negative consequences for recipient groups? If so, what are they?
- 10. Knowing that your answers will be confidential, do you have any positive or negative feedback for OWEB/ODA about their work to support councils and districts? What changes would you recommend that they make to their programs?

D. Database of Case Study Organizations

The following table is a summary of the organizational background information we collected for each of the organizations selected for in-depth interviews. The purpose of this is to highlight the context of the organizations we studied (Table 17).

Table 17. Case Study Organizations Database.

COUNCILS

Organization	Background	Geography	Land Ownership
Coast Fork Willamette WC	Founding Year: 1999 501(c)(3) incorporation: 2010	Lane County, Oregon Service Area: 435,000 acres Streams: 3,058 miles 303(d) Streams: 111.7 miles	Federal: 36.2% Private: 33.8% Private Industrial: 29.49% State & Local Government: < 1%
North Coast WA	501(c)(3) incorporation: 2001	Clatsop County, Oregon Service Area: 222,720 acres Streams: 417 miles 303(d) Streams: 164 miles	Private: 60.8% State Government: 39.2%
Powder Basin WC	Founding Year: 1996 501(c)(3) incorporation: 2008	Baker County, Oregon Service Area: 2,150,400 acres Streams: 4,833 miles 303(d) Streams: 1,223 miles	Private: 49.8% Federal: 49.7% State Government: < 1%
South Fork John Day WC	Founding Year: 1996 501(c)(3) incorporation: 2018	Grant County, Oregon Service Area: 546,850 acres Streams: 362 miles 303(d) Streams: 155 miles	Federal: 84% Private: 7% State Government: 9%

DISTRICTS

Organization	Background	Geography	Land Ownership
Curry SWCD	Incorporation: 1953 Curry Watersheds Partnership Formed: 2017	Curry County, Oregon Service Area: 1,047,707 acres Perennial Streams: 4,043 miles 303(d) Streams: 336 miles # of HUC-8 sub-basins: 7	Federal: 65.4% Private: 33.3% State Government: < 1%
Marion SWCD	Incorporation: 1949 Taxing District: 2000	Marion County, Oregon Service Area: 751,594 acres Perennial Streams: 1,789 miles 303(d) Streams: 291 miles # of HUC-8 sub-basins: 6	Private: 56.6% Federal: 30.2% Private Industrial: 8.2% State Government: 4.1% Tribal & Local Government: < 1%
Wheeler SWCD	Incorporation: 1963	Wheeler County, Oregon Service Area: 1,098,145 acres Perennial Streams: 937 miles 303(d) Streams: 148 miles # of HUC-8 sub-basins: 6	Private: 71.1% Federal: 28.7% State Government: < 1%

Appendix 5. External Capacity-Building Programs Review

As part of this project, we reviewed organizational capacity-building programs that invest in local organizational capacity in natural resources and conservation management to develop recommendations for OWEB's Operating Capacity grant program (see Appx 5.C. Summary of External Capacity-Building Programs Review). We started by looking at Washington, California, and Idaho, but since there were a limited number of capacity-building programs, we expanded our search to look across the U.S. For this review, we defined organizational capacity in terms of administrative management, financial, and technical capacities (Table 18). Following this, we shared our list of inclusion and exclusion criteria.

Table 18. *Defining Organizational Capacity.*

Administrative Management	Management skill training, networking with other local partners, peer learning, and building partnerships with other organizations to share staff expertise (e.g., technical skills, outreach, and fundraising).
Financial	Pooling financial resources and financial management strategies, practices, and/or training.
Technical	Technical skills training, e.g., learning GIS.

Inclusion Criteria:

- Improves capacity for a council, district, or non-profit organization that works at local or regional scales (e.g., community, county, watershed, subregion of a state).
- Targets work that focuses on building organizational capacity. We primarily included programs focused on capacity building for natural resources and conservation management, but we also included some that worked in other areas. For example: Ford Family Foundation offers a Community Building grant that focuses on organizational capacity building in rural communities, which can include organizations that work on natural resource issues.

Exclusion Criteria:

- Programs that only provide funding for on-the-ground restoration work.
- Programs that target and invest in organizations that work at a national scale. The funder providing organizational capacity-building grants could be at the national scale, but to be included, must support regional or local organizations.

