

**Virtual Board Meeting
January 27-28, 2026**



Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board

Meeting Agenda

January 27-28, 2026

Location of Meeting: Virtual meeting

The public is welcome to attend all OWEB Board meetings, and may access the meeting virtually through the following methods:

YouTube: [Watch Meeting Livestream](#). *Please note that there may be a slight delay when streaming the meeting live. The recording can be found on YouTube and linked on the meeting website after the meeting.*

Zoom

- January 27: [Attend Meeting Virtually: Tuesday](#)
To call in to Zoom: Dial 1 669 900 6833, ID number 856 3854 6926, and passcode 134683
- January 28: [Attend Meeting Virtually: Wednesday](#)
To call in to Zoom: Dial 1 669 900 6833, ID number 870 2212 1561, and passcode 702240

Meeting Materials

The board materials are available on the [January 27-28, 2025, meeting webpage](#).

For each agenda item, the time listed is approximate. Anyone interested in a particular agenda item is encouraged to give ample time and listen in to the meeting at least 30 minutes before the approximate agenda item time.

Public comment

OWEB welcomes written or verbal public comment on any agenda item. All written comments and requests to make verbal comments to the board should be submitted using [OWEB's Public Comment Form](#).

The deadline for submitting written comments and requests is **5:00 pm Thursday, January 22, 2026**.

Written comments will be provided to the board before the meeting. Verbal comments are limited to three minutes and will be heard in the public comment periods (Agenda Items E and K).

For additional information on [ways to provide public comment and tips for commenting in person](#), please refer to our website.

More Information

If you have any questions about this agenda or the board's procedures, please contact Nicole Bettinardi, OWEB Executive Assistant and Board Liaison, at 503-428-1804 or Nicole.BETTINARDI@OWEB.oregon.gov.

If physical, auditory, language, or other accommodations are needed for this meeting, please contact Nicole Bettinardi as soon as possible, and at least 48 hours before the meeting.

Agenda, Tuesday, January 27, 2026

| | |
|----------|---|
| 8:30 am | Welcome and agenda overview |
| 8:40 am | Item A. Board Member Comments Board representatives from state and federal agencies will provide updates on issues related to the natural resource agency they represent. This is also an opportunity for public and tribal board members to report on their recent activities and share information and comments on a variety of watershed enhancement and community conservation-related topics. <i>Information item.</i> |
| 10:10 am | Break |
| 10:20 am | Item B. Updates from the Governor’s Natural Resources Office Senior Natural Resources Advisor Geoff Huntington, Natural Resource Advisor Chandra Ferrari, and Communications and Policy Advisor for Natural Resources Anca Matica will update the board on the Governor’s Executive Order on the Resilience of Our Communities, Natural and Working Lands and Waters. <i>Information item.</i> |
| 11:05 am | Item C. Director’s Updates Executive Director Sara O’Brien and staff will update the board on agency business. <i>Information item.</i> |
| 11:25 am | Break |
| 11:35 am | <u>Item D. 2025 Annual Tribal Report</u> Effectiveness Monitoring Coordinator & Tribal Liaison Ken Fetcho will present the agency’s 2025 Annual Tribal Report and OWEB’s Tribal Policy. <i>Information item.</i> |
| 12:00 pm | Lunch break |
| 1:00 pm | Item E. Public Comment This time is reserved for the board to hear public comments and review the written public comment submitted for the meeting. <i>Information item.</i> |
| 1:15 pm | Item F. General Board Business This time is reserved for the board to act on routine items. Items for potential board action include adoption of the meeting minutes from October 2025, Oregon Agricultural Heritage Program conservation easement time extensions, delegation of authority for Coastal Wetlands funds, and a clarifying motion on the CREP TA spending plan line item from the October 2025 board meeting. <i>Action item.</i> |
| 1:25 pm | <u>Item G. Forest Collaboratives Grant Awards</u> Senior Policy Coordinator Eric Hartstein and Federal Programs Specialist Heidi Hartman will be joined by ODF Federal Forest Restoration Program Lead Kyle Sullivan-Astor to provide a “Forest Collaborative 101” and review the Fall 2025 Forest Collaborative grant offering and staff recommendations. <i>Action item.</i> |
| 2:10 pm | Break |

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2:20pm | Item H. Committee Updates Representatives from board committees will provide written updates on committee topics to the full board. <i>Information item.</i> |
| 2:30 pm | <u>Item I. Focused Investment Partnership (FIP) Ecological Priorities Adoption</u> Restoration Grants Manager Eric Williams, Partnerships Coordinator Denise Hoffert, Partnerships Coordinator Jillian McCarthy, and Senior Policy Coordinator Eric Hartstein will present the final draft revisions to the FIP ecological priorities for board adoption and request board action on deciding the maximum FIP award per biennium for the upcoming 2027-2029 FIP solicitation. <i>Action Item.</i> |
| | Adjourn |

Agenda Wednesday, January 28, 2026

| | |
|----------|--|
| 8:30 am | Welcome and agenda overview |
| 8:35 am | <u>Item J. Focused Investment Partnership Grant Program (FIP) Cohort 2 Report – Warner Basin Partnership</u> Partnerships Coordinator Denise Hoffert will introduce representatives from the Warner Basin Partnership who will update the board on their FIP initiative progress. <i>Information item.</i> |
| 9:00 am | Item K. Public Comment This time is reserved for the board to hear public comments and review the written public comment submitted for the meeting. <i>Information item.</i> |
| 9:15 am | <u>Item L. Summer 2025 Open Solicitation Grant Offering Board Awards</u> Restoration Grant Program Manager Eric Williams, Monitoring and Reporting Manager Courtney Shaff, Regional Program Representatives, and Effectiveness Monitoring Coordinator will review the Summer 2025 Open Solicitation grant offering and funding recommendations. <i>Action Item.</i> |
| 10:30 am | Break |
| 10:45 am | Board Deliberation and Awards The board will consider grant applications submitted through the Summer 2025 Open Solicitation grant offering. Applications, supporting materials, and funding recommendations will be discussed and acted on by the board. |
| 11:30 am | <u>Item M. Oregon Agricultural Heritage Commission (OAHC) Appointments</u> Oregon Agricultural Heritage Program Coordinator Taylor Larson and Acquisitions & Special Programs Manager Renee Davis will review applicants and recommendations for the OAHC commission vacancies and recommend appointment by the OWEB board. <i>Action item.</i> |
| 12:00 pm | Lunch |

| | |
|---------|--|
| 1:00 pm | <p><u>Item N. ODFW SWAP Update</u></p> <p>Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife (ODFW) Staff, Wildlife Division Administrator Bernadette Graham Hudson and Wildlife Diversity Program Coordinator Emily VanWyk will provide an overview on ODFW’s updated State Wildlife Action Plan. <i>Information item.</i></p> |
| 1:30 pm | <p><u>Item O. Land Acquisition Grant Program Modernization Update</u></p> <p>Acquisitions & Special Programs Manager Renee Davis and Executive Director Sara O’Brien will provide an update on the land acquisition grant program modernization process that is in progress. <i>Information item.</i></p> |
| 2:30 pm | <p>Item P. Other Business</p> <p>This item is reserved for other matters that may come before the board. <i>Information item.</i></p> |
| | <p>Adjourn</p> |

Meeting Rules and Procedures

Meeting Procedures

Generally, agenda items will be taken in the order shown. However, in certain circumstances, the board may elect to take an item out of order. Additionally, topics not listed on the agenda may be introduced during the meeting.

Oregon’s Public Meetings Law requires disclosure that board members may meet for meals when OWEB meetings convene.

Voting Rules

The OWEB Board has 18 members. Of these, 11 are voting members and 7 are non-voting advisory members. For purposes of conducting business, OWEB’s voting requirements are divided into 2 categories – general business and action on grant awards.

Action on General Business

For general business, a quorum is **6 voting members**. General business requires a majority of **all** voting members to pass a resolution (not just those present), so general business resolutions require affirmative votes of **at least 6 voting members**. Typical resolutions include adopting, amending, or appealing a rule, providing staff direction, etc. These resolutions cannot include a funding decision.

Action on Funding Decisions

Per ORS 541.900(4), special requirements apply when OWEB considers action on funding decisions such as grant awards. This includes a special **quorum of at least 8 voting members** present to act on grant awards, and affirmative votes of at least six voting members. Regardless of the number of members present, **if 3 or more voting members** object to an award of funds, the proposal will be rejected.

Executive Session

The board may also convene in a confidential executive session where, by law, only press members and OWEB staff may attend. Others will be asked to leave the room during these discussions, which usually deal with current or potential litigation. Before convening such a

session, the presiding board member will make a public announcement and explain necessary procedures.

Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board Membership

Voting Members

Elizabeth Agpaoa, *Board of Forestry*
Barbara Boyer, *Board of Agriculture*
Zavier Borja, *Public*
Raija Bushnell, *Public*
Kelly Coates, *Board Co-Chair, Public, Tribal Representative*
Russ Hoeflich, *Public*
Mark Labhart, *Fish and Wildlife Commission*
Lindsay McClary, *Board Co-Chair, Public*
Jamie McLeod-Skinner, *Public*
Mark Webb, *Environmental Quality Commission*
Woody Wolfe, *Water Resources Commission*

Non-voting Members

Dan Brown, *U.S. Environmental Protection Agency*
Aaron Curtis, *U.S. Bureau of Land Management*
Jessi Kershner, *Oregon State University Extension Service*
Brian Staab, *U.S Forest Service*
Claire Tachella, *U.S. Natural Resources Conservation Service*
Michele Zwartjes, *U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service*
Annie Birnie, *National Marine Fisheries Service*

Contact Information

Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board
775 Summer Street NE, Suite 360
Salem, Oregon 97301-1290
Tel: 503-428-1804 / Fax: 503-986-0199
www.oregon.gov/OWEB

OWEB Executive Director – Sara O’Brien
Sara.E.OBRIEN@OWEB.oregon.gov

OWEB Executive Assistant & Board Liaison –
Nicole Bettinardi
Nicole.BETTINARDI@OWEB.oregon.gov


2026 Board Meeting Schedule

January 27-28 – Virtual
April 28-29 – Canyonville
July 28-29 – The Dalles
Oct 27-28 – Burns


For online access to staff reports and other OWEB publications, visit our website:
www.oregon.gov/OWEB.

OWEB 2025-2027 GRANT FUNDS SPENDING PLAN
January 2026 Board Meeting

**2025-2027 Grant Funds Spending Plan -
Grant Types in Board Allocated Funding**



**2025-2027 Grant Funds Spending Plan - Board Allocated Funding and
Legislative/External Partner Allocated Funding**



| | GRANT PROGRAMS | 2025-2027 Spending Plan (As of October 2025) | 2025-2027 Spending Plan | Awarded to Date | January 2026 Proposed Awards | TOTAL Awards To-Date & Proposed Awards | Remaining Spending Plan after Awards |
|--------------------------------|---|---|----------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| Board Allocated Funding | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Restoration | | | | | | |
| 2 | Open Solicitation | 37,380,000 | 37,380,000 | \$ - | \$ 12,596,927 | \$ 12,596,927 | \$ 24,783,073 |
| 3 | Weed Grants | 3,500,000 | 3,500,000 | \$ 3,500,000 | \$ - | \$ 3,500,000 | \$ - |
| 4 | Small Grants | 4,760,000 | 4,760,000 | \$ 4,760,000 | \$ - | \$ 4,760,000 | \$ - |
| 5 | Lower Columbia Estuary Partnership | 330,000 | 330,000 | \$ 330,000 | \$ - | \$ 330,000 | \$ - |
| 6 | Conservation Reserve Enhancement Prog (CREP)-Cost Share | 750,000 | 750,000 | \$ 750,000 | \$ - | \$ 750,000 | \$ - |
| 7 | Total Restoration | \$ 46,720,000 | \$ 46,720,000 | \$ 9,340,000 | \$ 12,596,927 | \$ 21,936,927 | \$ 24,783,073 |
| 8 | Acquisitions | | | | | | |
| 9 | Land and Water Acquisition | 6,500,000 | 6,500,000 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 6,500,000 |
| 10 | Total Acquisitions | \$ 6,500,000 | \$ 6,500,000 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 6,500,000 |
| 11 | Technical Assistance | | | | | | |
| 12 | Open Solicitation | 7,500,000 | 7,500,000 | \$ - | \$ 2,529,986 | \$ 2,529,986 | \$ 4,970,014 |
| 13 | Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP) TA ⁽²⁾ | 1,659,922 | 1,659,922 | \$ 1,629,961 | \$ - | \$ 1,629,961 | \$ 29,961 |
| 14 | Tribal Project Development | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ - | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ - |
| 15 | Total Technical Assistance | \$ 10,159,922 | \$ 10,159,922 | \$ 2,629,961 | \$ 2,529,986 | \$ 5,159,947 | \$ 4,999,975 |
| 16 | Engagement | | | | | | |
| 17 | Open Solicitation | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 | \$ - | \$ 662,089 | \$ 662,089 | \$ 1,337,911 |
| 18 | Strategic Implementation Areas ⁽¹⁾ | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ - | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ - |
| 19 | Total Engagement | \$ 3,500,000 | \$ 3,500,000 | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ 662,089 | \$ 2,162,089 | \$ 1,337,911 |
| 20 | Partnership & Capacity | | | | | | |
| 21 | Capacity grants - Watershed Councils (WC) | 9,900,000 | 9,900,000 | \$ 9,899,792 | \$ - | \$ 9,899,792 | \$ 208 |
| 22 | Capacity grants - Soil & Water Conservation Districts (SWCD) | 8,700,000 | 8,700,000 | \$ 8,700,000 | \$ - | \$ 8,700,000 | \$ - |
| 23 | Statewide Organizational Conservation Partnership Support | 525,000 | 525,000 | \$ 525,000 | \$ - | \$ 525,000 | \$ - |
| 24 | Partnership Technical Assistance | 1,200,000 | 1,200,000 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,200,000 |
| 25 | Sage Grouse Conservation Partnership | 350,000 | 350,000 | \$ 350,000 | \$ - | \$ 350,000 | \$ - |
| 26 | Total Partnership & Capacity | \$ 20,675,000 | \$ 20,675,000 | \$ 19,474,792 | \$ - | \$ 19,474,792 | \$ 1,200,208 |
| 27 | Focused Investment Partnerships (FIP) ⁽¹⁾ : | | | | | | |
| 28 | Cohort 3 - 3rd Biennium | | | | | | |
| 29 | Klamath Siskiyou Oak Network | 2,959,837 | 2,959,837 | \$ 2,959,837 | \$ - | \$ 2,959,837 | \$ - |
| 30 | East Cascades Oak & Fire Partnership | 2,177,000 | 2,177,000 | \$ 2,177,000 | \$ - | \$ 2,177,000 | \$ - |
| 31 | Siuslaw Coho Partnership | 4,000,000 | 4,000,000 | \$ 4,000,000 | \$ - | \$ 4,000,000 | \$ - |
| 32 | Coos Basin Coho Partnership | 3,747,408 | 3,747,408 | \$ 3,747,408 | \$ - | \$ 3,747,408 | \$ - |
| 33 | Oregon Central Coast Estuary Collaborative | 2,390,250 | 2,390,250 | \$ 2,390,250 | \$ - | \$ 2,390,250 | \$ - |
| 34 | Cohort 4 - 2nd Biennium | | | | | | |
| 35 | Hood River Basin Partnership | 3,503,414 | 3,503,414 | \$ 3,503,414 | \$ - | \$ 3,503,414 | \$ - |
| 36 | Klamath Lake Forest Health Partnership | 4,000,000 | 4,000,000 | \$ 4,000,000 | \$ - | \$ 4,000,000 | \$ - |
| 37 | Oregon Sage-Grouse Partnership | 4,000,000 | 4,000,000 | \$ 4,000,000 | \$ - | \$ 4,000,000 | \$ - |
| 38 | Harney Basin Wetlands Collaborative | 3,927,400 | 3,927,400 | \$ 3,927,400 | \$ - | \$ 3,927,400 | \$ - |
| 39 | Total FIP's | \$ 30,705,309 | \$ 30,705,309 | \$ 30,705,309 | \$ - | \$ 30,705,309 | \$ - |
| 40 | Monitoring | | | | | | |
| 41 | Open Solicitation | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 | \$ - | \$ 2,880,536 | \$ 2,880,536 | \$ 2,119,464 |
| 42 | Quantifying Conservation Outputs and Outcomes | 570,039 | 570,039 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 570,039 |
| 43 | FIP Effectiveness Monitoring | 500,000 | 500,000 | \$ 500,000 | \$ - | \$ 500,000 | \$ - |
| 44 | Total Monitoring | \$ 6,070,039 | \$ 6,070,039 | \$ 500,000 | \$ 2,880,536 | \$ 3,380,536 | \$ 2,689,503 |
| 45 | Other Board Allocated | | | | | | |
| 46 | Governor's Priorities | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 | \$ 2,000,000 | \$ - | \$ 2,000,000 | \$ - |
| 47 | Total Other | \$ 2,000,000 | \$ 2,000,000 | \$ 2,000,000 | \$ - | \$ 2,000,000 | \$ - |
| 48 | TOTAL BOARD ALLOCATED | \$ 126,330,270 | \$ 126,330,270 | \$ 66,150,062 | \$ 18,669,538 | \$ 84,819,600 | \$ 41,510,670 |
| 49 | Percent (%) of OWEB Grant Funds Spending Plan total | 82.19% | | | | | |
| 50 | Board Approved Unallocated Funds | 13,325,337 | | | | | |

| | GRANT PROGRAMS | 2025-2027 Spending Plan (As of October 2025) | 2025-2027 Spending Plan | Awarded to Date | January 2026 Proposed Awards | TOTAL Awards To-Date & Proposed Awards | Remaining Spending Plan after Awards |
|---|--|---|----------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| Legislative/External Partner | | | | | | | |
| 51 | Restoration | | | | | | |
| 52 | Bureau of Land Management-Good Neighbor Authority ⁽¹⁾ | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 | \$ 5,000,000 | \$ - | \$ 5,000,000 | \$ - |
| 53 | Upper Klamath Water Quality Improvements-PacifiCorp IM11 | 5,709,407 | 5,709,407 | \$ 5,709,407 | \$ - | \$ 5,709,407 | \$ - |
| 54 | Watershed Natural Climate Solutions Fund ⁽³⁾ | 1,497,476 | 1,497,476 | \$ 1,497,476 | \$ - | \$ 1,497,476 | \$ - |
| 55 | Total Restoration | \$ 12,206,883 | \$ 12,206,883 | \$ 12,206,883 | \$ - | \$ 12,206,883 | \$ - |
| 56 | Acquisitions | | | | | | |
| 57 | Water Acquisition - Flexible Incentive Account | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 5,000,000 |
| 58 | Oregon Agricultural Heritage Program (OAHP) | 1,760,000 | 1,760,000 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,760,000 |
| 59 | Oregon Agricultural Heritage Program (OAHP) - Watershed Natural Climate Solutions Fund ⁽³⁾ | 752,524 | 752,524 | \$ 752,524 | \$ - | \$ 752,524 | \$ - |
| 60 | Total Acquisitions | \$ 7,512,524 | \$ 7,512,524 | \$ 752,524 | \$ - | \$ 752,524 | \$ 6,760,000 |
| 61 | Technical Assistance | | | | | | |
| 62 | USDA-NRCS Farm Bill Technical Assistance Amendment | 363,722 | 363,722 | \$ 363,722 | \$ - | \$ 363,722 | \$ - |
| 63 | Total Technical Assistance | \$ 363,722 | \$ 363,722 | \$ 363,722 | \$ - | \$ 363,722 | |
| 64 | Partnership & Capacity | | | | | | |
| 65 | Forest Health Collaborative-Oregon Department of Forestry | 350,000 | 350,000 | \$ - | \$ 138,899 | \$ 138,899 | \$ 211,101 |
| 66 | Total Partnership & Capacity | \$ 350,000 | \$ 350,000 | \$ - | \$ 138,899 | \$ 138,899 | \$ 211,101 |
| 67 | Monitoring | | | | | | |
| 68 | Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission-(PSMFC) Intensively Monitored Watersheds | 264,597 | 264,597 | \$ 264,597 | \$ - | \$ 264,597 | \$ - |
| 69 | Total Monitoring | \$ 264,597 | \$ 264,597 | \$ 264,597 | \$ - | \$ 264,597 | \$ - |
| 70 | Other Legislative/External Partner Allocated | | | | | | |
| 71 | Oregon Dept of Fish & Wildlife (ODFW)-PCSRF(Federal Funds) | 6,671,002 | 6,671,002 | \$ 6,671,002 | \$ - | \$ 6,671,002 | \$ - |
| 72 | Total Other | \$ 6,671,002 | \$ 6,671,002 | \$ 6,671,002 | \$ - | \$ 6,671,002 | \$ - |
| 73 | TOTAL LEGISLATIVE/EXTERNAL PARTNER ALLOCATED | \$ 27,368,728 | \$ 27,368,728 | \$ 20,258,728 | \$ 138,899 | \$ 20,397,627 | \$ 6,971,101 |
| 74 | Percent (%) of OWEB Grant Funds Spending Plan total | 17.81% | | | | | |
| TOTAL OWEB 2025-2027 Grant Spending Plan | | \$ 153,698,998 | \$ 153,698,998 | \$ 86,408,790 | \$ 18,808,437 | \$ 105,217,227 | \$ 48,481,771 |

⁽¹⁾ This program may include a variety of grant types (e.g. Restoration, Engagement, Technical Assistance, and Acquisition, etc.)