A. Program Highlights

In this section, we highlight key features and opportunities for improving OWEB and ODA capacity grant programs from the capacity-building program review. Following this, we provide potential recommendations.

Integrate Mentorship and Peer-Learning Opportunities into Program Design

The Ford Family Foundation's Community Building Grants Program supports organizations through coaching, mentoring, and connecting grantees to related ongoing efforts and relevant resources, including the foundation's own programs. During a 2019 program evaluation to identify the program's impacts and ongoing challenges to community-building work, they developed the following recommendations to improve peer support: (1) mobilize communities to reach communities (e.g., invest in an anchor person in each community, develop mentorship

groups, convene learning exchanges, etc.) and (2) clarify the confusing aspects of the community-building approach (e.g., simplify materials, develop a clear introductory path to people who are new, etc.). The Wilburforce Foundation's Capacity Building Program design focuses on providing long-term capacity-building and views organizational leadership as a key to an organization's efficiency and effectiveness. They partner with service providers that offer specialized consulting, coaching, and training on leadership development, board capacity, strategic planning, fundraising, financial management, human resource management, communications, technology, and more. Through this, they also convene organizations and partners to share knowledge to work towards advancing outcomes that benefit a regional ecosystem. Additionally, Lake Champlain Basin Program's Organizational Support Grant offers supplemental funding for professional development. Local watershed organizations can apply for an annual \$500 mini-grant for professional development. This can be used for conference attendance, registration, and associated travel costs.

Offer Funding Support to Develop Strategic Plans

The Pennsylvania Department of Conservation & Natural Resources' Peer Grant offers funding to hire a professional consultant to study specialized small-scale issues to work with community leaders to develop an action plan addressing conservation needs. The maximum grant award is \$10,000.

Coordinate with External Funders

The Ford Family Foundation's Community Building Grants program emphasizes the importance of working with external funders. As part of a recent self-directed evaluation, they identified the program's need to develop strategies for long-term partnerships (e.g., working with other foundations to develop tools for grant applications, demonstrating that long-term grants make a difference, etc.). Additionally, the Wilburforce Foundation's Capacity Building Program's design acknowledges the need to build and maintain strong relationships with organizations, agency leaders, decision-makers, funders, scientists, etc. to improve grantees' effectiveness. They also recognize the need to collaborate with funders to ensure that collective investments and capacity resources are coordinated and effective.

Identify Potentially Useful Indicators for Improving Capacity Program Monitoring

Types of Partners Engaged

- Builds and maintains strong relationships with grantees, funders, scientists, decision-makers, and other allies - *Wilburforce Foundation's Capacity Building Program*.
- Increases communication, cooperation, and collaboration among grantees, funders, scientists, and government decision-makers - *Wilburforce Foundation's Capacity Building Program*.
- Facilitates and coordinates public messaging with management partners (e.g., strengthening the feedback loop between resource managers and community members) - *Lake Champlain Basin Program's Organizational Support Grant*.

Partnership Types Engaged In

- Serves as an information conduit, builds professional capacity among partners, and fosters strong working relationships (e.g., supporting seminars, workshops, and conferences to deliver technical information on topics) - *Lake Champlain Basin Program's Organizational Support Grant*.
- Organizations are successful in agreeing on the design and implementation of watershed and/or landscape scale enhancement projects - *National Forest Foundation's Community Capacity & Land Stewardship Program*.

Internal Governance and Operational Practices (*Focusing on strategic planning)

- Extent to which the proposal will strengthen the capacity of eligible organizations to achieve their mission and to implement priorities detailed in the Opportunities for Action Plan- *Lake Champlain Basin Program's Organizational Support Grant*.
- Merit of the proposal and the extent to which the proposal will result in tangible benefits or improvements that can be clearly measured - *Lake Champlain Basin Program's Organizational Support Grant*.
- Appropriateness and clarity of the proposed budget, relative to project objectives - *Lake Champlain Basin Program's Organizational Support Grant*.