⁽²⁾ This includes NRCS CREP TA funds awarded of \$162,532

⁽³⁾ These funds total \$2.25M from the 2023-2025 OCAC allocation to OWEB



The Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB) provides grants to help protect and restore healthy watersheds and natural habitats that support thriving communities and strong economies.

Eligible applicants include not-for-profit organizations, Soil and Water Conservation Districts, Tribes, Watershed Councils, political subdivisions of the state that are not state agencies, schools, community colleges, Oregon State institutions of higher education, and independent not-for-profit institutions of higher education. State and federal agencies are not eligible grantees but are often partners on OWEB-funded projects. In addition to those listed below, OWEB may offer grant types based on legislative priorities.




Land Acquisition

Acquisition

[Conservation Easement \(Ag Heritage\)](#)
[Drinking Water Source Protection](#)
[Land Acquisition](#)
[Water Acquisition](#)

Acquire interests in land or water from willing sellers. Acquisitions result in legally or contractually protected land or instream flow for the benefit of watersheds, habitats for native fish and wildlife, to protect drinking water, and to protect working lands.



Sage Grouse Conservation Engagement Grant

Focused Investment Partnership

[Focused Investment Partnerships](#)

Landscape-scale restoration investments that address board-identified priorities. Successful FIPs achieve clear and measurable ecological outcomes; use integrated, results-oriented approaches and are implemented by a high-performing partnership. Funds partnerships with up to \$12 million over 6 years.



Oak Woodland (FIP)

Engagement

[Engagement](#)

Communicate and engage with landowners, organizations, and the community about the need for, feasibility of, and benefits of eligible project(s) within an identified geography. Education projects are not eligible.

Monitoring

[Monitoring](#)

Monitor, gather, analyze, and share watershed data with the public. May describe current watershed conditions, establish trends about watershed conditions, or evaluate specific before-and-after effects of a project.

Partnerships & Capacity

[Operating Capacity](#)
[Organizational Collaboration](#)
[Partnership TA](#)

Support operations of SWCDs, WC, and other partnership organizations.

Restoration

[Coastal Wetlands](#)
[Invasive & Noxious Weeds \(ODA\)](#)
[Restoration](#)
[Small Grants](#)

Protect or restore watershed functions for instream, riparian, upland, and wetland or estuarine habitat.

Technical Assistance (TA)

[CREP TA](#)
[NRCS/OWEB Farm Bill TA](#)
[Technical Assistance](#)
[Technical Assistance and Conservation Management Planning \(Ag Heritage\)](#)

Develop a technical design or implementation plan for restoration, including consideration for compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act.



Coastal Wetlands Monitoring



Coho Habitat Restoration



Floodplain Restoration



OREGON WATERSHED ENHANCEMENT BOARD

Public Comment

Agenda Items E and K

Submitted written public comment will be published in a supplemental document after the board meeting and posted on OWEB's website: <https://www.oregon.gov/oweb/about-us/Pages/board/2026-Jan.aspx>

Application Evaluations

Agenda Items G and L

Written Evaluations for all grant applications that will be considered by the board this meeting are published in a supplemental document and posted OWEB's website: <https://www.oregon.gov/oweb/about-us/Pages/board/2026-Jan.aspx>



OREGON
WATERSHED
ENHANCEMENT BOARD

Agenda Item C

Director's Updates

Board Meeting January 27-28, 2026



OREGON
WATERSHED
ENHANCEMENT BOARD



Astoria wharf, Erica Stange, ODOT, cc

2025-2028 Strategic Plan

Quarterly Report to the Board | January 2026



Mission: To help protect and restore healthy watersheds and natural habitats that support thriving communities and strong economies.

Each quarterly report describes key accomplishments under Strategies that have been identified for each of the six Strategic Plan priorities. See the last page for the full list of Strategies, and a summary of when accomplishments were reported throughout the calendar year.



Priority 1

Build awareness of the relationship between people and watershed protection and restoration.



WEAT course is available on YouTube and Workday.

Strategy 1.2 OWEB created a cultural resources training course to instruct restoration practitioners on **what to do when cultural resources are discovered in the field in order to comply with section 106** of the National Historical Preservation Act. The course is available on [YouTube](#) and WorkDay.



Grantee panel discussion.

Strategy 1.3 A panel of grantees from [Necanicum Watershed Council](#) and [North Coast Watershed Association](#) held a panel discussion with the OWEB board over dinner after the October board meeting to share their experiences and **discuss engagement with diverse communities**.



Priority 2

Engage the diversity of Oregonians in watershed enhancement work.



Site visit in Baker City.

Strategy 2.1 OWEB's Executive Director and Deputy Director collectively **visited the 6 OWEB regions** this year for meetings with local partners and local communities. Visits included:

- Local partner meeting in Burns
- OWEB board meetings and tours in Astoria and Pendleton
- Land Acquisition public hearings on the north coast, Grant County, and Lake County
- Ridgetop to Rooftop summit in Bend
- Tour of a dam removal site at Mt. Hood Community College
- Tour of virtual fencing and other projects in Gilliam and Grant counties
- Tour of an invasive aquatic weed control project with the state Weed Board
- Visit with local partners on the South Coast



Map of Small Grant Teams.

Strategy 2.3 (& 6.1) Awarded 27 Small Grant Team Contact grants to Small Grant Teams (up to \$20,000 per team) across the state to conduct outreach efforts to **engage new organizations to join the Small Grant Team** and potential applicants to apply for Small Grant project funding.




Priority 3

Strengthen and leverage people and organizational capacity to achieve healthy watersheds.



Oregon Conservation Partnership houses information about upcoming webinars on its [website](#), including a webinar on Capacity Grant Rulemaking on February 4, 2025.

Strategy 3.2 The Oregon Conservation Partnership grant application has been approved, **funding a two-year workplan** that includes webinars, trainings, and conferences to assist Watershed Councils, Soil and Water Conservation Districts, and Land Trusts with gaining the skills and knowledge necessary to implement restoration and acquisition projects to restore and protect Oregon's watersheds.



Strategy 3.2 OWEB staff provided an **overview of upcoming Capacity Grant Engagement & Rulemaking** and fielded questions at the Oregon Association of Conservation Districts Conference in October.



Priority 4

Advance learning about watershed restoration effectiveness through coordinated monitoring.



Presentation to Oregon Association of Conservation Districts at the [2025 Conference](#).

Strategy 4.3 (& 1.3) In October (2025), staff attended the Oregon Association of Conservation Districts annual conference in Pendleton, Oregon. Staff co-presented with Umatilla Soil and Water Conservation District about how to 'Tell the Story' of conservation success, linking data collection efforts to future engagement in projects. The presentation **highlighted OWEB's data and information systems that are available to help Districts tell their story.**



Photo of Klamath River after dam removal (Resource Environmental Services).

Strategy 4.1 The **2025 Oregon Plan biennial report** was completed and circulated to the Governor and legislators in December. The report highlights key watershed investments and accomplishments over the past two years; describes coordinated actions among Oregon Plan partners; and includes recommendations from the OWEB Board about future work.

- [Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds webpage](#)
- [2023-2025 Full Report](#)
- [2023-2025 Executive Summary](#)



Priority 5

Increase connection of urban and working lands to watershed health.

Strategy 5.1 OWEB’s “Telling the Restoration Story” offering provides a model to help **communicate the connection of both urban and working lands to watershed health.**

- The [Coyote Creek South Wetlands project](#) near Eugene provides an example of how restoration near an urbanized area can be highlighted for many visitors through resources like visitor pamphlets.
- The [Zumwalt Prairie Preserve grant](#) in Wallowa County resulted in several data-driven outreach products about topics like incorporating pollinator health in grazing plans for rangeland management.

Strategy 5.1 (& 5.3) An **internal review of gaps between funded restoration grants for urban and rural projects** found that OWEB funds urban projects at a similar rate as those outside urban areas (36% versus 35% respectively). About 1% of Oregon’s land is in urban areas, which received 5% of the awarded projects.

Based on the funding gap analysis, OWEB did not determine that changes to the review lenses were necessary.



Visitor brochures for Coyote Creek.



Priority 6

Take bold and innovative action toward climate resilience.


Strategy 6.2 OWEB **funded grants with Natural and Working Lands funds** through two pathways.

- Open Solicitation Restoration and Technical Assistance grants to remove invasive plants, increase native plants, reforest following a wildfire, establish demonstration sites to train local landowners, and study the feasibility of a cover crop incentive program. Projects also incorporate social benefits such as workforce development for low-income youth, Traditional Ecological Knowledge, and restoration on Tribally owned lands:

- 1,041 acres (potential of 60,000 more)
- Total awards nearly \$1.5 million
- Leveraging \$631,000 in match funding

- Oregon Agricultural Heritage Program Conservation Management Plans to enhance habitat, improve water quality, and maintain soil health through incentivizing practices like prescribed burning, prescribed grazing, and riparian buffer establishment:



- Over 38,000 acres
- Total awards \$752,000
- Leveraging approximately \$83,000 in match funding



Map of projects funded with Natural and Working Lands Funds in 2025 from informational handout.

Strategies Chart

April 2025- January 2026











 accomplishments
 highlighted in quarterly update

 April
 July
 October
 January

1 Through our grantmaking, build awareness of the relationship between the people of Oregon and watershed protection and restoration

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.1 Elevate the story of how protection and restoration promote healthy watersheds |  |  |  |  |
| 1.2 Connect people around watershed work |  |  |  |  |
| 1.3 Increase use of OWEB's engagement grant offering to support grantees doing community engagement | |  |  |  |

2 Leverage our position as an anchor funder to engage the diversity of Oregonians in watershed enhancement

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2.1 Enhance OWEB presence throughout Oregon |  |  |  |  |
| 2.2 Increase diversity and inclusion through improving access to our programs | | |  |  |
| 2.3 Engage organizations, entities, and communities that have not traditionally been involved in watershed restoration work |  |  |  |  |

3 Use our funding to strengthen and leverage people and organizational capacity to achieve healthy watersheds

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3.1 Support diverse funding opportunities to sustain the capacity of partners |  |  |  |  |
| 3.2 Expand training for partners |  |  |  |  |


4 Advance learning about watershed restoration effectiveness through coordinated monitoring

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 4.1 Facilitate learning through monitoring |  |  |  |  |
| 4.2 Learn, share and support efforts to integrate indigenous knowledge | | |  |  |
| 4.3 Communicate data-driven outcomes to guide restoration investments |  |  |  |  |

5 Increase investment connecting urban and working lands to watershed health

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 5.1 Promote value of multi benefit watershed projects |  |  |  |  |
| 5.2 Increase investment connecting of urban and working lands to watershed health |  |  |  |  |
| 5.3 Support and fund grantees building or expanding partnerships with urban constituencies |  | | |  |

6 Take bold and innovative action toward funding projects that advance climate resilience

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 6.1 Increase support for bold and innovative grant making in service to watershed restoration and protection |  |  |  |  |
| 6.2 Articulate the benefits of watershed protection and restoration for climate resiliency |  |  |  |  |



This report provides the board updates on upcoming OWEB rulemaking efforts.

Background

Grant programs at OWEB are guided by administrative rules. Rules cover topics such as project eligibility, application requirements, evaluation criteria, technical review processes, and funding decisions for OWEB grant programs/types.

OWEB regularly conducts rulemaking to update existing rules and establish rules for new programs. Generally, rulemaking takes 12 months from board initiation to rule adoption. During those 12 months, OWEB staff recruit a Rulemaking Advisory Committee (RAC) through a process consistent with Oregon Administrative Procedures law (ORS 183.333) that requires the committee to be made up of entities most likely to be impacted by the rules, develop draft rule language, hold several RAC meetings to discuss rule language, and provide formal tribal and public notification to receive comments on draft rules. The schedule may be abbreviated in instances where a RAC is not involved in rulemaking.

The process begins when staff requests the board initiate rulemaking in an [OWEB rules division](#). At that time, staff will provide a high-level overview of what is intended to be accomplished with rulemaking and describe the draft schedule. For rulemaking efforts that involve a RAC, staff will provide the board a progress update on key emerging themes of the draft rules at a second meeting near the middle of the rulemaking. At a third board meeting, staff will bring a final draft set of rules for board consideration for adoption.

Rulemaking Schedule

The following table describes the tentative schedule for current and future OWEB rulemaking. It does not include rulemaking associated with the new Oregon Environmental Restoration Council established in SB 1561 (2024), but it is assumed that OWEB staff will also be involved in the development of rules for those programs in 2026. The timeframes in the table below may be adjusted due to workload.

| Administrative Rules | Board Initiate Rulemaking | Board Consideration for Adoption - Proposed |
|---|---------------------------|---|
| Water Acquisition Grants (Division 46) | July 2025 | July 2026 |
| Land Acquisition Grants (Division 45) | July 2026-January 2027 | July 2027-January 2028 |
| Outcome-Based Watershed Council Operating Capacity Grants (Division 40) | July 2026 | July 2027 |



This report provides the board updates on the 2023-25 biennial report for the Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds.

Background

The mission of the Oregon Plan is to restore the watersheds of Oregon and to recover the fish and wildlife populations of those watersheds to productive and sustainable levels in a manner that provides substantial ecological, cultural, and economic benefits. The State of Oregon developed the plan in the 1990s to address declining salmon runs. In addition to the plan, the state made an unprecedented financial commitment to species recovery and watershed health.

The Oregon Plan consists of four key elements:

- Voluntary restoration actions by private landowners
- Coordinated state and federal agency and tribal actions
- Monitoring
- A scientific foundation

Oregon Revised Statute 541.972 requires OWEB to submit a Biennial Report that assesses the statewide and regional implementation and effectiveness of the Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds. The Report, which is submitted to the Governor and appropriate legislative committees, must address each drainage basin in the state and include the following: information about watershed and habitat conditions, voluntary restoration activities, board investments, and recommendations from the board for enhancing effectiveness of the Oregon Plan. The Report must be submitted by January 15 of each even numbered year and summarizes the Oregon Plan accomplishments for the prior biennium.

2023-25 Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds biennial report

The Report consists of two components: 1) a two-page Executive Summary and 2) a full report, providing an overview of investments and accomplishments associated with each basin. The full report includes recommendations from the board consistent with OWEB's strategic plan, links to in-depth natural resources datasets, and more information from each state agency implementing the Oregon Plan.

In the 2023-2025 biennium, OWEB awarded over \$139 million in grant funding. During this biennium, significant match funding was reported from a variety of sources, including tribal, federal, state and local, private and non-profit organizations. In addition to funding data, the Report includes metrics for watershed restoration activities, providing comparable information from federal agencies, where available. These watershed metrics have been included consistently throughout the history of Oregon Plan reporting.

The Executive Summary and full report are both available online:

[Executive Summary](#)

[Full Report](#)



This report provides the board information on the Conflict of Interest policy for board members as identified by the Oregon Government Ethics law.

Background

Several OWEB board members have requested additional information on how to identify and address actual or potential conflicts of interest in the context of Board funding decisions. Staff requested guidance from the Oregon Government Ethics Commission (OGEC), both on specific questions and examples shared by members and on potential to develop additional agency-specific policies or guidance.

Government ethics law at ORS 244.120-130 is the state's policy on conflicts of interest.

In accordance with this law, appointed members of the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board are considered public officials. State law forbids public officials, including board members, from using their office for any personal gain.

OGEC developed [A Guide for Public Officials](#) to provide additional guidance and will be updating the guidance in the future. Where the application of the law to a particular situation is unclear, only the Commission can provide guidance upon which can be safely relied (i.e., only the Commission has the authority to apply government ethics law). Agencies may develop more detailed informational materials in consultation with OGEC staff to help board or staff understand how to understand and comply with the law. However, agency-specific policies must undergo review and approval by the OGEC Commission to ensure consistency with statute and rule.

Conflict of Interest

Oregon Government Ethics law identifies two types of conflicts of interest that apply to public officials: an actual conflict of interest (defined in [ORS 244.020\(1\)](#)) and a potential conflict of interest (defined in [ORS 244.020\(13\)](#)). Conflicts of interest are very common, especially in smaller communities where an individual may serve multiple public and private roles. Determining the type of conflict informs how to handle the situation.

Actual Conflict of Interest

A Board member has an actual conflict of interest if any action taken within their official capacity on the board would lead to a certain financial effect (positive or negative) for the member, their relative, their household member,[1] or a business that the board member, their relative, or their household member are associated with.

A member with an actual conflict of interest on an official action, decision, or recommendation before the board must publicly announce the nature of the conflict of interest before participating in any allowable official action on the issue giving rise to the conflict of interest [2]. This could be announcing it at the beginning of the respective agenda item before the staff presentation or in a written statement to be included in the meeting materials publicly posted ahead of the scheduled meeting. The member **must refrain from participating** in any discussion or debate or voting on the issue, unless one or more members' recusal prevents the board from meeting quorum requirements. In that case, a member with a conflict may vote but must still refrain from participating in any discussion on the issue.

Potential Conflict of Interest

A Board member has a potential conflict of interest if any action taken within their official capacity on the board could lead to a certain financial effect (positive or negative) for the member, their relative, their household member, or a business that the board member, their relative, or their household member are associated with.

A member with a potential conflict of interest on an official action, decision, or recommendation before board must publicly announce the nature of the potential conflict of interest before participating in any allowable official action on the issue giving rise to the conflict of interest. However, the member **may participate** in discussion and debate and may vote on the issue.

[1] Section 1 of [HB 2930 \(2025\)](#) amended ORS 244.020(1), (2), (3)(a), (3)(b), (3)(c), (13), (13)(b) adding in “member of the household” effective January 1, 2026

[2] [\[ORS 244.120\(2\)\(a\) and ORS 244.120\(2\)\(b\)\]](#)

Oregon Government Ethics Commission

Questions or comments may be submitted to the Oregon Government Ethics Commission.

Email mail@ogec.oregon.gov

Phone (503) 378-5105

Fax (503) 373-1456

Attachments

- A. Scripts for board on how to declare a conflict of interest
- B. Examples of conflict of interest for OWEB board members

Conflict of Interest Declaration Scripts

The purpose of this document is to help the board determine how to properly declare a conflict of interest (COI) during public meetings and what actions are or are not permissible.

The [Guide for Public Officials](#) contains more details and examples of both types of conflicts described below. OWEB staff requested additional guidance from Oregon Government Ethics Commission (OGE) staff on situations that our board members may encounter.

If you suspect you have a conflict of interest on any agenda item that comes before the board, please contact your Board Liaison as soon as you become aware of the conflict. Early planning and preparation will help us provide good guidance and ensure business actions are able to move forward in a timely manner.

Actual Conflict of Interest

If you have an actual COI, you **may NOT participate in deliberations or voting**, unless quorum cannot be met otherwise. Non-verbal communication (for example, a thumbs-up or down motion or a nod) also counts as participation and should be avoided.

Your conflict should be declared before the staff presentation for the respective agenda item.

“Before we begin the next agenda item, I would like to declare an actual conflict of interest. [Describe the nature of the conflict]. Therefore, I will not be participating in deliberations or voting on this item.”

In describing the **nature of the conflict**, aim to outline specifically how are you affected by the decision. For example:

“I would like to declare an actual COI. My spouse’s company is named in the application we are voting on. Therefore, I will not be participating in the deliberations or voting on the item.”

Sharing this level of information on specific conflicts is a best practice that allows the public to gain a better understanding of the nature of the conflict and builds trust in public accountability.

Potential Conflict of Interest

If you have a potential COI, **you may participate in deliberations and voting**, but you must still declare your conflict. This should also be done before the staff presentation on the respective agenda item.

“Before we begin the next agenda item, I would like to declare a Potential Conflict of Interest. [Describe the nature of the conflict]. In accordance with state ethics laws, I may still participate in deliberations and voting now that I have declared the potential conflict.”

Potential Bias

Bias does not fall under Oregon Ethics law and is not considered a conflict of interest, but for transparency members may prefer to disclose sources of potential bias before deliberations. For example, an organization with which you are affiliated may benefit, even in the absence of individual financial benefit, or an issue on which you have advocated in the past may be affected by the decision. Publicly acknowledging potential sources of bias may also help build public trust through increased transparency. **You are not required to disclose sources of bias and may participate normally in deliberations and voting on the issue, regardless of whether you share the bias or not.**

*“Before we begin deliberations on this agenda item, I would like to share that I may have a potential bias. **[Describe the nature of the bias]**. However, this does not constitute a conflict of interest according to the Oregon Ethics Law.”*

Special Exceptions for Voting

Under ORS 244.120(2)(b)(B), if any public official’s vote is necessary to meet a requirement of a minimum number of votes to take official action, be eligible to vote, but not to participate as a public official in any discussion or debate on the issue out of which the actual conflict arises.

In the situation, the board members with the actual COI will still not be allowed to participate in the deliberations. If more than one board member has an actual COI and only one (or some) of those members needs to vote to meet quorum, the board must have a process to select which member(s) vote(s). OWEB’s process will be to select the member whose last name comes first in the alphabet and continue selecting this way until quorum has been met.

Examples of COI as applied to the OWEB board

Guidance given by OGEC staff on December 23, 2025.

The [Guide for Public Officials](#) contains more details and examples of the two types of conflict of interest (COI), actual and potential. OWEB staff requested additional guidance from OGEC staff on situations that our board members may encounter.

The board is voting on a funding decision or other agreement with my employer that will or may directly fund my position.

Regardless of the organization type, if a grant or other agreement with your employer is being considered by the board, and the grant has your position listed specifically in the application as being funded by the agreement, or you otherwise will receive direct financial benefit from the agreement, this is an **actual COI**.

If a grant or other agreement with your employer or organization is being considered by the board and could potentially be used to fund your position or otherwise provide you with a direct financial benefit, but your position is not specifically named in the application or agreement, that may be a **potential COI**. The Board Liaison will help you contact OGEC for further guidance.

The board is voting on a funding decision or agreement with my employer, but it will not in any way fund my position.

First, if you are a public official who is required to file a Statement of Economic Interest (SEI) and if you list this organization as a source of your income, this is an **actual COI**.

For non-SEI filers, you will next need to determine what type of organization you work for. The type of “[Business with which the person is associated](#)” ORS 244.020 (3)) determines whether or not this situation is considered a conflict of interest.

This is an **actual COI** for the following types of organizations:

- Privately-owned (closely held) business: director, officer, owner, employee
- Publicly held corporation: director or officer only

For 501(c) listed organizations, we will need to contact OGEC for guidance, as the determination depends on your specific type of connection to the organization and decision.

For employees of federally recognized Tribes and other governmental bodies (cities, counties, special districts), this is **not a conflict of interest**. Governmental entities are not considered a business. For transparency, you can disclose this as a potential source of bias during the discussion, but this is not required, and you can still participate fully in the discussion and vote.

I serve on the board or as a volunteer of an organization that will get the grant being voted on. I do not financially benefit in any way from the grant being awarded.

This is **not a conflict of interest**. For transparency, you can disclose this as a potential source of bias during the discussion, but this is not required, and you can still participate fully in the discussion and vote.

1. I do contract work on a property where a grant will be awarded (either as a sole proprietor or my organization has a contract).

If you or your organization are specifically named in the application, then it's an **actual COI**.

If it is unknown whether your organization will be awarded a contract under the specific grant under consideration, this is a **potential COI**. If no further information is available at the time of the board deliberation and decision, it should be disclosed publicly but does not require the member to be recused from deliberation or decision.

I reside in the immediate area that will benefit from the grant, and grant funds may help a participating organization work or near on my property.

Please contact the Board Liaison as soon as possible, so that we can seek further guidance. OGE staff have informed us that the legal complexity around this situation is such that only the Oregon Government Ethics Commission itself (not OGE staff) can evaluate this issue.

2. If a co-chair has an actual COI, can they facilitate that part of a meeting?

Yes. Remember, those with actual conflicts of interest must publicly announce their conflicts before any action is taken, and they must NOT take part in any discussion, debate, or voting on the item. They would still be allowed to direct the meeting but must take care not to participate in the substance of the discussion. A governing body chair could announce that the item is up for consideration, ask if anyone has a motion, and announce the results of the vote.

Definitions

Below are some terms defined in [ORS 244.020](#).

“Actual conflict of interest” means any action or any decision or recommendation by a person acting in a capacity as a public official, the effect of which would be to the private pecuniary benefit or detriment of the person or the person’s relative or any business with which the person or a relative of the person is associated unless the pecuniary benefit or detriment arises out of circumstances described in subsection (13) of this section.

“Business” means any corporation, partnership, proprietorship, firm, enterprise, franchise, association, organization, self-employed individual and any other legal entity operated for economic gain but excluding any income-producing not-for-profit corporation that is tax exempt under section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code with which a public official or a relative of the public official is associated only as a member or board director or in a nonremunerative capacity.

“Business with which the person is associated” means:

- (a) Any private business or closely held corporation of which the person or the person’s relative is a director, officer, owner or employee, or agent or any private business or closely held corporation in which the person or the person’s relative owns or has owned stock, another form of equity interest, stock options or debt instruments worth \$1,000 or more at any point in the preceding calendar year;
- (b) Any publicly held corporation in which the person or the person’s relative owns or has owned \$100,000 or more in stock or another form of equity interest, stock options or debt instruments at any point in the preceding calendar year;
- (c) Any publicly held corporation of which the person or the person’s relative is a director or officer; or
- (d) For public officials required to file a statement of economic interest under [ORS 244.050 \(Persons required to file statement of economic interest\)](#), any business listed as a source of income as required under [ORS 244.060 \(Form of statement of economic interest\)](#)

“Member of the household” means any person who resides with the public official or candidate.

“Potential conflict of interest” means any action or any decision or recommendation by a person acting in a capacity as a public official, the effect of which could be to the private pecuniary benefit or detriment of the person or the person’s relative, or a business with which the person or the person’s relative is associated, unless the pecuniary benefit or detriment arises out of the following:

(a) An interest or membership in a particular business, industry, occupation or other class required by law as a prerequisite to the holding by the person of the office or position.

(b) Any action in the person's official capacity which would affect to the same degree a class consisting of all inhabitants of the state, or a smaller class consisting of an industry, occupation or other group including one of which or in which the person, or the person's relative or business with which the person or the person's relative is associated, is a member or is engaged.

(c) Membership in or membership on the board of directors of a nonprofit corporation that is tax-exempt under section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code.

“Relative” means:

(a) The spouse, parent, stepparent, child, sibling, stepsibling, son-in-law or daughter-in-law of the public official or candidate;

(b) The parent, stepparent, child, sibling, stepsibling, son-in-law or daughter-in-law of the spouse of the public official or candidate;

(c) Any individual for whom the public official or candidate has a legal support obligation;

(d) Any individual for whom the public official provides benefits arising from the public official's public employment or from whom the public official receives benefits arising from that individual's employment; or

(e) Any individual from whom the candidate receives benefits arising from that individual's employment.

“Statement of economic interest” means a statement as described by [ORS 244.060 \(Form of statement of economic interest\)](#) or [244.070 \(Additional statement of economic interest\)](#).



OREGON
WATERSHED
ENHANCEMENT BOARD

Agenda Item D

2025 Annual Tribal Report

Board Meeting January 27-28, 2026



Oregon

Tina Kotek, Governor



OREGON
WATERSHED
ENHANCEMENT BOARD

775 Summer Street NE, Suite 360
Salem OR 97301-1290
www.oregon.gov/oweb
(503) 986-0178

January 27-28, 2026, OWEB Board Meeting
Staff report – Agenda Item D. 2025 Annual Tribal Report

MEMORANDUM

TO: Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board
FROM: Ken Fetcho, Tribal Liaison
Sara O'Brien, Executive Director

I. Introduction

OWEB's 2025 Annual Tribal Report describes how OWEB engaged and fostered relations with the 9 federally recognized Tribes in Oregon. The 2025 Annual Tribal Report has been submitted to the Legislative Commission on Indian Services (LCIS) and the Governor's Office. OWEB staff will deliver a presentation highlighting key information in the agency's 2025 Annual Tribal Report to demonstrate the agency's commitment to including Tribes in its decision-making processes.

II. Background

[Oregon Revised Statute \(ORS\) 182.166 \(3\)](#) requires state agencies to submit an annual report to the LCIS and the Governor's Office by December 15. The statute describes several required elements of the report that OWEB includes in the agency report each year.

III. OWEB Tribal Policy

OWEB first established its Tribal Policy in 2007 and revised it in 2018 to incorporate additional Tribal input. The revisions provide greater clarity on how OWEB will involve and include Tribal members and governments in the development and implementation of policies and programs administered by the agency.

OWEB recognizes and respects the sovereign status of the Tribes and their respective authorities on reservation, Tribal, ceded lands, and established usual and accustomed areas and their co-management authorities over certain resources on non-Tribal lands. The goal of this policy is to maximize Tribal relations and collaborative efforts and to resolve potential concerns by enhancing exchange of information, ideas, and resources.

This Tribal Policy includes, but is not limited to, the following additional elements.

- The OWEB Board will include a Tribal representative, and OWEB will assist the Governor to reach out broadly to Tribes to seek interested volunteers to participate on the board.

- OWEB will engage Tribes and seek early tribal involvement in policy development and implementation.
- OWEB will provide training to staff to ensure that all staff are aware of the sovereign nature and authorities of Tribes, to improve their capacity to promote collaboration with Tribes.

IV. Annual Tribal Report

The 2025 Annual Tribal Report includes a description of the following:

- Agency overview to identify the key contacts responsible to establish and promote relations with Tribes and a description of OWEB;
- Tribal participation in OWEB's Board and grant programs;
- Promotion of communication between OWEB and Tribes, and
- Training for staff to learn more about the provisions of legislation detailing Oregon's relationship with Tribes.

The annual report also includes a summary of the amount of funding OWEB has provided to Tribes and summarizes the amount of funding that Tribes have contributed to grants through match. **Since 1998, OWEB has awarded \$15,716,941 in grants to Tribal governments.** Across all grant programs, OWEB provided \$2,543,779 to Tribes in 2025, the most in a single year to date. OWEB provided a total of 14 grants to eight of the nine federally recognized Tribes in Oregon and the Nez Perce Tribe. In addition, 2025 is the year where we have provided the highest number of grants to the most Tribes in a given year. This marked increase is likely due to the Tribal specific grant program, the Tribal Project Development Grant Program that was initiated in October 2024.

It is important to note that this summary only includes grants that go directly to Tribal governments. Tribes also benefit from OWEB funds from grants to other organizations such as watershed councils and Soil and Water Conservation Districts that then provide funding to Tribes via contracts or implement restoration projects on Tribal lands. Tribes are critical partners in watershed restoration in Oregon and often contribute vital match funds to grant projects. In 2025, 21 completed grants included Tribal contributions. **Across all grant programs, Tribes provided \$1,030,315 in cash and \$557,979 of in-kind support to grants that were completed in 2025.**

V. Recommendation

This is an information item only.

VI. Attachments

- A. 2018 Tribal Policy
- B. 2022 Annual Tribal Report



Purpose

Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 182.162 to 182.168 requires state agencies to promote relations with Tribes. State agencies are to develop and implement policies to include Tribes in the development and implementation of state programs that affect Tribes. The Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB) first established its Tribal Policy in 2007. This revised policy replaces the original policy and provides additional clarity on how OWEB will involve and include Tribal members and governments in the development and implementation of policies and programs administered by the agency. OWEB recognizes and respects the sovereign status of the Tribes and their respective authorities on reservation, Tribal, ceded lands and established usual and accustomed areas and their co-management authorities over certain resources on non-Tribal lands. The goal of this policy is to maximize Tribal relations and collaborative efforts and to resolve potential concerns by enhancing exchange of information, ideas, and resources.

Definitions

A. Annual Report

The annual report by OWEB to the Governor and to the Legislative Commission on Indian Services on Tribal relations as required by ORS 182.166.

B. Authorities

The Oregon Administrative Rules and Regulations and ORS that govern the actions and responsibilities of OWEB.

C. Legislative Commission on Indian Services (LCIS)

The Commission created by statute in 1975 to improve services to Indians in Oregon. Its 13 members are appointed jointly by the Senate President and the Speaker of the House to a two-year term. LCIS members select their own officers to serve one-year terms of office. LCIS serves as the main forum in which Indian concerns are considered. It serves as a conduit through which concerns are channeled to the appropriate entity, as a point of access for finding out about state government programs and Indian communities, and a catalyst for making reforms when change is needed.

D. Natural Resources Workgroup

The Tribal-State workgroup established during meetings under Governor Kitzhaber's Executive Order 96-30. That Executive Order was later codified by Senate Bill 770 in 2001 as ORS 182.162 to 182.182. The Natural Resource Workgroup was created in order to improve communication between the State of Oregon and Tribes regarding natural resources protection and management. The workgroup consists of key state agency contacts, a representative from each of Oregon's nine federally recognized Tribes, and a representative from the Governor's Office.

E. Tribes

An Oregon Tribal Government, their Tribal Council, Board of Directors, and/or other authorized representatives that are recognized as having a government-to-government relationship with the United States, with the responsibilities, powers, limitations, and obligations attached to that designation. The 9 federally recognized Tribes in Oregon are:

- Burns Paiute Tribe;
- Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians;
- Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde Community;
- Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians;
- Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation;
- Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon;
- Coquille Indian Tribe;
- Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians; and
- Klamath Tribes.

OWEB also works with the federally recognized Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho based on that Tribe's ceded lands in Northeast Oregon.

F. Programs

The programs that OWEB implements to execute Oregon Administrative Rules.

G. Tribal Liaison

The OWEB employee who is responsible for facilitating, promoting, and ensuring communication between OWEB's program managers and Tribes.

Statutory Authorities

OWEB is a state agency with statutory authority to administer constitutionally dedicated funds for the purpose of protecting and enhancing Oregon's fish and wildlife habitats. The responsibilities of the agency include:

- Managing a grant program for watershed protection and enhancement;
- Assisting in the development and implementation of watershed scale restoration efforts; and
- Coordinating the efforts of watershed councils throughout the state.

OWEB is led by a policy oversight and decision-making board. Board members represent the interests of the public at large, Tribes, state natural resource agency boards and commissions, Oregon State University Extension Service, and federal land management and natural resource agencies. The Board Tribal Representative is recommended by the governor and approved by the Senate. In advising the governor on the Tribal appointment, OWEB will reach out broadly to Tribes to seek interested volunteers to participate on the Board. The Tribal Representative seat on the Board is not intended to represent all of the Tribes' interests nor is it intended to replace the obligation OWEB has to include Tribes in the decision-making process.

OWEB provides grants and services to citizen groups, organizations, Tribes, and agencies working to restore healthy watersheds in Oregon. OWEB actions support the Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds, created in 1997. Funding comes from the Oregon Lottery as a result of citizen initiatives in 1998 and 2010, sales of salmon license plates since 1997, federal salmon recovery funds, and other sources.

Mission

The mission of OWEB is "To help protect and restore healthy watersheds and natural habitats that support thriving communities and strong economies."

Approach and Priorities

Created in 1999, OWEB has embraced a community-based problem-solving approach to carry out statutory responsibilities. This has occurred in response to the need to maximize the use of available resources and identify ways to achieve environmental gains in the most efficient manner. The agency has four operational programs: Board and Policy, Grant Management, Business Operations, and Technical Services. Each program is headed by a manager responsible for honoring the relationships between OWEB and Tribes.

Tribal Government Participation in OWEB Policy Development and Implementation

It is the policy of OWEB to:

- Involve the appropriate level of Tribal decision-maker in the notification and decision-making process;
- Provide timely, accurate information regarding agency activities to Tribes including legislative, administrative, policy, and technical data and actions; and
- Promote innovations in communication by employing a Tribal Liaison and seeking early Tribal involvement in the design of a policy, program, and/or process implicating Tribal interests;

OWEB will provide to key Tribal contacts notice of policy and planning efforts, and communicate with Tribes in considering and addressing identified issues of concern. Examples of specific involvement by Tribes include, but are not limited to, solicitation of information concerning proposed land or water acquisitions, participation in grant review teams, and adoption of or changes to administrative rules.