B. Potential Recommendations

Coordinate with Service Providers on Mentorship and Peer-Learning

OWEB and ODA can continue to support and coordinate with their service providers (e.g., NOWC, OACD, OCEAN, OrCP, and the SWCD Operations Specialist) to provide tailored services to grantees. Many of the topics mentioned in the Wilburforce Foundation's program design were also of interest to interviewees. These included: specialized consulting, coaching, and training on leadership development, board capacity, strategic planning, financial management, and HR management. Additionally, new lead staff may have different needs than those who have been in this position longer. This emphasizes the importance of mentorship and peer-learning networks to create information exchanges and learn from each other's experiences.

Mini-Grants for Professional Development

Councils and districts may benefit from mini-grants for professional development, which would particularly be useful for lead staff since they are typically funded by project grants. Providing a small grant for professional development could help support lead staff in developing new skills or improving existing ones.

Technical and Financial Support for Strategic Plan Development

Strategic planning processes are shaped by their regional contexts, are varied based on the organization's structure, and serve different functions depending on how the organization is managed. Strategic plans, may have more detail or less, depending on these factors. Councils and districts can benefit from technical and financial support from OWEB and ODA and other supportive organizations to assist their strategic planning and annual work plan processes to incorporate diverse perspectives and needs and engage in relevant technical expertise for identifying restoration and conservation priorities.

Coordinating with and Educating External Funders on the Significance of Longer-Term Funding

OWEB and ODA have provided ongoing, programmatic support for 20 years to councils and districts' efforts in improving local watershed quality and health. OWEB has also developed longer-term funding strategies to help support grantees in partnership capacity and larger landscape scale restoration through their Partnership Technical Assistance, Focused Investment Partnership grants. External funders often see OWEB and ODA as essential funding partners in getting restoration work done on the ground through these locally-based councils and districts. As such, OWEB can play a role in educating funders on the significance of longer-term grants to work toward landscape-scale restoration and conservation.

C. Summary of External Capacity-Building Programs Review.

Sponsoring Organization and Program Name	Program Design, Activities and/or Objectives	Eligibility Requirements	Match Requirement	Evaluation Criteria and Selection Process	Allowed Costs and Uses	Program Implementation and Monitoring Measures
OWEB's Council Capacity Grant Program	(1) Support organizational growth with access to diverse skill sets. (2) Develop broad and deep support from local and regional communities. (3) Engage a balance of interested and affected people, businesses, and communities in their watershed to participate in voluntary, cooperative conservation. (4) Secure diversified funding and/or build strategic collaborations with other councils and/or natural resource groups to increase collective local capacity.	(1) Designated as a watershed council by a local government. (2) Has previously received a Council Capacity grant, and which serves an area that is the same or larger than the geographic area served by a council or group of councils as of 2013 with only 1 applicant per geographic area & includes a minimum population of 500 within its designated boundaries. (3) Adopted action plan by a council-governing body that meets OWEB requirements. (4) 501(c)(3) registered with Oregon, or written fiscal sponsorship agreement with a 501(c)(3), SWCD, city, county, or tribal government. (5) Adopted bylaws/charter & policies/ procedures that include standard best-practice governance provisions. <i>(See Appx. 1 for full description of eligibility criteria in rule.)</i>	\$1 match	(1) Effective Governance and Management. (2) Progress in Planning. (3) Progress in On-the-Ground Watershed Restoration. (4) Progress in Stakeholder Engagement for Watershed Restoration Purposes.	(1) Staff and contractors. (2) Audit and tax preparation costs. (3) General IT Support. (4) Contracted grant administration. (5) General office material & supplies. (6) General training. (7) Software or software subscription, free, or lease (e.g., GIS access). (8) General office rent, utilities, janitorial, yard maintenance, copier lease, P.O. box rent. (9) Insurance. (10) Banking fees, payroll service fees, business license fees, dues *Any expense eligible in other OWEB grants is also an eligible expense for Council Capacity grants.	Continued progress in meeting evaluation criteria. If the organization continues to meet eligibility criteria and makes progress in meeting evaluation criteria, the organization continues to receive funding. Funding levels include: (1) full funding if the council meets all criteria, (2) reduced funding if the council meets some criteria, and (3) do not fund if the council's performance is inadequate.
ODA's District Capacity Grant Program	Capacity funds are divided into two categories: (1) Scope of Work (SOW): Support working with partners and landowners for the conservation and protection of natural	Must be an SWCD and in compliance with legal requirements of ORS 568: (1) Current annual and long-range business plans (2) Annual audit (3) Annual report of activities	\$1 match.	None.	(1) Contracted services (e.g., labor, supplies, materials, travel for project implementation). (2) Travel. (3) Materials and supplies. (4) Equipment/Software.	None.