Tribal Relations Protocol

The following OWEB commitments describe the approach to be taken to create and maintain strong Tribal relations:

- OWEB will maintain a Tribal Liaison who will be responsible for facilitating Tribal relations with Tribes;
- The OWEB Director, Tribal Liaison, and Board Tribal Representative will meet at least annually to discuss any known issues;
- The OWEB Tribal Liaison will actively participate as a member of the State Agency Tribal Natural Resources Workgroup and other Tribal State Workgroups or Clusters as deemed appropriate;
- OWEB will maintain organization information and contact sources and will provide updates annually to the key Tribal contacts;
- OWEB will support the exchange of relevant information and data collected by its staff or by a Tribal government to maximize relations and collaborative efforts and to resolve potential concerns;
- OWEB will ensure that all staff are aware of the sovereign nature and authorities of Tribes, their consequent self-governing attributes, and the basic organizational structure of Tribal governments;
- OWEB will provide training and other information exchange appropriate for agency staff to improve their capacity to promote collaboration with Tribes and execute the provisions of this Policy;
- OWEB will support and participate in cooperative efforts among the Tribal, federal, state, and local governments as well as non-governmental parties environmental and related concerns that may cross jurisdictional boundaries;
- OWEB will seek representatives from Tribes to participate on advisory committees and review teams; and
- OWEB will consider and utilize advice, guidance and recommendations when appropriate from the LCIS, the Board Tribal Representative, and staff on Tribal government matters, affairs and issues pertaining to them.

2025 Annual Tribal Report



OREGON
WATERSHED
ENHANCEMENT BOARD

Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board
775 Summer Street NE, Suite 360, Salem, OR 97301-1290



Agency Overview

► Key Contact

Sara O'Brien, *Executive Director*
971-718-2605

sara.e.obrien@oweb.oregon.gov

► Tribal Liaison

Ken Fetcho, *Effectiveness Monitoring Coordinator*
971-345-7018

ken.fetcho@oweb.oregon.gov

The Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB) is a state agency that administers grants to organizations for voluntary conservation actions. OWEB grant programs support healthy watersheds, protect farm and ranchlands, build local partner capacity, protect drinking water, encourage natural climate solutions, foster landscape resiliency, and support environmental restoration. The agency offers a suite of grant and fiscal administration services depending on the fund source and customer needs. OWEB is led by an 18-member policy oversight and decision-making board. Board members represent the public, federally recognized Tribes, five state natural resource agency boards and commissions, Oregon State University Extension Service, and six federal land management and natural resource agencies.

OWEB works with the nine (9) federally recognized Tribes in Oregon and the Nez Perce Tribe to address watershed-scale restoration needs. OWEB operates grant programs that Tribes can apply for to fund a variety of watershed management, protection, and restoration projects. Tribes can leverage those funds to meet their natural and cultural resource restoration goals and objectives.

As described in the following report, OWEB engaged extensively with Tribes in 2025 in a variety of ways. OWEB continued implementing recommendations from a report identifying opportunities for improvement in OWEB's grantmaking to Tribes, and we have continued awarding grants to Tribes and to partnerships that included Tribes. OWEB thoughtfully engaged Tribes in new program scoping as well as ongoing program improvement in the rulemaking process, while also respecting that Tribal capacity does not always allow for this engagement.

In 2025, OWEB provided grant funds to Tribes through the agency's first Tribal Project Development grants. This program was developed in direct response to feedback from Tribal staff and with significant Tribal input in program design. OWEB also worked closely with Tribes regarding the Oregon Environmental Restoration Program to establish the Tribal Nations Fund as a result of the Monsanto vs Oregon Settlement. Another key milestone in 2025 was the signing of a programmatic agreement with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) regarding cultural resource compliance; OWEB is working closely with NMFS, Tribes, and grantees to implement this agreement.

Tribal Policy

In 2018, OWEB revised its [Tribal policy](#) by working with the Legislative Commission on Indian Services (LCIS) and incorporating Tribal input. In 2024, OWEB's leadership and Tribal liaison continued to work together to communicate the intent of OWEB's Tribal Policy and identify opportunities for staff to work effectively with Tribes. OWEB's Tribal policy and the most recent Annual Tribal Report may be found on the [Tribal Engagement webpage](#).

Summary of Programs and Process for Involving Tribes

OWEB works closely with Tribes and seeks involvement in programs and decision-making processes at all levels of the organization. Examples of specific involvement by Tribes include, but are not limited to, solicitation of information concerning proposed land or water acquisitions, participation in grant review teams, participation on Rules Advisory Committees (RACs) and additional opportunities to provide input on changes to administrative rules. The following sections describe the agency's interactions during 2025 with the nine federally recognized Tribes in Oregon and the Nez Perce Tribe.

OWEB Board and Grant Programs Tribal Participation

Board Membership

The Governor appoints a Tribal representative as a voting member of the OWEB Board. We have been extremely grateful for the Tribal representation on the OWEB Board since 2000. The Tribal representatives who have participated as Board members since 2000 are listed in the table below. The position is currently occupied by Kelly Coates, Natural Resources Program Director of the Cow Creek Band of the Umpqua Tribe of Indians and has been in this role since November 2021. Kelly was recently elected to serve as Co-chair of the OWEB Board in July 2024.

| Board Member | Tribe | Period of Time Served |
|------------------------|--|--|
| Delores Pigsley | Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians | 1.01.2000 – 6.30.2001 |
| Bobby Brunoe | Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs of Oregon | 9.10.2001 – 6.30.2005 7.01.2005 – 6.30.2009 |
| Eric Quaempts | Confederated Tribes of Umatilla Indian Reservation | 7.01.2009 – 6.30.2013 7.01.2013 – 1.31.2017 |
| Jason Robison | Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians | 3.15.2017 – 7.28.2021 |
| Kelly Coates | Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians | 11.20.2021 – present |

▲ Figure 1. Summary of OWEB Board Tribal representatives from 2000 to present.

Additionally, board member Lindsay McClary serves with Kelly as the Co-chair in a public voting position. Lindsay is the Restoration Ecologist/Fish & Wildlife Policy Analyst for the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde, and her term began on March 1, 2022, following Senate confirmation. We are extremely grateful to have these two voting members participating on the OWEB Board. Kelly and Lindsay help identify opportunities for collaboration and ensure the OWEB Board and staff are aware of their responsibilities to involve and consider Tribal interests. They are highly

valued board members focused on the mission of OWEB and share their practical experiences as OWEB grantees and technical expertise as natural resource professionals.




▲ Photo 1. OWEB Board members, staff and local partners on a field tour hosted by the Confederated Tribes of Umatilla Indian Reservation, July 2025.

Grant Programs

Grant Applicants

OWEB grants are available to a broad range of entities, including Tribes [ORS 541.375(1)]. **Since 1998, OWEB has awarded \$15,716,941 in grants to Tribal governments. Across all grant programs, OWEB provided \$2,543,779 to Tribes in 2025, the most in a single year to date.** See the graph below of annual OWEB funding provided to Tribes since 1998. It is important to note that this summary only includes grants that go directly to Tribal governments. Tribes also receive OWEB funds from grants to other organizations, such as Watershed Councils, Soil and Water Conservation Districts (SWCDs), and land trusts, that then provide funding to Tribes via contracts. The amount of funds that Tribes receive as a contractor from an OWEB grant is much harder to consistently calculate over time due to the limitations in our funding database. However, this report will provide a few examples of OWEB grants to other grantees and how they worked with Tribes to implement restoration actions.



▲ Figure 2. Annual OWEB grant funding provided to Tribes from 1998 to 2025.

In addition to being grantees, Tribes are often members of, or partners with, local organizations such as Watershed Councils. Oregon law describing Watershed Councils (ORS 541.388) specifically identifies “federally recognized Indian Tribes” as potential members of these local organizations. Tribes are critical partners in watershed restoration in Oregon and often contribute vital match funds to grant projects.

Since 1999, Tribes have contributed match funds to 424 completed projects. Across all grant programs, Tribes have provided a grand total of \$22,439,941 in cash and \$4,013,933 of in-kind support to OWEB grants.

In 2025, Tribes contributed to 21 completed grants—across all OWEB grant programs, Tribes provided \$1,030,315 in cash and \$557,979 of in-kind support. This significant match contribution demonstrates the critical role of Tribes in implementing watershed restoration in Oregon.

Oregon Agricultural Heritage Program (OAHP)

The Oregon Agricultural Heritage Program (OAHP), established by the Oregon Legislature in 2017, provides voluntary incentives that support agricultural practices that benefit both working lands and natural resources such as fish, wildlife, and water quality. The Oregon Agricultural Heritage Commission (Commission), composed of 12 members appointed by the OWEB Board—including one representative of Tribal interests—oversees the program and advises the Board on funding and policy matters.

Amanda Lowe has served as a Soil Conservationist with the Department of Natural Resources for the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation and as the Tribal representative on the Commission since January 2024. Amanda brought her expertise in integrating culturally significant First Foods into land management practices and has been instrumental in ensuring Tribal perspectives are reflected in OAHP’s work through her participation in a recent rulemaking advisory committee (RAC). The RAC recommended a suite of updates to the administrative rules governing the program, including the addition of evaluation criteria considering engagement with and support from Tribes. The new OAHP Rules were adopted by the OWEB Board in January 2025. Amanda is stepping off the Commission in January of 2026, and OWEB is currently recruiting for her replacement in hopes of selecting a new Tribal representative at the January 2026 OWEB Board meeting.

In 2025, the Oregon Legislature allocated an additional \$2 million to the Oregon Agricultural Heritage Fund, marking the third round of funding for the program. A solicitation for working land conservation easement project grants closed November 13, 2025, with awards expected in April 2026.

Natural and Working Lands Fund


In 2023, House Bill 3409 allocated \$10 million to four state agencies to incentivize natural climate solutions on Oregon’s natural and working lands, while also supporting the social, economic, and health benefits of local communities. OWEB received \$2.25 million for grants to support the adoption of natural climate solutions, with a mandate to prioritize projects

administered or proposed by Tribes and environmental justice communities. These funds were awarded in 2025 through two grant offerings:

Open Solicitation: \$1.5 million for Restoration and Technical Assistance grants for projects that combine carbon sequestration or mitigation activities and community co-benefits.

Oregon Agriculture Heritage Program (OAHP): \$750,000 for the development of agricultural Conservation Management Plans and then annual payments for ecosystem service benefits to implement approved plans.

As part of OWEB's implementation of these grant offerings, the agency engaged with Tribal and environmental justice communities. OWEB used Tribal input to inform the Natural and Working Lands grant offering. OWEB promoted this grant offering through our key Tribal contacts list and through the Pacific Northwest Climate Change Network newsletter. OWEB hosted three pre-application consultations with Tribes, and while we did not receive any applications from Tribes as lead applicants, 4 of the 6 funded projects have a Tribal component or partnership. The projects that were funded range from incorporating Traditional Ecological Knowledge to building a seed collection process for restoration on the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde lands.



▲ **Figure 3.** Map of project locations that were funded by OWEB, Oregon Department of Agriculture (ODA) and Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) across all the Natural and Working Lands grant offerings, several had a direct benefit to Tribes who participated in the project development and implementation.

Small Grant Program

In OWEB's Small Grant program (OAR Chapter 695, Division 35), Tribes are eligible to be members of Small Grant Teams in each of the state's 28 Small Grant areas. The Small Grant Project offering is an easy-to-engage-in, competitive grant program that awards up to \$20,000 for on-the-ground restoration projects. Tribes are also eligible to apply for this grant offering.

At their July 2025 meeting, the OWEB Board approved the 2025-2027 spending plan, which included \$4,760,000 allocated to the Small Grant Program—a \$2 million increase over the previous biennium. The Small Grant Program consists of two project types:

- Small Grant Team Contact grants
- Small Grant Projects grants

The new Small Grant Team Contact grant offering provides grant funding to administer one (1) Small Grant Team in each of the 28 OWEB Small Grant Areas around the state. Tribes with reservations, Tribal lands, ceded lands, or Usual and Accustomed Areas located partially or entirely within the team's area are invited to participate in the small grant teams. Recognizing that effective engagement requires resources, this grant funding supports outreach efforts to engage new Small Grant Team members and potential applicants for program funding. Grant funding also supports the facilitation of application review processes as Small Grant Teams accept, review, and recommend or deny Small Grant project applications for funding.

Open Solicitation Grant Program

OWEB solicits these grant applications twice a year through the Open Solicitation grant program to fund Restoration, Technical Assistance, Monitoring, and Engagement projects. OWEB's Regional Program Representatives (RPRs) have regular contact with Tribal staff—before grant applications are submitted and throughout the life of each grant—to ensure Tribes can meet their goals and objectives. Tribes often partner with Watershed Councils, SWCDs, and land trusts by helping manage the projects and receiving funding to implement projects as contractors. Tribal participation is critical to partner success and crucial in making a meaningful impact on the health of our watersheds and communities in Oregon. In addition, Tribes may be applicants, landowners, contractors for project implementation, partners, board members of the applicant's organization, supporters of the applicant (such as writing letters of support), and provide cash match funds.

While no Open Solicitation grants were awarded to Tribes in 2025, the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation completed significant work on two restoration projects this year using funds from previously awarded OWEB grants.

Birch Creek Instream Enhancement & Floodplain Restoration

This 77.6-acre parcel, which encompasses Birch Creek and its associated floodplains between approximately river mile 1.8 to 2.7, is the first of a multi-phase landscape restoration and protection project in the Umatilla Basin. This project will serve as an example of restoring floodplains to benefit fish and wildlife and help protect downstream communities and infrastructure from impacts like the damage that occurred during two extreme flood events in 2020.



▲ **Photo 2.** Post-restoration conditions in Birch Creek. Restoration was completed with OWEB funds by the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation in 2025.

Meacham Creek River Mile 10-11 Floodplain and In-Stream Habitat Restoration

The floodplain and in-stream habitat restoration project in Meacham Creek at river mile 10-11 marked the fifth year of floodplain restoration. This restoration project was designed to improve floodplain connectivity and habitat conditions for Endangered Species Act-listed Middle Columbia summer steelhead and Columbia River bull trout, as well as Chinook salmon, Pacific lamprey, and other first food species that utilize the watershed.



▲ **Photo 3.** Post-restoration conditions in Meacham Creek, implemented with OWEB funds by the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation in 2025. **Click** on the image above to watch a short drone video of this restoration project area.

Open Solicitation Grant Program – Regional Technical Review Teams

Restoration, Engagement, and Technical Assistance applications received through OWEB's Open Solicitation grant program are reviewed by 1 of 6 Regional Technical Review Teams. Monitoring applications are reviewed by the Oregon Plan Monitoring Team (OPMT). All these teams are comprised of state, federal, and Tribal natural resource professionals. All 6 Regional Review Teams have at least one Tribal natural resource professional participating in the review process. In 2025, 6 Tribal agency representatives participated in OWEB Regional Review Teams, including representatives from the Nez Perce Tribe, Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians, Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs, Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians, and the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde. Efforts are being made to recruit a Tribal natural resource professional to participate on the OPMT, and we hope to have a Tribal member participate on this monitoring team in 2026.



▲ Photo 4. OWEB Southwest Region Technical Review Team, which includes representatives from the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians Natural Resources Department, attends a site visit during the application review phase.

Land and Water Transaction Programs – Notification Process

Project managers for OWEB's four transaction programs (Land Acquisition, Water Acquisition, Oregon Agricultural Heritage Program, and Drinking Water Source Protection) worked closely with OWEB's Tribal liaison in 2025 to review the Tribal notification process of grant applications received and of funding recommendations. This effort improved the consistency of how Tribal comment opportunities are communicated. It also reduced the quantity of emails sent to Tribes because we have combined comment opportunities when possible. We are always open to improving these processes and welcome feedback from Tribal staff who receive these emails.



▲ Photo 5. Chaa-lamali cultural burn (credit: Alejandro Mejia).



▲ Photo 6. Camas seed on bare ground post-fire at Camp Creek Hills (credit: Sara Worl).

Land Acquisition Grant Program

OWEB's Land Acquisition grant program provides funding for projects that acquire interests in land from a willing seller to address the conservation needs of priority habitats and species. OWEB notifies all Tribes after receiving a land acquisition application to solicit input in the decision-making process and, when applicable (i.e., for proposed fee-simple projects), informs them of the public hearing date. OWEB also notifies all the Tribes once a funding recommendation has been made by OWEB staff, allowing Tribes to provide additional input before the OWEB Board's funding decision.

In 2023, OWEB started focused, individual conversations with natural resources staff from the 9 federally recognized Tribes in Oregon and the Nez Perce Tribe regarding OWEB's Land Acquisition grant program. This outreach builds on a 2021 external assessment of how OWEB grant practices impact Tribes ([Alli Miller 2021](#)). The assessment was completed and presented to the OWEB Board in October 2021. The outreach also builds on work by Jennifer Arnold to complete the [Partnership Learning Project Report 3](#) that was presented to the board in October 2023.

These assessments found existing barriers and some misperceptions that have impacted Tribes' abilities to pursue and receive OWEB Land Acquisition funds. OWEB staff aimed to better understand each Tribe's interest in this grant program, discuss any questions or concerns they may have, and help identify barriers and solutions to Tribes accessing these funds. Staff met individually with all the Tribes in the Spring of 2024. Issues raised included concerns about use of conservation easements with sovereign Tribal governments, ensuring Tribal access for First Foods harvest on lands protected under the program, and ensuring the ability of Tribes to adaptively and actively manage lands consistent with traditional ecological knowledge and values.

In 2025, based on feedback from Tribes, land trusts, and the Governor's Office, the agency embarked on a modernization process of its Land Acquisition grant program. The process includes 4 workstreams:

1. Board-level work on foundational issues
2. Tribal workstream
3. Initial streamlining before the 2025 grant cycle
4. Potential rulemaking beginning in 2026

The Tribal workstream specifically focuses on substantive and process issues of concern to Tribes, building on previously identified challenges and opportunities. Following up on survey and interview results, OWEB leadership and staff conducted legal research and identified potential policy options that could help address potential barriers to Tribal government access to the Land Acquisitions program.

In October 2025, OWEB sent letters to each of the federally recognized Tribes that summarized the potential policy options and sought additional feedback on Tribal priorities for these potential program changes. OWEB's executive director and Tribal liaison have reached out to each Tribe to gauge interest in meetings to discuss the policy options. The Tribal workstream will begin to merge into the Board Acquisitions, Restoration, and Emerging Issues (ARE) Committee discussions where possible, while recognizing the sovereignty and unique role of Tribes. The December 2025 ARE Committee meeting includes a Tribal panel to hear directly from federally recognized Tribes. The panel provides a great opportunity for the board to hear directly from Tribes regarding their interest in OWEB's Land Acquisition grant program, thoughts on conservation easements and how they affect conservation efforts, habitat considerations, and other uses (e.g., cultural uses). Finally, we hope to hear thoughts about which potential program changes OWEB staff should prioritize to improve this important program's accessibility to Tribes. This feedback will directly inform OWEB Land Acquisition program changes anticipated in 2026 and beyond.



▲ Photo 7. Large wood placed at Meacham Creek.

Water Acquisition Grant Program

OWEB's Water Acquisition grant program provides funding for programs or projects that acquire an interest in water from a willing seller to increase instream flow. Like the Land Acquisition grant program, OWEB notifies Tribes after a Water Acquisition grant application is received and once a recommendation has been made. This allows multiple opportunities to provide input during the decision-making process. Additionally, staff engaged Tribes to recruit a representative on the Water Acquisition grant program review team to help review and recommend projects for funding. Anton Chiono, Habitat Conservation project leader for the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, and Lawrence Schwabe, the Hydrosystem Compliance Specialist for the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde, are participating on this review team and bring a wealth of knowledge and expertise to the review process.



▲ *Photo 8. Water Acquisition Panel discusses the program with the OWEB Board at the October 2025 board meeting in Astoria. (seated at left) **Anton Chiono**, Habitat Conservation Project Leader from the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, Department of Natural Resources participating with state agency representatives and local partners.*

At the October 2025 OWEB Board meeting, a Water Acquisition Panel of project developers and technical experts discussed considerations that inform scoping, developing, valuing/appraising, and implementing Water Acquisition projects. This Water Acquisition Panel included Anton Chiono, of the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation. Anton provided a key Tribal perspective to the Board to emphasize the importance of organizational capacity and the amount of work that occurs to develop projects before they are submitted for funding consideration.

Drinking Water Source Protection Grant Program

In June 2023, the Oregon Legislature passed [House Bill \(HB\) 2010](#) that, combined with other legislation, allocated \$5 million to establish the Drinking Water Source Protection (DWSP) grant program at OWEB. Through the DWSP grant program, OWEB has awarded grants to public water suppliers to protect, restore, or enhance sources of drinking water through land acquisition and conservation.

In April 2025, the OWEB board approved six grants to public water suppliers to protect, restore, or enhance sources of drinking water through land conservation and protection. One project, awarded to the Neskowin Regional Water District, was developed with engagement with the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde and the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians.



▲ Photos 9 and 10. Dogbane plant material and cordage made at the Carbon and Culture Symposium hosted by the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation.

Focused Investment Partnership Program

A Focused Investment Partnership (FIP) is an OWEB investment that:

- ✓ Addresses a board-identified Focused Investment Priority of significance to the state;
- ✓ Achieves clear and measurable ecological outcomes;
- ✓ Uses integrated, results-oriented approaches as identified through a strategic action plan;
- ✓ Is implemented by a high-performing partnership.

In 2025, Tribes continued to participate in the Focused Investment Partnership (FIP) grant program. The program's implementation funding provides opportunities for Tribes and others to work collaboratively on long-term, landscape-scale programmatic restoration initiatives. These initiatives create measurable outcomes within priority areas that were identified by the OWEB Board. Currently, there are 14 active FIP initiatives in OWEB's portfolio. A majority of these 14 partnerships include Tribes as core partners who help direct and receive funding to restore watershed conditions.

In January 2025, OWEB staff initiated a process to seek Tribal input prior to the OWEB Board approving the ecological priorities of significance to the State to be addressed by Focused Investment Partnership (FIP) Initiatives. “At least every five years, the Board shall approve ecological priorities of significance to the State to be addressed by Focused Investment Partnership Initiatives.” (OAR 695-047-0030). OWEB developed several opportunities for Tribes to share their input before the board is scheduled to adopt new ecological priorities at the January 2026 Board meeting.

In January, OWEB staff presented at the State/Tribal Natural Resources Workgroup to provide an overview of the effort to update the FIP ecological priorities, what input we are seeking, the different opportunities to share input, and the overall timeline for the board to decide. In February, OWEB sent out an online survey to Tribes that was open until June to ask them a series of questions to better understand their thoughts on updating existing ecological priorities and adding new ecological priorities. In addition, OWEB held two virtual Tribal listening sessions in April to have a focused conversation with Tribal natural resources staff to better understand the feedback we received and anything specific details they wanted to share with OWEB. OWEB also offered to meet in person and for Tribes to provide written comments via email to OWEB staff. Broadly, these engagement efforts pointed towards updating the existing ecological priorities with new information, and in some cases, new maps. The draft ecological priority with the most substantive revisions is the “Aquatic Habitat for Native Fish,” which has merged with “Coho Habitat and Populations along the Coast” and expanded to include habitat for other aquatic species. This process has assisted OWEB to ensure that the new priorities—that will be approved by the OWEB Board in January 2026—reflect important Tribal considerations. Following the January board meeting, OWEB expects to announce the solicitation for new FIP initiatives to begin in the 2027-2029 biennium.

Once FIP initiative funds are awarded to high-performing partnerships, Tribes that are part of the partnerships may receive grant funding from OWEB. **During 2025, 5 grants totaling \$1,724,824 were awarded to Tribes:**

- One grant was amended to add \$410,456 to an existing grant agreement with the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians.
- One grant of \$500,000 was awarded to the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs.
- Three grants totaling \$814,368 were awarded to the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation.

In addition to participating as a core partner and receiving funding to implement projects, Tribes play a crucial role in the FIP grant program by serving on the technical review teams to help evaluate and provide constructive feedback on project-level applications. For example, the Klamath Siskiyou Oak Network (funded in 2022) has 2 Tribal representatives on the technical review team, Lindsay McClary from the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde and Joe Scott from the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians. In 2025, the Harney Basin Wetlands FIP technical review team welcomed Nathan Jones from the Burns Paiute Tribe, who is an asset at providing comments to evaluate projects. In addition, Collin Williams, from the Burns Paiute Tribe,

participates in the Oregon Sage Grouse Partnership FIP to evaluate projects that restore sage steppe habitats in eastern Oregon.

In 2025, the East Cascades Oak Partnership was issued a grant to the Columbia Land Trust, who is working on the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs reservation's lands, to implement an oak understory restoration project.

Focused Investment Partnership (FIP) Technical Assistance Program

FIP Technical Assistance grants offer two tracks:

1. Partnership *Development* to produce or enhance a Strategic Action Plan and governance documents.
2. Partnership *Capacity* to support Strategic Action Plan coordination and implementation.

The Partnership Technical Assistance grant offering closed in early November 2025 with 16 applications received. Many of these applications propose to partner with Tribes on the development and implementation of strategic action plans across the state. Awards for this offering will be made at the OWEB Board meeting in April 2026. The Board's 2025-2027 spending plan includes \$1.2 million in Partnership Technical Assistance funding.

CTWS Mutton Mountains Oak Understory Restoration

This OWEB Restoration grant for \$101,000 leverages \$25,000 in match provided by the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs. In collaboration with the Columbia Land Trust, the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs will implement a project within the Mutton Mountains region of the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon to restore native vegetation communities. Due to the presence of roots gathered by Tribal members since time immemorial, a robust post-treatment monitoring effort will be provided as match by the Tribes. Monitoring will track the response of the oak understory to restoration and look at the residual herbicide that remains in plant matter up to five years after project implementation. Information garnered from this study will aid biologists in determining when it is safe for Tribal members to gather in areas treated with Rejuvra (an herbicide).



▲ Photos 11, 12. Pre-restoration conditions in the Mutton Mountains. Site of a future restoration project to be implemented with OWEB funds by the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs.

Klamath Water Quality Improvements Grant Program (Interim Measure 11)

Interim Measure 11 (IM 11) from the Amended Klamath Hydroelectric Settlement Agreement (KHSa) includes funding to address water quality improvements in the Klamath River via restoration and conservation actions in the Klamath Basin in Oregon. The emphasis of IM11 is nutrient reduction projects. PacifiCorp, in consultation with the Interim Measures Implementation Committee, developed a list of project categories to be implemented that will fulfill the objective of IM11. PacifiCorp has provided funding of up to \$6,433,500 million to design, engineer, and implement projects. These grants are funded by OWEB through the Klamath Water Quality Improvements Grant Program.

A steering committee, facilitated by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, assists OWEB with program implementation. OWEB is the Fiscal Agent and will continue to award IM11 funds for projects approved by the Steering Committee until the funds are exhausted. The Steering Committee is comprised of members from the following organizations: Oregon Water Resources Department, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, Oregon Department of Agriculture, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration, US Fish and Wildlife Service, US Bureau of Reclamation, Yurok Tribe, Karuk Tribe, The Klamath Tribes, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, California North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board and Aquatic Ecosystem Sciences.

Four projects were funded in 2025; all of them will implement important restoration actions to improve water quality and fish habitat in the Upper Klamath Basin. These projects are vital given the presence of fall Chinook salmon in the upper basin one year after dam removal. Another grant offering will occur in 2026, and the Tribes in the Klamath Basin are eligible to apply for funds to fulfill the objective of IM11.



▲ Photo 13. Pre-restoration conditions along the Upper North Fork Sprague River, future site of a habitat and floodplain restoration project to be completed with funds from an OWEB-administered grant offering that is funded from the KHSa IM 11.

New Grant Programs

Tribal Project Development Grant Program

In 2025, OWEB continued to apply what we learned from the 2021 assessment of how OWEB's granting practices impact the ability of federally recognized Tribes to apply for and receive grant funding to meet their watershed enhancement goals and objectives. In 2024, OWEB developed its first-ever Tribal set-aside grant program in response to feedback from federally recognized Tribes that additional capacity funding is needed to engage in the development of restoration projects and that OWEB grant programs are extremely competitive.

To help fund this new grant program, OWEB requested and was awarded \$900,000 from NOAA's Pacific Coast Salmon Recovery Fund (PCSRF) in 2024 and 2025 to offer Tribal Project Development grants. At the July 2025 OWEB Board meeting, the board approved an additional \$1 million to the 2025-2027 Spending Plan for this grant offering. Along with OWEB's lottery funds, a total of \$2 million is available — \$200,000 for each federally recognized Tribe in Oregon and the Nez Perce Tribe. These funds are available to support Tribal capacity to participate in salmon recovery efforts in Oregon and to engage in work associated with implementing the Programmatic Agreement between OWEB and NOAA.

OWEB staff continued to communicate the intent of the grant program and encourage Tribes to apply for these funds. Since the grant offering opened on October 25, 2024, we have received and funded 8 applications, for a total of \$799,955 provided to the following Tribes:

Burns Paiute Tribe, Returning the Agai to their Homewaters: Developing the Malheur River Salmon Reintroduction Plan

Nez Perce Tribe, Wallowa River Spring Creeks Floodplain Project

Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians, Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians Tribal Project Development

Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs, Lower Tony Creek Instream Habitat Restoration Project: Design and Engineering

Coquille Indian Tribe, Coquille Indian Tribe - Salmon Recovery and Monitoring Project

Confederated Tribes Umatilla Indian Reservation, Monitoring Stage zero restoration in the Grand Ronde Basin.

Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde, Grand Ronde Salmon Strength Initiative

Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians, Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians Cultural Resources Assessments

In addition, OWEB is currently reviewing an application that the Confederated Tribes of the Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians submitted on December 1, 2025, and we anticipate providing a grant in early 2026 to support their Misery Creek Restoration Project Planning and Monitoring project. The Tribal Project Development grant offering has helped make 2025 the highest year of OWEB funding being provided to Tribes. These projects represent the Tribes' ambitions and interests to develop projects that benefit salmon and steelhead in Oregon.

Starting in 2026, OWEB will reach out to all the federally recognized Tribes in Oregon and the Nez Perce Tribe to notify them that there is an additional \$100,000 available to meet their salmon restoration project development needs.

Oregon Environmental Restoration Program

In 2024, Governor Kotek signed Senate Bill 1561 into law, creating the Oregon Environmental Restoration Fund (proceeds from Oregon's settlement with the Monsanto Company). This fund will invest in new projects and programs to restore Oregon's environment and benefit communities that were harmed by PCBs (polychlorinated biphenyls) and other toxins.

The Legislature established the Oregon Environmental Restoration Council (Council) to oversee responsible and restorative distribution of the funds and tasked the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB) to administer the funds.

The Oregon Environmental Restoration Fund will function similarly to an endowment over the next 50 years. The settlement money will be managed by the Oregon State Treasury and will earn investment and interest income. On a biennial basis, the Council will authorize OWEB to distribute that income to three sub-funds. One of those funds is the Tribal Nation Natural Resource Program Fund. It will receive 25% of the biennial disbursement, which will be paid out in equal amounts to each of the nine federally recognized Indian Tribes in the state of Oregon. Tribes may use the funds to invest in stewardship of their natural resources.

In 2025, OWEB hired three new staff to implement the Oregon Environmental Restoration Program. Over the past six months, those staff, in partnership with the Governor's Natural Resources Office, have met individually with representatives of federally recognized Tribes in Oregon to 1) share an overview of the proposed steps and timeline for establishing the Tribal Nation Natural Resource Fund and 2) hear what processes would be effective for Tribal input and engagement in developing the Fund.

In October 2025, the Governor-appointed Oregon Environmental Restoration Council had its inaugural meeting. Chuck Sams III is a co-chair of the Council and most recently served as the Director of the National Park Service (appointed by President Biden in 2021). Sams is Walla Walla and Cayuse and is an enrolled member of the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR). The Council's first order of business was to initiate rulemaking on the Tribal Nation Natural Resource Program Fund. Program staff will continue to work in partnership with Tribes to review and develop rules that define eligible expenditures and reporting requirements for the Tribal Nations Fund, with the goal of having the Fund established in early 2026.

Other Grant Program Involvements

The Upper Middle Fork John Day River Intensively Monitored Watershed (IMW) is a long-term, large-scale monitoring effort to evaluate watershed restoration projects. OWEB participates on the steering team and assists with securing funding for several aspects of the program. The Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs continues to be a key participant in the Upper Middle Fork John Day River IMW and received \$19,000 in funding this year to continue their important work

in this long-term watershed monitoring effort. In 2025, Fisheries Habitat Program Supervisor for the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs, Stefan Kelly, hosted a field trip to the Oxbow Conservation Area (see photo below) to explain the recently completed phase of restoration at the Tribally owned property along the Middle Fork John Day River.



▲ Photo 14. Stefan Kelly, Fisheries Habitat Program Supervisor for the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs describes the recently completed restoration actions in 2025 along the Middle Fork John Day River with OWEB funding.

Promotion of Communication between OWEB and Tribes

Tribal Liaison

In conformance with OWEB's Tribal policy, OWEB's designated staff, Ken Fetcho, continues to operate as a Tribal liaison for the agency. The Tribal liaison is responsible for ensuring that OWEB's programs and policy development adhere to our Tribal policy. This includes coordinating program and policy notices to Tribal natural resource key contacts and providing training to staff as appropriate.

In 2025, OWEB's Tribal liaison continued to notify OWEB employees and board members of the provisions of ORS 182.162 to 182.168 to emphasize the importance of OWEB's Tribal policy. These provisions are discussed intentionally at multiple touchpoints throughout the year, including at the all-staff meeting when information is requested to write the annual Tribal report. The provisions are also reviewed when the final report is presented to staff and the OWEB board in celebration of what we have accomplished to develop and foster relationships with Tribes in Oregon.

Starting in 2019, each new employee and board member is briefed on the Tribal policy and receives a copy of the current annual Tribal report. In addition, the Tribal liaison gave a presentation at the January 2025 board meeting to describe how the provisions of ORS 182.162 to 182.168 and OWEB's Tribal policy provide the guiding framework for OWEB's government-to-government relationship with Tribes. This presentation also highlighted the accomplishments that were summarized in the 2024 Annual Tribal Report.

Cultural Resources Protection

OWEB continues to emphasize the importance of grantees and grant project managers to comply with regulations that protect cultural resources. OWEB grants pay for the expenses to comply with cultural resource regulations and to legally implement watershed improvement projects.

In 2022, OWEB and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) began developing a Programmatic Agreement for projects funded by the Pacific Coastal Salmon Restoration Fund (PCSRF). This agreement delegates Section 106 responsibilities of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA) to OWEB. On August 12, 2025, OWEB, NMFS, along with the Oregon State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, signed the Programmatic Agreement (PA) for PCSRF projects, delegating Section 106 responsibilities of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA) to OWEB. These responsibilities will include reviewing projects, determining eligibility, and assessing a project's effect on historic properties. Additionally, OWEB will consult with other federal, state, and Tribal governments involved in the PCSRF projects.

In anticipation of signing the PA, Courtney Shaff, OWEB's Monitoring and Reporting Program Manager, along with Shane James, OWEB's Cultural Resource Specialist, reached out to federally recognized Tribes in Oregon and the Nez Perce Tribe to schedule meetings. These meetings aimed to foster relationships, discuss the implementation of the PA, and gather input from Tribal staff on how to conduct consultations with their respective Tribes. Many of these meetings occurred in 2024 but continued into the current year. At the time of this reporting, OWEB had the opportunity to meet with the cultural and natural resources staff from the Confederated Tribes of the Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, as well as the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon. These meetings have exceeded our original intentions by connecting various aspects of individual programs to the shared goal of salmonid recovery. OWEB is committed to meeting with the remaining Tribes as we start reviewing projects for cultural compliance. This effort will provide an opportunity to help OWEB further foster our relationships with the Tribes in Oregon as we work on a topic of the utmost importance to Tribal governments.



▲ Photo 15. OWEB's Cultural Resources Specialist surveys Spring Creek Fish Ladder.

As part of the terms of the PA, OWEB developed the Workers Environmental Awareness Training (WEAT). This training was designed to provide information on the types of cultural resources that may be encountered on the project site, Oregon's laws that exist to protect these resources, and the procedures to follow in the event of an inadvertent discovery. This training will be available on the State's Workday Learning account for all construction personnel, including contractors or state employees who work on certain PCSRF projects. It is our hope that this training will provide valuable information that can help protect our shared heritage for individuals beyond the reach of our grants.



▲ **Photo 16.** Camas flowers in the Camp Creek Hills burn unit, April 2025, as a result of the OWEB grant “Regenerating Native Plant Communities with Cultural Fire” to the Long Tom Watershed Council in coordination with the Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Indians.

Rulemaking

At their July 2025 meeting, the OWEB Board initiated rulemaking for OWEB's Water Acquisition grants program. OWEB formed a Rulemaking Advisory Committee (RAC) to provide input on revisions to the program rules. All Tribes were invited to participate in the RAC, and Anton Chiono, with the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, also volunteered to participate. We anticipate meeting with the RAC through Spring 2026 to develop revisions to the rules for OWEB Board consideration. OWEB staff will send an email with the draft rules to each Tribe and invite them to provide written or verbal comments before the OWEB Board approves the revised rules.

Task Force on Oregon Tribal Cultural Items

In 2020, OWEB completed its survey and reported its findings in OWEB's Cultural Items Survey Report for the Task Force on Oregon Tribal Cultural Items. Based on guidance from the State Archivist and the Task Force, OWEB provided notification to the Tribes before any paper files were purged. OWEB has not purged any electronic files to date. As of December 15, 2023, OWEB is not purging any paper or electronic files based on a directive by the Department of Justice due to litigation. OWEB has designated its Tribal Liaison, Ken Fetcho, as the Tribal Cultural Items Contact Person for the agency.