	resources of native fish and wildlife, watersheds, and water quality through implementation of Agricultural Water Quality Management Area Plans. (2) District Operations: Help SWCDs comply with ORS, conduct business, and provide assistance to landowners and partners.	(4) Annual meeting of the landowners of the district.			(5) Other (e.g., project-specific printing, renting meeting rooms, software subscriptions, website domain, etc.).	
National Forest Foundation's Community Capacity & Land Stewardship Program	(1) Remove barriers to watershed and/or landscape scale restoration projects. (2) Facilitate job creation, retention, and business development. <i>Length of grant funding:</i> 8 months. <i>Can grantee apply again:</i> Yes. Encouraged to apply for continuing work or for new projects, contingent on demonstrated success. <i>Grants awarded per year:</i> ~10. <i>Award range:</i> Up to \$20k.	501(c)(3) nonprofit; federally-recognized Native American tribes; and colleges and universities.	No cash or in-kind match is required, but applicants are encouraged to leverage additional funds to demonstrate broad project support.	(1) Tangible benefits to National Forests & Grasslands. (2) Job creation, business development, or workforce development benefits. (3) Facilitate restoration actions and treatments. (4) Support or help advance the transition to young growth-based forest management.	(1) Outreach and plan development. (2) Workshops and training for capacity building (e.g., facilitation, contracting, etc.). (3) Dissemination of best practices and tools to assist community-based nonprofits & collaborative groups in project development, implementation, and monitoring. (4) Organizational and staff support for facilitation, technical assistance, networking, & peer-to-peer evaluations for shared learning. (5) Travel for collaborative group activities. (6) Development of action plans, project strategic documents, or other collaborative process documents.	(1) Organizations are successful in agreeing on the design and implementation of watershed and/or landscape scale enhancement projects. (2) Organizations accomplish activities that directly support or help advance the transition to young growth-based forest management. (3) Organizations have developed plans for facilitating job creation and retention that will lead to improved watershed health.
Ford Family Foundation's Community	Organizations are invited to submit a grant by Rural Community Building staff.	(1) Be invited by Rural Community Building staff. (2) 501(c)(3) non-profit,	Must have >= 50% of funding for the total	(1) Community participation is a primary	(1) Training, communications, and gatherings.	The foundation conducted a self-directed evaluation

Building Grants	The program supports organizations through coaching, mentoring, and connecting grantees to related ongoing efforts and relevant resources, including the foundation's own programs. <i>Program Objectives:</i> (1) Deepening Community Connections. (2) Strengthening Community Capacity. (3) Taking Community-led Action. (4) Fostering a Community Builder Culture. <i>Length of grant funding:</i> Typically 1 year, but offers multi-year grants on a limited basis. <i>Can grantee apply again:</i> Yes, if the organization does not have a currently active grant with the Foundation. <i>Grants awarded per year:</i> 75. <i>Award range:</i> - \$2k to \$350k. - Average: \$50k. - Large: \$100k.	governmental entity, or a federally recognized tribe. (3) Serve communities in rural Oregon or Siskiyou County, California. (4) Requests are for no more than 1/3 of the total project cost.	project budget committed before applying.	consideration, demonstrated through >= 50% of project fundraising raised through the organization's traditional supporters, local businesses, key donors, and other foundations. (2) Involvement of the organization's board with cash or in-kind contributions. (3) Well-defined benefits or outcomes with a description of who and why the community is behind the proposal.	(2) Planning, coordination, capacity building, and regional networking. *They will not fund sponsorship of fundraising events.	in 2019, evaluating the program's impacts and ongoing challenges to community-building work. They developed the following responses to address these: (1) Mobilize communities to reach communities (e.g., invest in an anchor person in each community, develop mentorship groups, convene learning exchanges, etc.). (2) Build capacities to reach the hard-to-reach (e.g., listening sessions, relationship building, etc.). (3) Develop strategies for long-term partnerships (e.g., work with other foundations to develop tools for grant applications, show that long term grants make a difference, etc.). (4) Clarify the confusing aspects of the community-building approach (e.g., simplify materials, develop a
-----------------	---	--	--	---	---	--