In October 2025, OWEB staff attended the Tribal Liaison training hosted by Danny Santos at the Joint Culture Cluster and State/Tribal Natural Resources Workgroup. Danny provided an update on Executive Order 24-06 to re-establish the Task Force on Oregon Tribal Cultural Items that helped clarify expectations of state agencies. OWEB continues to conduct its survey work and make maps, photos, records, case files, or other materials, which may be of interest to the Tribes, available via our online databases and upon request. OWEB's Tribal Cultural Items Survey Report and Responses to Comments that were provided to the Task Force on November 14, 2019, and July 29, 2020, describe the information that OWEB stores. To request a copy of these documents or for more information on the items we manage, please [contact OWEB's Tribal Liaison](#).

In 2026, OWEB will continue to make the cultural items we manage available to Tribes in our online grant database and respond to inquiries from Tribes on specific information they are interested in. OWEB will notify Tribes if and when OWEB begins to purge our paper files and will make that information available to the Tribes if they are interested in it. OWEB will continue to manage sensitive information in a manner that is not accessible in our online databases and store it in a manner that allows us to share it with Tribes. Finally, OWEB looks forward to attending the Orientation for State Agency Tribal Cultural Items Liaisons in 2026.



▲ Photo 17. Technical review team members discuss a stream restoration project at a site visit along the Hood River, that includes representatives from the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs.

Meetings with Tribes

The Tribal liaison continues to attend the State/Tribal Natural Resources Workgroup quarterly meetings to provide relevant updates and to better understand issues of importance to the Tribes. Additionally, in 2025, Shane James, OWEB's Cultural Resource Specialist, regularly attended the Cultural Cluster quarterly meetings and assisted the Culture Cluster in updating its Charter. The Tribal liaison, Executive Director, and the Environmental Restoration Program Manager attended the 2025 Government-to-Government Summit that was co-hosted by the Coquille Indian Tribe in North Bend, OR, on October 7th and 8th. OWEB staff enjoyed an evening of networking at the pre-summit reception and the cultural exchange at the Coquille Community Plank House. The evening's events were a great way to connect with the Tribes and other state

agencies before the Summit began the following day. OWEB had the opportunity to further connect with Tribal and state leadership to better understand Tribal issues that arose at the summit. OWEB staff engaged in the day's networking activities, including the breakout group exercise that provided an opportunity to connect and develop a deeper level of understanding of Tribal staff's roles and day-to-day activities.



▲ Photo 18. Governor Kotek and Tribal partners celebrate the signing of several bills at the 2025 Government-to-Government Summit co-hosted by the Coquille Indian Tribe.

In 2025, OWEB staff continued to work with Tribes' natural resources staff to receive input on OWEB program development and to pursue learning opportunities to improve our capacity to promote collaboration with Tribes. In February 2025, Burns Paiute Tribe Natural Resources staff and Diane Teeman, who at the time was Cultural Resources Director of the Burns Paiute Tribe, presented at an OWEB All-staff meeting. The presentation was a great opportunity for OWEB to learn more about the Burns Paiute Tribe's natural and cultural resources priorities. This presentation focused on the Burns Paiute Tribe's history, how their government is structured, and the Wildlife program's efforts to restore the Tribe's conservation properties.

In May 2025, the Executive Directors of the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board, and the Oregon Water Resources Department jointly met with the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation Board of Trustees and Natural Resources leadership. This was an opportunity for them to learn the Confederated Tribe's history, culture, and current initiatives to help the agencies align their efforts with Tribal values and priorities, ultimately leading to more effective and inclusive resource management. This meeting supported coordinated dialogue between the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, the three agency directors, and the leadership on water policy and other natural resource issues. OWEB leadership remains available to meet in person with the Tribal staff and leadership in 2026, individually or in coordination with other state agency leadership, to have an opportunity to learn what is important to each Tribe and to identify areas of collaboration.

In July 2025, the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation's Natural Resources Director Eric Quaempts and Fish Habitat Program Manager Michael Lambert hosted OWEB's Executive Director, Sara O'Brien, on a tour of the Meacham Creek watershed. Director Quaempts also spoke during a dinner with the OWEB Board, outlining CTUIR's First Foods and River Vision approach to natural resource management and connecting the First Foods approach with OWEB's mission and work.

In addition, the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation Fisheries Program staff led the OWEB Board and staff on a tour of the Umatilla River-Birch Creek floodplain reconnection project. This tour highlighted fish and wildlife habitat enhancement activities to realign Birch Creek's main channel to its historic meandering channel, and the Umatilla River into the floodplain areas previously restricted by a levee. This tour included the local and state partners who are working together to implement this important project. Being on-site with agency leadership and Tribal partners provided valuable insights into the challenges in implementing large-scale river restoration projects along working lands.



▲ Photo 19. Jude Love, Fisheries Habitat Biologist from the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation speaks to OWEB staff, board members, and local partners during a field trip along the Umatilla River and Birch Creek, July 2025.

In July 2025, OWEB staff met with the Klamath Tribes to discuss the Tribes' newly established Watershed Council. OWEB staff met with Willa Powless, Shahn timer Rich, and Derek Kimbol to discuss their interest in receiving Watershed Council Capacity funds and various grant offerings the Klamath Tribes are eligible for. OWEB staff followed up after the meeting to provide more details.

The Klamath Tribes are encouraged to participate in rule-making for the Watershed Council Capacity grant program that will be revisited in 2026.

In September 2025, OWEB's Deputy Director and Environmental Restoration Program Manager attended the Tribal Water Task Force meeting in Bend to discuss next steps for ongoing collaboration on shared water policy interests. OWEB is committed to participating in a future Tribal-State Water Policy Forum in 2026. We look forward to engaging with Tribal and state leadership to address water resource challenges and solutions.

Also in September 2025, Alexa Schmidt, OWEB's Water and Climate Coordinator, attended the [Carbon and Culture Symposium](#) that was hosted by the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation. The symposium brought Tribal knowledge keepers, land managers, academics, state government, and others together to consider natural and geologic carbon sequestration activities on Tribally owned and managed lands. Alexa presented about OWEB offerings for natural climate solutions and the forthcoming Tribal Nation Fund (part of the Environmental Restoration Program).



▲ Photo 20. Dogbane cordage making workshop at the Carbon and Culture Symposium hosted by the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, September 2025.

We hope that by expanding OWEB staff's learning and Tribal engagement opportunities, we are increasing OWEB's capacity to develop and foster our relationships between OWEB and each federally recognized Tribe in Oregon. OWEB looks forward to continuing to meet with the Tribes on their lands to learn more about their cultural and natural resources priorities in 2026.



OREGON
WATERSHED
ENHANCEMENT BOARD

Agenda Item F

General Board Business

Board Meeting January 27-28, 2026



MINUTES ARE NOT FINAL UNTIL APPROVED BY THE BOARD

October 28-29, 2025, Board Meeting Minutes

Hybrid Board Meeting

Recording at: https://www.youtube.com/channel/UC0dl-TOWlt4Sp--i1KEa_OA

ATTENDEES

BOARD MEMBERS

Agpaoa, Elizabeth
Brown, Dan
Buckmaster, Bruce
Coates, Kelly
Hoeflich, Russ
Kershner, Jessi
Labhart, Mark
McAlister, Liza Jane
McClary, Lindsay
McLeod-Skinner, Jamie
Staab, Brian
Webb, Mark
Wolfe, Woody

OWEB STAFF PRESENT

Bettinardi, Nicole
Davis, Renee
Duzik, Katie
Fetcho, Ken
Forney, Miriam
Hartman, Heidi
Hartstein, Eric
Hatch, Audrey
Hoffert, Denise
Lanusse, Clare
Larson, Taylor
Meacher, Robin
O'Brien, Sara
Page, Stephanie
Repplinger, Linda
Shaff, Courtney
Williams, Eric
Wolcott, Brian

OTHERS

Bellis, Natasha
Bushnell, Raija
Buttafuoco, Joe
Chiono, Anton
Coleman, Liesl
Coordes, Regan
Fitzpatrick, Kate
Freiberg, Femke
Hamilton, Jennifer
Humphreys, Jessica
Kendrick, Karsyn
Kowitz, Chris
Kreiner, Andrea
Logalbo, Mary
Mallon, Zac
Matica, Anca
McClary, Toby
McLaughlin, Mark
Moore, Brooke
Preeg Riggsby, Terri
Richardson, Ann
Ruiter, Terry
Sawaske, Spencer
Schulman, Neil
Stutzman, Karin
Thieman, Cindy

Tuesday, October 28

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Timestamp | The meeting was called to order at 8:30 am by Kelly Coates: Recording |
| 0:09:15 | Item A. Board Member Comments Board representatives from state and federal agencies provided updates on issues related to the natural resource agency they represent. Public and tribal board members also reported on their recent activities, shared information, and commented on various watershed enhancement and community conservation-related topics. <i>Information item.</i> |

| | |
|---------|--|
| 1:40:55 | <p>Item B. Directors Updates</p> <p>Executive Director Sara O’Brien and staff will update the board on agency business. <i>Information item.</i></p> |
| 2:23:10 | <p>Item C. General Board Business</p> <p>This time was reserved for the board to act on routine items. <i>Action item.</i></p> <p>Motion #1. Mark Webb moved the board approve the minutes from the July 22-23, 2025, board meeting. Motion seconded by Mark Labhart. Bruce Buckmaster, Kelly Coates, Russ Hoeflich, Mark Labhart, Liza Jane McAlister, Lindsay McClary, Jamie McLeod-Skinner, Mark Webb, and Woody Wolfe voted in favor. Barbara Boyer and Liz Agpaoa were absent. Motion passed.</p> <p>Motion #2. Mark Webb moved the board approve receipt of up to \$300,000 from PSMFC; add \$264,597 to the “Other Legislative/External Partner Allocated” section of the spending plan for grants; and delegate authority to the Executive Director to distribute funds through the appropriate agreements. Motion seconded by Russ Hoeflich. Bruce Buckmaster, Kelly Coates, Russ Hoeflich, Mark Labhart, Liza Jane McAlister, Lindsay McClary, Jamie McLeod-Skinner, Mark Webb, and Woody Wolfe voted in favor. Barbara Boyer and Liz Agpaoa were absent. Motion passed.</p> <p>Motion #3. Russ Hoeflich moved the board approve receipt of \$500,000 from NRCS; add \$363,722 to the “Other Legislative/External Partner Allocated” section of the spending plan for grants; and delegate authority to the Executive Director to distribute funds through the appropriate agreements. Motion seconded by Mark Webb. Bruce Buckmaster, Kelly Coates, Russ Hoeflich, Mark Labhart, Liza Jane McAlister, Lindsay McClary, Jamie McLeod-Skinner, Mark Webb, and Woody Wolfe voted in favor. Barbara Boyer and Liz Agpaoa were absent. Motion passed.</p> <p>Motion #4. Mark Labhart moved the board extend the closing deadline for Seely Farm Phase 1 (Grant No. 223-7100-22521) to June 30, 2026. Motion seconded by Mark Webb. Bruce Buckmaster, Kelly Coates, Russ Hoeflich, Mark Labhart, Liza Jane McAlister, Lindsay McClary, Jamie McLeod-Skinner, Mark Webb, and Woody Wolfe voted in favor. Barbara Boyer and Liz Agpaoa were absent. Motion passed.</p> |
| 2:32:55 | <p>Item D. Public Comment</p> <p>This time was reserved for the board to hear public comments and review the written public comment submitted for the meeting. <i>Information item.</i></p> <p>All written public comments can be viewed on the meeting page of our website. The following people provided verbal comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Andrea Kreiner, Oregon Association of Conservation Districts • Terri Preeg Riggsby, Network of Oregon Watershed Councils • Karsyn Kendrick, Coalition of Oregon Land Trusts • Ellen Hammond, Jefferson Soil and Water Conservation District |

| | |
|---------|---|
| 2:56:35 | <p>Item E. Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP) Technical Assistance (TA) Grant Awards</p> <p>Federal Program Specialist Heidi Hartman and Monitoring & Reporting Manager Courtney Shaff provided an overview of the CREP TA grant offering and outlined staff recommendations for the grant awards. <i>Action item.</i></p> <p>Motion #1: Bruce Buckmaster moved the board approve receipt of \$200,000 from NRCS; add \$162,532 to the “Board Allocated Funding” section of the spending plan to the CREP TA line item; and reallocate \$29,961 from the Quantifying Outcomes and Outputs line item to the CREP TA line item. Motion seconded by Woody Wolfe. Bruce Buckmaster, Kelly Coates, Russ Hoeflich, Liza Jane McAlister, Lindsay McClary, Jamie McLeod-Skinner, Mark Webb, and Woody Wolfe voted in favor. Barbara Boyer, Liz Agpaoa, and Mark Labhart were absent. Motion passed.</p> <p>Motion #2: Liza Jane McAlister moved the board award funding to the 12 applications shown in Attachment B with an award date of October 28, 2025. Motion seconded by Bruce Buckmaster. Bruce Buckmaster, Kelly Coates, Russ Hoeflich, Liza Jane McAlister, Lindsay McClary, Mark Webb, and Woody Wolfe voted in favor. Jamie McLeod-Skinner voted against. Barbara Boyer, Liz Agpaoa, and Mark Labhart were absent. Motion passed.</p> |
| 4:30:55 | <p>Item F. Focused Investment Partnership Grant Program (FIP) Cohort 2 Report - Clackamas</p> <p>Partnership Coordinator Denise Hoffert introduced representatives from the Clackamas Basin Partnership who will update the board on their FIP initiative progress. <i>Information item.</i></p> <p>Representatives included Mary Logalbo and Neil Schulman.</p> |
| 5:05:50 | <p>Item G. OWEB Monitoring Grants 101</p> <p>Effectiveness Monitoring Coordinator & Tribal Liaison Ken Fetcho and Monitoring & Reporting Manager Courtney Shaff provided an overview of OWEB’s monitoring grant programs. <i>Information item.</i></p> |
| | <p>The meeting was adjourned at 2:35 p.m. by co-chair Lindsay McClary.</p> |

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Timestamp | The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. by Lindsay McClary: Recording |
| 0:01:50 | <p>Item H. Public Comment</p> <p>This time was reserved for the board to hear public comments and review the written public comment submitted for the meeting. <i>Information item.</i></p> <p>All written public comments can be viewed on the meeting page of our website. The following people provided verbal comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joe Buttafuoco, Coalition of Oregon Land Trusts • Natasha Bellis, Deschutes Land Trust • Ann Richardson, Deschutes Land Trust board |
| 0:15:16 | <p>Item I. Water Acquisitions Panel</p> <p>Water Acquisitions & Capacity Coordinator Brian Wolcott and Acquisitions & Special Programs Manager Renee Davis and a panel of partners provided background about OWEB’s Water Acquisition grant program and the process for developing and reviewing water acquisition projects, then provided an opportunity for board discussion with the panel and OWEB staff. <i>Information item.</i></p> <p>Panel members included: Anton Chiono, Habitat Conservation Project Leader, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation Department of Natural Resources; Kate Fitzpatrick, Executive Director, Deschutes River Conservancy; Femke Freiberg, Western Water Program Director, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation; Jessica Humphreys, Oregon Flow Restoration Director, Trout Unlimited; Chris Kowitz, North Central Region Manager, Oregon Water Resources Department; and Spencer Sawaske, Habitat Division Deputy Administrator, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife.</p> |
| 1:56:18 | <p>Item J. Committee Updates</p> <p>Representatives from board committees provided updates on committee topics to the full board. <i>Information item.</i></p> |
| 2:02:50 | <p>Item K. FIP Ecological Priorities</p> <p>Restoration Grants Manager Eric Williams, Partnerships Coordinator Denise Hoffert, and Senior Policy Coordinator Eric Hartstein presented draft revisions to the FIP ecological priorities and requested board feedback. <i>Information item.</i></p> |
| 2:54:22 | <p>Item L. Land Acquisition Grant Program Modernization Update</p> <p>Acquisitions & Special Programs Manager Renee Davis, Executive Director Sara O’Brien, and Land Acquisition Grants Coordinator Miriam Forney provided an overview of the land acquisition grant program modernization process that is in progress. <i>Information item.</i></p> |
| 3:17:19 | <p>Item M. Other Business</p> <p>This item is reserved for other matters that may come before the board. <i>Information item.</i></p> |
| | The meeting was adjourned at 12:11 pm by co-chair Kelly Coates. |



This report provides the board updates on the progress and timeline extension request for one Oregon Agricultural Heritage Program (OAHP) Conservation Easement Grant awarded in 2023.

Background

Every OAHP grant is conditioned on the grantee completing required due diligence items to the satisfaction of OWEB and the match-funding partner before the release of funds for the conservation easement transaction. At the prompting of the Board at its October 2025 meeting to explore possibly efficiencies in extending OAHP conservation easement grants, staff completed legal research into the obligations presented in OAR 698-015-0110(3) related to the extension of grant timelines. Staff confirmed extension requests must be presented to the Oregon Agricultural Heritage Commission for recommendation to the OWEB Board prior to granting or denying a grantee's request for a grant extension.

Pitchfork T was awarded to Deschutes Land Trust (DLT) in 2023 and required, per the administrative rules in effect at that time, to complete the transaction within 18 months of the board award. At the June 2024 Oregon Agricultural Heritage Commission (OAHC) meeting, staff presented the commission with a recommendation to extend all 2023 OAHP conservation easement grant awards by 9 months to help with coordinated review and timelines with federal match partners. The commission agreed and forwarded the recommendation to the OWEB Board, which approved the commission's recommendation. This action extended the date for closing to July 28, 2025. DLT requested, the commission recommended, and the Board approved an additional closing extension in 2025 to align the closing deadline to the project-specific Natural Resource Conservation Service grant timeline, which extended the grant to March 31, 2026.

OAHP Conservation Easement Grant Extension Requests

Pitchfork T (Grant No. 223-7105-22611) was awarded to DLT to be used for the purchase of a working lands conservation easement on approximately 171 acres of valuable soils and rangeland in Deschutes County. DLT requests that OWEB extend its closing deadline to March 31, 2027. This date would bring the project closing deadline consistent with the the extended deadline on the NRCS grant for the project.

DLT has completed nearly all due diligence for the Pitchfork T project, including presenting final environmental site assessments and survey work to OWEB for review and approval. DLT was in the process of finalizing a draft easement deed and the easement baseline documentation with the landowner and their counsel when a land use dispute unrelated to the easement project arose. The issue relates to property adjacent to the Pitchfork T easement, resulting in the landowner listing the property for sale. This led to a pause on work for the easement. The property has since been taken off the market and DLT has resumed work with the current landowner and a potential buyer that would continue the easement project, and is hopeful for a positive resolution. DLT has consistently communicated with OWEB staff in a timely manner on this matter and all other due diligence items.

The Oregon Agricultural Heritage Commission reviewed this extension request on December 15, 2025 and recommends that the OWEB board approve this request from DLT for the Pitchfork T project.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommend the OWEB Board extend the grant deadline for Pitchfork T (Grant No. 223-7105-22611) to March 31, 2027 with the condition that the Grantee provide an updated project schedule.



This report describes a National Coastal Wetlands Conservation grant application that OWEB submitted to the US Fish and Wildlife Service on behalf of the Coquille Watershed Association (WA) and requests advance delegation of authority to the Executive Director to enter into a grant agreement with the Coquille WA if the USFWS awards the grant to OWEB.

Background

The US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) National Coastal Wetlands Conservation Grant Program (NCWCGP) was established to acquire, restore, and enhance wetlands in coastal states through competitive matching grants to state agencies. The primary goal of the NCWCGP is the long-term conservation of coastal wetland ecosystems.

OWEB is an eligible state agency applicant for NCWCGP funds and applies on behalf of local conservation and restoration partners for acquisition and restoration projects. If an application is successful, OWEB serves as the official grantee of the federal award and enters into a grant agreement to sub-award the grant to the local partner. OWEB would be awarded the funding from the USFWS inclusive of indirect charges.

In July 2025, OWEB submitted a restoration grant application on behalf of the Coquille WA for the Beaver Hill Wetland Reserve Enhancement Project. The WA requested \$912,659 in grant funding to complete the enhancement of 51 acres of coastal wetlands on the Beaver Hill Wetland Reserve in the Coquille Valley in Coos County, Oregon. The reserve property is owned by the Leslie Family, LLC, and the wetlands within the project area have been permanently protected under an NRCS conservation easement since 1998. At that time, wetland and channel restoration work was initiated; however, additional restoration is needed to more fully restore the wetlands on the property, while also improving private and public road access and safety for local landowners and the broader community.

Preemptive Delegation Request

As of the date of this staff report, it is unknown when OWEB will be notified of the grant award decision from the USFWS. Currently, the application is undergoing review and evaluation. If the Beaver Hill Wetland Reserve project is selected for funding, the application must be approved through the US Department of the Interior before the award is made.

To provide good customer service, OWEB staff are requesting advance delegation of authority from the Board to the Executive Director to award up to \$1 million in Coastal Wetland grant funds to the Coquille WA for the Beaver Hill Wetland Reserve Enhancement Project, contingent upon an award to OWEB from the USFWS for the project. The amount to be awarded to Coquille WA would correspond to the grant application amounts. This advance delegation would allow OWEB to immediately begin working on a grant agreement with the Coquille WA if we are notified of an award between the January and April OWEB board meetings.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommend the OWEB Board delegate authority to the Executive Director to award up to \$1 million (less any authorized OWEB indirect charges) in Coastal Wetlands grant funds to the Coquille Watershed Association for the Beaver Hill Wetland Reserve Enhancement Project, contingent upon a grant award to OWEB for the project from the US Fish and Wildlife Service.



This report provides the board clarification and a recommendation to correct a motion approved in the October 2025 board meeting (Item E) regarding the Grant Funds Spending Plan Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP) Technical Assistance (TA) line item.

Background

In the October 2025 board meeting, Item E, the board approved the receipt of NRCS CREP TA funds, moving funds from the Quantifying Outcomes and Outputs line item to the CREP TA line item; and award funding of 12 applications.

During the board discussion, it was misunderstood that the grant portion (\$162,532) of the NRCS CREP TA funds that were being accepted (\$200,000) needed to be added to the CREP TA spending plan line item, and the motion was modified to include that addition. However, the total amount approved in the July 2025 Spending Plan for 2025-2027 for CREP TA of \$1.6 million had already included any NRCS CREP TA funds that may be awarded to OWEB (July 2025 Board meeting agenda [Item F](#)).

The October 2025 [Item E CREP TA staff report](#) included the following sentence: “The Board has been asked to approve receipt of the \$200,000 in federal funds though no change is necessary in the spending plan amount of \$1.6 million.”

The exact amount of the grant funds of \$162,532 was also noted at the bottom of the October 2025 spending plan as being included in the total of \$1.6 million. Therefore, no additional funds need to be added to the Spending Plan line item, and a correction of the motion is recommended to ensure that funding for the CREP TA spending plan line item remains at \$1.6 million.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommend the OWEB Board clarify through a motion that the CREP TA spending plan line item in the 2025-2027 Grant Funds Spending Plan be held at \$1.6 million inclusive of any NRCS CREP TA funds received.



OREGON
WATERSHED
ENHANCEMENT BOARD

Agenda Item G

Forest Collaboratives

Grant Offering Board Awards

Board Meeting January 27-28, 2026



Oregon

Tina Kotek, Governor



OREGON
WATERSHED
ENHANCEMENT BOARD

775 Summer Street NE, Suite 360
Salem OR 97301-1290
www.oregon.gov/oweb
(503) 986-0178

January 27-28, 2026, OWEB Board Meeting

Staff Report- Agenda Item G. Forest Collaborative grant awards

MEMORANDUM

To: Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board

From: Heidi Hartman, Federal Programs Specialist

Eric Hartstein, Senior Policy Coordinator

Supports OWEB's Strategic Plan priority #3: Use our funding to strengthen and leverage capacity of people and organizations to achieve healthy watersheds.

I. Introduction

This staff report provides an overview of the Forest Collaborative grant program and summarizes the grant solicitation, grant review process and the technical review team's funding recommendation for the Board's consideration.

II. Background

In 2013, the Oregon Legislature provided state funds to create the Federal Forest Restoration (FFR) Program to increase the pace, scale, and quality of restoration on Oregon's federal forests. The Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF) entered into an agreement with OWEB in 2015 to administer the Forest Collaborative Grant Program. Forest Collaborative grants are intended to increase restoration efforts on federal forests statewide by enhancing and strengthening the effectiveness of local collaboratives.

III. Purpose

The purpose of the Forest Collaborative grant program is to increase the number, acreage, and complexity of forest restoration projects on United States Forest Service (USFS) and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) managed forest lands in Oregon by providing funding for Collaborative Governance projects and for developing, expanding, or advancing Zones of Agreement for restoration that includes vegetation management.

Strong, capable, collaborative organizations are needed to effectively develop restoration agreements that are defensible, durable, and representative of public desires for federal forest lands. Collaborative Governance projects ensure that organizations engaging in collaborative forest restoration are robust and can effectively develop restoration agreements and use all available restoration tools. Zones of Agreement projects reduce conflict around federal forest management and advance project-level restoration goals.

IV. Summary of Solicitation and Review Process

The Forest Collaborative Grant Program has a total of \$350,000 in available funding from ODF for the 2025-27 biennium for both Collaborative Governance and Zones of Agreement

activities. For the grant offering that closed in October 2025, applicants could request up to \$20,000 for Collaborative Governance proposals, and up to \$65,000 for Zones of Agreement proposals. For applicants applying for both project types, the maximum request was \$85,000.

Staff opened the Forest Collaborative grant solicitation cycle on August 26, 2025, with a closing date of October 23, 2025. OWEB and ODF hosted a webinar for prospective applicants on September 16, 2025. ODF and OWEB staff were available to consult with prospective applicants on eligibility, application and program requirements, as requested throughout the open application period.

Applications Submitted

Four applications were submitted requesting a total of \$223,420. The two applications recommended for funding were geographically distributed across Central Oregon, one in North Central Oregon and one in Southern Oregon. See map in Attachment A.

Grant Application Review Process

The grant application review process began with ODF reviewing each application for eligibility and completeness. All applications were determined eligible and complete, moving them on to the next phase of the review process.

The technical review team members were comprised of diverse backgrounds, including state and federal agencies, non-profits, and the private sector. On November 21, 2025, staff facilitated a virtual review team meeting where the applications were evaluated based on existing OWEB technical assistance criteria and supplemental criteria specific to the Forest Collaborative grant program. At the conclusion of each application review, the review team provided an anonymous funding recommendation.

V. Recommendation


Staff recommend the OWEB Board award funding to the two applications shown in Attachment B with an award date of January 27, 2026.

VI. Attachments

- A. Location Map of Forest Collaborative Applications
- B. Forest Collaborative Funding Recommendations

Forest Collaborative application evaluations can be found in the [Application Evaluations](#) document and funding recommendations are included in Attachment B.

Forest Collaborative Fall 2025 Funding Recommendations



Forest Collaborative
Fall 2025
Technical Review Team Rankings

| Application # | Applicant | TRT Recommendation | OWEB Amount Requested | Funding Recommendation |
|----------------|---|--------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| 226-8008-24805 | Southern Oregon Forest Restoration Collaborative | Fund | \$76,709 | \$76,709 |
| 226-8008-24806 | Wheeler SWCD | Do not Fund | \$20,000 | \$0 |
| 226-8008-24807 | Wasco SWCD | Fund | \$62,190 | \$62,190 |
| 226-8008-24808 | Discover Your Northwest DBA: Discover Your Forest | Do not Fund | \$64,521 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | | | \$223,420 | \$138,899 |



OREGON
WATERSHED
ENHANCEMENT BOARD

Agenda Item H

Committee Updates

Board Meeting January 27-28, 2026



Committee Members

Dan Brown (co-chair), Kelly Coates, Russ Hoeflich (co-chair), and Mark Webb. (Bruce Buckmaster transitioned off the board between the October and December committee meetings).

Meeting Summary

The Acquisitions, Restoration, and Emerging Topics (ARE) committee met on [October 23](#) and [December 11, 2025](#).

The October meeting was added to the committee's standing schedule to provide time for the committee to discuss the extensive information provided thus far during the Land Acquisition Modernization process, including feedback provided by the grantee panel in September. During the October ARE meeting, the committee heard public comment from Karsyn Kendrick from the Coalition of Oregon Land Trusts (COLT).

The December meeting provided opportunity for further input to the committee from partners. The majority of the meeting focused on a Tribal panel that discussed challenges and opportunities for the OWEB land acquisition grant program from the perspective of Tribes. The committee also heard public comment from Joe Buttafuoco from COLT, Eli Tome from McKenzie River Trust, and Mark McLaughlin from North Coast Land Conservancy.

October 23, 2025 Meeting

The committee used the October meeting to share with fellow committee members thoughts and observations about the September ARE meeting discussion. Topics included:

- Alternative approaches for conservation easements (CEs) that may exist, including different instruments, alternative approaches to terms and conditions in CEs, and a streamlined CE that separates out the goal of the acquisition grant from specifics such as future conditions and restoration requirements;
- The need for better and more detailed definitions of risk that leverages the risk matrix that was presented by staff in September and provides information such as likelihood/probability, severity, and cost/impact, etc.;
- How to strike a balance between a potentially more streamlined process for accredited entities with the reality of a competitive grant program that requires use of evaluation criteria in a resource constrained environment; and
- The importance of determining how much the CE instrument itself presents challenges as opposed to the content and implementation approach used by OWEB.

The committee expressed interest in hearing ideas from staff and grantees—including Tribes—about specific refinement and streamlining options and learning more about how other funders approach land acquisitions.

December 11, 2025 Meeting

The December meeting included a Tribal panel, brief discussion among committee members of key observations from the Tribal panel, extended public comment from local partner organizations that included multiple case studies, and abbreviated discussion of next steps for the committee.

The Tribal panel was comprised of the following individuals:

- Anton Chiono from Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation
- Ashley Russell and Jeremy Doze from Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians
- Lawrence Schwabe from Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde
- Austin Smith Jr. from Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs
- Emmit Taylor Jr. from Nez Perce Tribe
- Stan van de Wetering from Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians

Panelists provided feedback about the following questions: 1) What are the barriers that have made this program difficult to access or less desirable for your Tribe to access up until now? 2) What could OWEB learn from other funders about how to make this program work better for Tribes? 3) If you could wave a magic wand, what change(s) would you most like us to make as soon as possible to make this funding source available for Tribal land acquisition priorities?

Following a detailed discussion with the Tribal panel, committee members identified several topics for potential follow-up, including the CE drafting and negotiation process, stewardship funding, the importance of recognizing Traditional Ecological Knowledge and building trust-based relationships with Tribes, and match requirements for land acquisition grants to Tribes. The committee then heard public comment that touched on several OWEB funded projects, including: haich ikt'at'tuu (formerly known as Waite Ranch), North Fork Siuslaw, Boneyard, and Tillamook River Wetlands. Committee members engaged in brief discussion with the public comments, asking questions about reasonableness and expectations of different funding conditions and future condition/restoration expectations. In addition, the committee received two written public comments regarding habitat related topics that the committee will revisit at its March 2026 meeting.

The meeting wrapped up with Sara O'Brien, Executive Director, outlining next steps for the committee: reporting out at January 2026 board meeting; at the March 2026 meeting, continuing the Habitat discussion that was originally planned for the December meeting; discussing Other Uses and Risk Tolerance topics at the March and June 2026 meetings; and preparing for recommendations to the full board in April or July 2026. Follow-ups for staff were also outlined: continuing partner follow-ups about the case studies presented to the committee; compile program refinement ideas and recommendations for the committee; and proposing a mechanism by which formal direction/guidance from the board would be provided regarding the land acquisition grant program (in addition to potential rulemaking). The committee also requested that staff obtain an example of standard CE language that Tribes have negotiated with other funders for discussion at a future ARE meeting.

To Be Presented at the Board Meeting By

Dan Brown and Russ Hoeflich



Committee Members

Liz Agpaoa, Barbara Boyer, Raija Bushnell, Aaron Curtis, Lindsay McClary (co-chair), and Woody Wolfe (co-chair)

Meeting Summary

The Partnerships and Capacity committee met on December 2, 2025 [[Meeting Recording](#)].

The committee heard an update on planned pre-rulemaking engagement for capacity grant programs and made a recommendation for proposed Focused Investment Partnership (FIP) Ecological Priorities. There was no public comment.

Pre-rulemaking Engagement for Capacity Grants

Eric Williams, Restoration Grants Manager, provided background on the rationale to conduct extensive engagement prior to asking the board to form a Rulemaking Advisory Committee. The Operating Capacity rules for Watershed Councils have not been updated since 2014. Watershed Councils and Soil and Water Conservation Districts both receive capacity grants for the same purpose: to develop eligible restoration and acquisition projects; however, current capacity rules only address watershed council capacity grants, and some watershed councils are not eligible. The rulemaking process will ensure alignment with constitutional and statutory authority. Given the reach and complexity of the proposed rulemaking, OWEB staff, in partnership with ODA, who administers capacity grants to soil and water conservation districts, will conduct listening sessions in each of OWEB's 6 regions as well as a virtual session and a survey instrument to inform the rulemaking process. Engagement will begin on February 4 with a webinar hosted by the Network of Oregon Watershed Councils and the Oregon Association of Conservation Districts. Staff anticipate requesting board authority to form a Rulemaking Advisory Committee at either the April 2026 or July 2026 board meeting.

FIP Ecological Priorities

Eric Hartstein, Senior Policy Coordinator, reviewed previous discussions on proposed changes to the FIP ecological priorities and those recommendations will be presented to the board for final decision at the January 27-28, 2026 meeting. Eric then presented information to support a committee recommendation for the biennium cap on FIP awards, which has been \$4 million since 2015. After extensive discussion, the committee recommended a cap increase to \$5 million for the solicitation planned to open after the January board meeting. The board will be asked to make a final decision at that meeting.

Upcoming Agenda Items

At the March 2026 meeting, the committee will receive a status update on capacity pre-rulemaking engagement and an update on Partnership Technical Assistant grant applications and review, which will be subject to board action in April.

To Be Presented at the Board Meeting By

Lindsay McClary and Woody Wolfe



January 27-28, 2026, OWEB Board Meeting

Tracking and Communicating Outcomes, Mission, and Values Committee Update

Committee Members

Mark Labhart, Brian Staab, Annie Birnie, Jamie McLeod-Skinner, Claire Tachella (co-chair), and Jessi Kershner (co-chair)

Meeting Summary

Tracking and Communicating Outcomes, Mission, and Values committee met on December 10, 2025 [[Meeting Recording](#)].

Courtney Shaff, Monitoring and Reporting Manager, and Ken Fetcho, Effectiveness Monitoring Coordinator, previewed a Quantifying Conservation Outputs and Outcomes delegated award for Long-Term Fish and Habitat Monitoring in the Middle Fork John Day IMW that will occur prior to the January 2026 Board meeting.

Courtney Shaff, Monitoring and Reporting Manager, Audrey Hatch, Conservation Outcomes Coordinator, and Eric Hartstein Senior Policy Coordinator provided the committee with a presentation on Focused Investment Partnership (FIP) reporting. The committee discussed the history of FIP Reporting and the various products OWEB develops to communicate the FIP accomplishments over the six-year award period. The committee discussed other examples of reporting program outcomes, including examples from SeaGrant programs. There was no public comment.

Upcoming Committee Agenda Items

At the next committee meeting OWEB staff will provide an overview of the Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds Biennial Report and share an update on Executive Order 25-26 Resiliency Attribute development.

To Be Presented at the Board Meeting By:

Jessi Kershner



OREGON
WATERSHED
ENHANCEMENT BOARD

Agenda Item I

Focused Investment Partnership

Ecological Priorities Adoption

Board Meeting January 27-28, 2026



Oregon

Tina Kotek, Governor



OREGON
WATERSHED
ENHANCEMENT BOARD

775 Summer Street NE, Suite 360
Salem OR 97301-1290
www.oregon.gov/oweb
(503) 986-0178

January 27-28, 2026, OWEB Board Meeting

Staff report – Agenda Item I. FIP Draft Ecological Priorities & Next Grant Solicitation

MEMORANDUM

To: Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board
From: Eric Williams, Restoration Grants Manager
Jillian McCarthy, Partnerships Coordinator
Denise Hoffert, Partnerships Coordinator
Eric Hartstein, Senior Policy Coordinator

Supports OWEB's Strategic Plan priority #3: Use our funding to strengthen and leverage capacity of people and organizations to achieve healthy watersheds.

I. Introduction

At the January board meeting, staff will present the final draft Focused Investment Partnership (FIP) grant program ecological priorities for board approval. In addition, the board will consider the Partnership and Capacity Committee's recommendation for the maximum award per biennium for the upcoming 2027-2029 FIP solicitation.

II. Background

The FIP grant program provides multiple years of funding for high performing partnerships to implement landscape-scale restoration and conservation that addresses Board-identified ecological priorities of significance to the State. Oregon Administrative Rule 695-047-0030 requires the Board to approve these ecological priorities at least every five years, and that the priorities be determined with public input, scientific rigor, and include a map, theory of change (expected short- and long-term outcomes), and narrative describing the desired ecological outcomes for eligible FIP initiative activities. In 2020 the Board approved, with modest revisions, the following ecological priorities that were first designated by the Board in 2015:

- Aquatic Habitat for Native Fish Species
- Closed Lakes Basin Wetland Habitat
- Coastal Estuaries
- Coho Habitat and Populations along the Coast
- Dry-Type Forest Habitat
- Oak Woodland and Prairie Habitat
- Sagebrush/Sage-Steppe Habitat

To view the existing priority memos that were adopted by the OWEB Board in 2020, please see the [FIP webpage](#).

At the January meeting, the Board will consider approving revised and/or new ecological priorities for the FIP program. After approving ecological priorities, the Board must determine the maximum amount for biennial awards for the 2027-2029 FIP solicitation that will be announced following the January meeting.