						clear introductory path to people who are new, etc.).
Oregon Community Foundation's Community Grants Program: Capacity-Building	To help strengthen and stabilize an organization's governance, operations, internal culture and/or community relationships. <i>Length of grant funding:</i> 1 year. <i>Can grantee apply again:</i> No, unless considered a small, rural or culturally-specific organization. <i>Grants awarded per year:</i> 370. <i>Award range:</i> - Average: \$20k. - Large: \$40k.	501(c)(3) organization, or fiscal sponsorship with a 501(c)(3), Tribal entity, or government entity.	No cash or in-kind match is required, but applicants are encouraged to leverage additional funds to be more competitive.	(1) Prioritizes organizations that support disproportionately impacted communities (e.g., BIPOC, immigrants, people experiencing disabilities, etc.). (2) Supports organizations that demonstrate strong community support (e.g., intentional engagement and representative support of communities being served). (3) Propose work that advances DEI.	N/A	N/A
Wilburforce Foundation's Capacity Building Program	(1) Supports organizations committed to science-driven conservation efforts and sustainable policies for critical wildlife habitat. (2) Use conservation science to identify priority regions with a focus on wildlands and habitat connections. (3) Build and maintain strong relationships with organizations, agency leaders, decision-makers, funders, scientists, etc. to improve organizations' effectiveness.	Supports current 501(c)(3) grantees.	None.	No longer accepting grant applications. They provide long-term capacity-building support to increase organizational knowledge and skills. They invest in Training Resources for the Environmental Community (TREC) to provide grantees with support for fundraising, board capacity, strategic	Programs are tailored to current grantees to meet their capacity needs. They invest in leaders, organizations, and campaigns, partnering with service providers that offer specialized consulting, coaching and training on leadership development, fundraising, financial management, human resource management, communications, strategic planning, technology, and more.	(1) Builds and maintains strong relationships with grantees, funders, scientists, decision-makers, and other allies. (2) Improves the effectiveness of grantee organizations, their leaders, conservation scientists, and other allies. (3) Increases access to and use of

	(4) Invest in the capacity of our grantees and their leaders to help them become more efficient and effective. (5) Convene organizations and partners to exchange knowledge and advance shared outcomes. (6) Collaborate with funders to ensure that collective investments and capacity resources are coordinated and effective. <i>Length of grant funding:</i> Typically, 1 year. May fund multi-year grants if they discuss with a representative why the program would benefit from this. <i>Can grantee apply again:</i> Yes, if an organization does not have a currently active grant with the Foundation. <i>Grants awarded per year:</i> 153. <i>Award range:</i> \$10k - \$250k.			planning, etc..		scientific, legal, political, and economic resources to advance conservation plans, policies, and practices. (4) Increases communication, cooperation, and collaboration among grantees, funders, scientists, and government decision-makers. (5) Increases conservation's social and political relevance in the communities and priority regions in which we work. (6) Decreases or mitigates threats to lands, waters, and wildlife, while improving the ecological resilience, and improving the protected status of these areas.
Lake Champlain Basin Program's Organizational Support Grant	(1) Strengthen watershed organizations during development. (2) Assist established watershed organizations in strengthening their organizational capacity.	501(c)(3) organizations or voluntary watershed associations working with an established 501(c)(3) organization.	No in-kind or cash match is required, though match will be considered favorably	(1) Impact (40 points): Extent to which the proposal will strengthen the capacity of eligible organizations to achieve their	(1) Staffing & fringe benefits. (2) Supplies (e.g., photocopying, mailing, purchasing equipment, technology, software subscriptions).	Support priorities in <i>Opportunities for Action Plan</i>. Examples include: (1) Supports local watershed groups (e.g.,

(3) Facilitate work and communication within and among local communities to further watershed protection and restoration efforts. (4) Local watershed organizations can also apply for an additional annual \$500 mini-grant for professional development. <i>Length of grant funding:</i> 1.5 years. <i>Can grantee apply again:</i> Yes, if the grant is for a new project, contingent on demonstrated success. <i>Grants awarded per year:</i> ~ 11. <i>Award range:</i> Up to \$4k.		during budget review and may make proposals more competitive.	mission and to implement priorities detailed in <i>Opportunities for Action Plan</i>. (2) Merit (30 points): Merit of the proposal and the extent to which the proposal will result in tangible benefits or improvements that can be clearly measured. (3) Budget (30 points): Appropriateness and clarity of the proposed budget, relative to project objectives.	(3) Professional services (e.g., hiring a consultant to integrate DEI into organizational documents, participating in training to learn how to create online videos to improve outreach). (4) Travel costs associated with building partnerships. (5) Indirect (e.g., paying auditor, liability insurance, auto insurance). <i>Specific to professional development mini-grants:</i> (1) Meetings, conferences, and other venues' activities must be related to improving water quality and/or improving organizational capacity (e.g., fundraising, computer training). (2) Travel, meals, registration, and lodging to attend training.	providing technical assistance through meetings, workshops, presentations, and training; working with partners in priority watersheds to provide technical support and capacity building). (2) Facilitates and coordinates public messaging with management partners (e.g., strengthening the feedback loop between resource managers and community members). (3) Serves as an information conduit, builds professional capacity among stakeholders, and fosters strong working relationships (e.g., supporting seminars, workshops, and conferences to deliver technical information on topics).
---	--	--	---	---	--

Pennsylvania Department of Conservation & Natural Resources' Peer and Circuit Rider Grant Programs	<i>Specific to Peer Grant:</i> Funding to hire a professional consultant to study specialized small-scale issues to work with community leaders to develop an action plan addressing conservation needs. <i>Maximum grant award:</i> \$10k. <i>Specific to Circuit Rider:</i> Annual funding gradually decreases over a 4-year period. The purpose is to hire a professional, full-time staff person (i.e., Circuit Rider) to initiate new regional programs and services that position sponsoring entities to more efficiently and effectively meet their natural resource and conservation needs. Includes training expenses (up to \$2k) and mentoring expenses (up to \$1.5k) for an approved mentor to assist new staff.	County or municipal government. <i>Specific to Circuit Rider:</i> Two or more municipalities must cooperate in a new intergovernmental or regional effort by adopting an intergovernmental agreement.	<i>Specific to Peer Grant:</i> 10% local cash or in-kind match. <i>Specific to Circuit Rider:</i> Must provide local funds to cover the Circuit Rider's employee benefits for all 4 years, the balance of the salary in years 2, 3, and 4, and normal support services (e.g., office space, training and travel expenses, clerical support, equipment, etc.).	Grantees must submit an evaluation of the organization's guiding documents (strategic plan, annual work plan, management action plan, interpretive plan, etc.) to determine the specific project(s), work tasks, outputs, and outcomes they would like to accomplish with grant funding.	<i>Specific to Peer Grant:</i> Hire a professional consultant. <i>Specific to Circuit Rider:</i> Hire a professional full-time staff person.	None listed for Peer Grant. <i>Specific to Circuit Rider: <u>Annual Report</u></i> (1) Goals and objectives met or unachieved. (2) Accomplishments & challenges. (4) Programs created. (5) Marketing. (6) Budget. (7) Training programs attended. (8) Training programs requested for next year. (9) Evaluating grant program's assistance. <u>Final Report</u> How has the cooperative become a valued service? Which groups gained the most? What would happen if the agency folded? How did the cooperative effort encourage other areas of intergovernmental cooperation?
Minnesota Board of Water	Supports increased capacity by funding	Must be an SWCD.	None.	N/A	(1) Staffing (2) Office rent, utilities,	Report expenditures,

and Soil Resources' Clean Water Fund Capacity Grant	expenses in the following categories: Staffing, Cost Share/Incentives, Technology/Capital Equipment, and Operations. <i>Length of grant funding:</i> 1 year. <i>Can grantee apply again:</i> Yes, provides ongoing support. <i>Grants awarded per year:</i> 90 (Supports all SWCDs in the state). <i>Award range:</i> \$108k.				and other costs associated with facility maintenance (3) Supplies and equipment. (4) Conservation practice cost-share and incentive.	measurable outcomes, and activities from the previous calendar year as outlined in the grant agreement. May withhold grant payments if the grantee is not in compliance with all reporting requirements.
---	--	--	--	--	---	---