III. Draft Ecological Priorities

In early 2025 OWEB staff began the FIP ecological priority update process by engaging the public and tribes with a survey, listening sessions, and written comments. Additionally, staff reached out to state and federal natural resource agencies for input to inform potential revisions to the ecological priorities. Broadly, these engagement efforts pointed towards updating the existing ecological priorities with new information, and in some cases, new maps. The draft ecological priority with the most substantive revisions is the “Aquatic Habitat for Native Fish,” which has merged with “Coho Habitat and Populations along the Coast” to become “Aquatic Habitat for Native Species” and expanded to include habitat for other certain aquatic species. Attachment A provides a summary of the draft revisions to the ecological priorities.

Throughout the FIP ecological priority revision process, the Board Partnerships and Capacity (PAC) Committee has been regularly updated and has been providing feedback to staff. At the October 2025 meeting, staff presented the draft revisions to the FIP ecological priorities to the full Board and received input. Following the October Board meeting, minor revisions were made to the final draft ecological priorities, which are included in Attachment B.

IV. FIP Solicitation

Following the January Board meeting, OWEB will announce the solicitation for new FIP initiatives to begin in the 2027-2029 biennium. Prior to the solicitation, OAR 695-047-0090 requires the Board to determine the maximum amount for FIP initiative biennial awards. Previously, the maximum amount a FIP initiative could request per biennium was \$4 million. In January 2025, the Board approved revised FIP program rules to eliminate this static cap in order to provide flexibility and account for inflation.

At the October Board meeting, staff provided information to assist the Board in an initial discussion in determining the maximum amount of funding per biennium partnerships may request in the upcoming solicitation. At the December PAC Committee meeting, members discussed the issue in-depth and provided a recommendation for a \$5 million maximum award per biennium for the upcoming 2027-2029 FIP solicitation.

V. Recommendations

Staff recommend the Board approve the Final Draft Revised FIP Ecological Priority memos as provided in Attachment B. The PAC Committee recommends the Board set the maximum biennial award at \$5 million for FIP initiatives that begin in the 2027-2029 biennium.

VI. Attachments

- A. Summary of Revisions to FIP Ecological Priorities
- B. Final Draft Revised FIP Ecological Priorities Memos

FIP Ecological Priorities- Draft Revisions Summary

Aquatic Habitat for Native Fish Species

- Change name to 'Aquatic Habitat for Native Species'.
- Broaden the priority to include coast coho salmon habitat and habitat for other aquatic species (i.e., Oregon spotted frog, western pond turtle, and western ridged mussel).
- Revisions to the map for native fish, which now incorporates coast coho salmon habitat and a reprioritization of the watersheds that support native fish habitat. The draft revised map includes only the highest priority watersheds with lower priority watersheds removed.

Closed Lakes Basin Wetland Habitat

- General updates, including linkages to Oregon State Wildlife Action Plan and other reference plans.
- Substantial edits to 'Indicator species and/or species of interest supported by this habitat'.

Coastal Estuaries

- Change name to 'Estuary Habitats.'
- General updates, including linkages to Oregon State Wildlife Action Plan and other reference plans.

Coho Habitat and Populations along the Coast

- Removing this ecological priority and incorporating coast coho salmon into the revised 'Aquatic Habitat for Native Species'.

Dry-Type Forest Habitat

- General updates, including linkages to Oregon State Wildlife Action Plan and other reference plans.
- Substantial updates to 'Key limiting factors and/or ecological threats' section.
- Updates to the map demonstrating percent of watershed needing disturbance restoration.

Oak Woodland and Prairie Habitat

- Change name to 'Oak and Prairie Habitat.'
- General updates, including linkages to Oregon State Wildlife Action Plan and other reference plans.

- Removing reference to supporting aquatic ecosystems, as making this connection is not necessary for oak and prairie habitat.

Sagebrush/Sage-Steppe Habitat

- In addition to sage-grouse habitat, add existing high-quality sagebrush, and sagebrush growth opportunity areas, as focal areas of the priority.
- General updates, including linkages to Oregon State Wildlife Action Plan and other reference plans.

Supplemental Information to All Ecological Priorities

- Add landscape-scale disturbance as a key limiting factor and/or threat across the priorities, noting that post-disturbance restoration actions may be eligible for FIP funding.
- Add wildlife habitat connectivity as a key limiting factor and/or threat across the priorities, linking to the ODFW Priority Wildlife Conservation Areas to show where habitat connectivity is most important, and noting that actions related to connectivity are eligible within FIP initiatives.



OWEB Focused Investment Partnership Priority

AQUATIC HABITAT FOR NATIVE SPECIES - 2025 Draft Revisions

Summary Statement of Priority

The OWEB Board will consider proposals for investment in **aquatic habitat for native species** for initiatives that address habitat conservation and restoration needs to achieve ecological outcomes over time at the landscape scale, which will restore and protect ecologically meaningful areas.

OWEB's Focused Investment Priority for Aquatic Habitat for Native Species guides voluntary actions that address limiting factors related to the quality of this habitat type. These actions also support and/or improve watershed functions and processes. Action will be guided by the habitats, limiting factors, ecological outcomes, and conservation approaches outlined in associated federal recovery plans, state conservation plans, Oregon's State Wildlife Action Plan, tribal plans, and other plans listed at the end of this document.

Background

Where it occurs


As defined here, aquatic habitats include rivers, streams, estuaries, wetlands, floodplains, lakes, tidally influenced waters, and associated riparian habitats. These areas occur across the state and provide essential habitat to many at-risk species.

The Aquatic Habitat for Native Species priority map includes priority habitat for aquatic species of conservation concern. Priority species for this FIP include those that are federally listed or proposed for listing under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), including ESA-listed fish, Oregon Spotted Frog, and Northwestern Pond Turtle. In addition, it includes associated habitat for other species that have been identified as Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN) in Oregon's State Wildlife Action Plan (SWAP) such as Pacific Lamprey and Western Ridged Mussel.

Indicator species and/or species of interest supported by these habitats

Several native fish and wildlife species have been listed or are candidates for listing under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) or have been identified as threatened, endangered, or sensitive by the state of Oregon. These species include, but are not limited to: anadromous salmon, listed trout, several species of sucker, lamprey, chub, Oregon spotted frog, northwestern pond turtle, and Western ridged mussel.

Pacific lamprey and other ODFW identified native lamprey species of greatest conservation need are also included in this Priority, and there are no geographic limits for proposed conservation actions targeting lamprey. Proposed FIP initiatives that include lamprey as a focal species will be assessed independently of the associated Aquatic Habitat for Native Species map.



Why it is significant to the state

Aquatic habitats support an incredible number of Oregon's native fish and wildlife species. The extent of biodiversity in an aquatic habitat is a reflection of the native fish and wildlife, plants, and other aquatic species present there. High-quality aquatic systems provide essential habitat to many at-risk species, including important spawning and rearing habitat for salmonids and other native fishes and Species of Greatest Conservation need, such as Oregon Spotted Frog, Western Pond Turtle, and Western Ridged Mussels.

Sustaining aquatic biodiversity is essential to the health of our environment and to the quality of human life. Healthy aquatic ecosystems are imperative for to Oregon's communities and economy, including fisheries and recreation. Many of the species that are a focus of this Priority provide substantial ecological, economic, and cultural benefits to Oregon tribes. A warming climate presents challenges to aquatic habitat in Oregon, and restoring and protecting these habitats helps build durable adaptation and resilience for these ecosystems.

Key limiting factors and/or threats, with a focus on ecosystem function and process

- Degraded and impaired water quality (e.g., temperature and sedimentation, dissolved oxygen, temperature, bacteria load), including those factors associated with the loss of riparian and floodplain vegetation;
- Reduced and insufficient water quantity/flows during critical flow periods (e.g., low streamflow and altered hydrology due to water diversions, dam operations, and loss of beaver);
- Loss of habitat complexity (e.g., high-quality instream structure and spawning gravel, floodplain connectivity, connected off-channel habitat, presence of pools, and presence of large wood);
- Impaired ecosystem functions that have resulted in decreased quantity and quality of instream complexity and degraded rearing and spawning habitats;
- Degraded riparian areas;
- Loss of habitat connectivity, including: floodplain connectivity; access to cold-water refugia; and fish-passage barriers that are identified as primary limiting factors for native fish species and as noted by ODFW's statewide fish passage priority list;
- Spread of invasive plant and animal species (e.g., reed canary grass, bullfrogs);
- Climate change which may exacerbate drought and water temperature stress;
- Disease: emerging pathogens such as chytrid fungus (*Bd*);
- Habitat loss from development and impacts from grazing;
- Landscape-scale disturbance, including wildfire, landslides, flooding or similar events may occur within the FIP geography. Post-disturbance restoration actions addressing landscape-scale disturbance may be eligible FIP actions; and
- Loss of wildlife habitat connectivity. Many species rely on the ability to move throughout the landscape to fulfill their daily and seasonal needs for access to food, shelter, and opportunities to reproduce. ODFW produced [Priority Wildlife Conservation Areas \(PWCAs\) maps](#) to show where habitat connectivity is most important. Fifty-four species were selected for the project as surrogates, representing a variety of taxa, movement types, dispersal capabilities, and sensitivity to anthropogenic threats. FIP Initiatives may include actions enhancing PWCAs within the geographic boundary of their FIP Initiative.

Reference plans

1. Oregon State Wildlife Action Plan: (<https://dfw.state.or.us/SWAP-Revision/>)
2. Species-specific conservation and recovery plans:
 - Table 1. Conservation and Recovery Plans for Native Fish Species
 - Table 2. Conservation and Recovery Plans for Oregon Spotted Frog
 - Table 3. Conservation and Recovery Plans for Western Pond Turtle
 - Table 4. Reference Plans for Western Ridged Mussels

Oregon Tribes may also have native fish species plans guiding conservation efforts that can be referenced in developing FIP initiatives under this Priority. All of the plans noted here focus on maintaining sustainable native fish and wildlife populations that contribute to their ecosystems and provide a variety of recreational, commercial, cultural, and aesthetic benefits.

These plans identify key limiting factors for specific fish and wildlife species, geographies in which habitat for these species occur, and priority actions that will address limiting factors. While these plans have a species focus, addressing the limiting factors and meeting the goals of each plan supports native fish and wildlife communities and the ecosystem function of aquatic habitats more generally. Thus, achieving the desired habitat and population objectives within these plans will provide significant ecological, economic and cultural benefits for all Oregonians.

Table 1. Conservation and Recovery Plans for Native Fish Species

USFWS = U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

NMFS = NOAA Fisheries

ODFW = Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife

| Conservation and Recovery Plans | Native Fish Species | Associated Basin(s) |
|---|---|--|
| USFWS Recovery Plan for the Threatened and Rare Native Fishes of the Warner Basin and Alkali Sub-basin (1998) | Warner Sucker, Hutton Tui Chub, Fosskett Speckled Dace | Closed Lakes |
| USFWS Recovery Plan for the Lahontan Cutthroat Trout (1995) | Lahontan Cutthroat Trout | Closed Lakes |
| USFWS Recovery Plan for the Coterminous United States Population of Bull Trout (2015) | Bull Trout | Deschutes, John Day, Upper Klamath, Lower Columbia, Willamette, Grande Ronde |
| USFWS Revised Recovery Plan for the Lost River Sucker and Shortnose Sucker (2013) | Lost River Sucker, Shortnose Sucker | Upper Klamath |
| ODFW Coastal, Columbia, and Snake Conservation Plan for Lampreys in Oregon (2020) | Pacific Lamprey, Western River Lamprey, Western Brook Lamprey, Pacific Brook Lamprey | |
| NMFS/ODFW Conservation & Recovery Plan for Oregon Steelhead Populations in the Middle Columbia River Steelhead DPS (2010) | Steelhead | Deschutes, John Day, Umatilla, Walla Walla |
| NMFS ESA Recovery Plan for Northeast Oregon Snake River Spring and Summer Chinook Salmon and Snake River Steelhead Populations (2017) | Spring Chinook Salmon, Steelhead | Grande Ronde, Imnaha |
| NMFS/ODFW Lower Columbia River Conservation and Recovery Plan for Oregon Populations of Salmon and Steelhead (2010) | Spring and Fall Chinook Salmon, Chum Salmon, Coho Salmon, Summer and Winter Steelhead | Lower Columbia River |
| NMFS/ODFW Upper Willamette River Conservation and Recovery Plan for Chinook Salmon and Steelhead (2011) | Spring Chinook Salmon, Winter Steelhead | Willamette |
| Oregon Coast Coho Conservation Plan for the State of Oregon (2007) | Coho Salmon | Coastal watersheds from the Necanicum River to the Sixes River |
| NMFS Final ESA Recovery Plan for Oregon Coast Coho Salmon (2016) | Coho Salmon | Coastal watersheds from the Necanicum River to the Sixes River |
| ODFW Coastal Multi-Species Conservation and Management Plan (2014) | Spring and Fall Chinook salmon, Chum Salmon, Summer and Winter Steelhead, Cutthroat Trout | Coastal watersheds from Cape Blanco to the Columbia River (including Umpqua, Tillamook, many others) |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| NMFS Final Recovery Plan for the Southern Oregon/Northern California Coast ESU of Coho Salmon (2014) | Coho Salmon | Rogue, coastal watersheds south of Cape Blanco |
| ODFW Rogue–South Coast Multi-Species Conservation and Management Plan (2021) | Coho Salmon, Summer and Winter Steelhead, Cutthroat Trout | Rogue, coastal watersheds south of Cape Blanco |
| ODFW Rogue Spring Chinook Salmon Conservation Plan (2007) | Spring Chinook Salmon | Rogue |
| ODFW Conservation Plan for Fall Chinook Salmon in the Rogue Species Management Unit (2013) | Fall Chinook Salmon | Rogue, coastal watersheds south of Cape Blanco |
| ODFW Plan for the Reintroduction of Anadromous Fish in the Upper Klamath Basin (2008) | Coho Salmon, Chinook Salmon, Steelhead, Pacific Lamprey | Upper Klamath |
| ODFW/The Klamath Tribes Implementation Plan for the Reintroduction of Anadromous Fishes into the Oregon Portion of the Upper Klamath Basin (2021) | Coho Salmon, Chinook Salmon, Steelhead, Pacific Lamprey | Upper Klamath |

Table 2. Conservation and Recovery Plans for Oregon Spotted Frog

| Reference or Plan | Description | Weblink |
|---|--|---|
| USFWS Recovery Plan for the Oregon Spotted Frog (2023) U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2023. Draft Recovery Plan for the Oregon Spotted Frog (<i>Rana pretiosa</i>). Portland, Oregon. xi + 23 pages | Recovery criteria include achieving moderate or higher resiliency in at least 12 sub-basins, representing all six genetic groups and five ecoregional areas. Recovery actions include restoring hydrology, managing invasive species, improving connectivity, and conducting monitoring and research. | https://ecos.fws.gov/docs/recovery_plan/Oregon_Spotted_Frog_Draft_RP_SIGNED_2023-02-24.pdf |
| Deschutes Basin Habitat Conservation Plan (2020) | Provides complementary conservation measures for Oregon spotted frog habitat in the Upper Deschutes. | |

Table 3. Conservation and Recovery Plans for Northwestern Pond Turtle

| Reference or Plan | Description | Web Link |
|---|--|---|
| Western Pond Turtle Range-wide Management Strategy (2020). WPTRCC | Guidance document that provides a shared conservation strategy to ensure persistence of pond turtle species throughout their range. | https://ecos.fws.gov/docs/recovery_plan/WPT%20RCC%20Strategy%202020.pdf |
| Oregon Conservation Strategy (2016). ODFW | State Wildlife Action Plan for Oregon which identifies priority species, habitats, conservation areas, and key conservation issues facing the state's wildlife. Provides an overview of special needs, limiting factors, data gaps, and recommends conservation actions. | www.oregonconservationstrategy.org |
| Species Status Assessment Report for Northwestern Pond Turtle (<i>Actinemys marmorata</i>) and Southwestern Pond Turtle (<i>Actinemys pallida</i>) (2023). USFWS | Provides the best available science on northwestern pond turtle biology, habitat, demography, and threats. Assesses current and future status considering two plausible future scenarios. | https://iris.fws.gov/APPS/ServCat/DownloadFile/241273 |
| Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Species Status With Section 4(d) Rule for the Northwestern Pond Turtle and Southwestern Pond Turtle (2023). USFWS | Proposed rule to list northwestern pond turtle as threatened after a positive 12-month finding (without critical habitat designation). | https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2023/10/03/2023-21685/endangered-and-threatened-wildlife-and-plants-threatened-species-status-with-section-4d-rule-for-the |
| Northwestern Pond Turtle (<i>Actinemys marmorata</i>) (2023). INR | Oregon-specific summary of biology, distribution, habitat, movement ecology, diet, status, and threats. | https://inside.dfw.state.or.us/wildlife/docs/SSA/rep_amph/Northwestern%20Pond%20Turtle.pdf |
| Northwestern Pond Turtle Coordinator Project (2021). Samara Group | Final report on 1) habitat restoration at three sites with pre- and post-treatment monitoring, and 2) pond turtle data compilation, analysis, and standardized occupancy surveys. | |
| Guidance for Conserving Oregon's Native Turtles Including Best Management Practices (2015). ODFW | Recommended management practices to plan projects, mitigate project impacts, create and/or restore habitat, and achieve conservation goals for native turtles. | https://www.dfw.state.or.us/wildlife/living_with/docs/ODFW_Turtle_BMPs_March_2015.pdf |
| Recommended Best Management Practices for the Western Pond Turtle on Department of Defense Installations (2020). USFWS, DoD-PARC | Guidance developed for DoD to plan, prioritize, conserve, and manage projects to the benefit of pond turtles. | https://www.denix.osd.mil/dodparc/denix-files/sites/36/2021/01/Pond-Turtles-BMP_Final_508_v2.pdf |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| Western Pond Turtle: Biology, Sampling techniques, Inventory and Monitoring, Conservation, and Management (2012). Bruce BR, Welsh Jr. HH, Germano, DJ, Ashton DT | Synthesis of biology, management, and conservation information for pond turtle. | thesnvb.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/SNVB_nwf7_WPT-2012_complete-1.pdf |
| Washington State Recovery Plan for the Western Pond Turtle (1999). Hays DW, McAllister KR, Richardson SA, Stinson DW | Summary of Washington pond turtle distribution, abundance, and factors affecting persistence. Establishes recovery goals and prescribes actions needed to meet recovery. | https://wdfw.wa.gov/publications/00398 |
| The Western Pond Turtle: Habitat and History: Final Report (1994). Holland DC | Provides comprehensive natural history information for western pond turtle including status of the Willamette basin population; summaries of reproductive ecology, aquatic movements, overwintering, effects of introduced species, and molecular genetics; and considerations for translocation efforts for mitigation. | osti.gov/servlets/purl/171287 |
| Conservation of Northwestern and Southwestern Pond Turtles: Threats, Population Size Estimates, and Population Viability Analysis (2021). Manzo SE, Nicholson G, Z. Devereux Z, Fisher RN, Brown CW, Scott PA, and Shaffer HB | Analysis to determine impacts of threats, population sizes, and future population viability assessment under various drought scenarios. | https://meridian.allenpress.com/jfwm/article/12/2/485/470112/Conservation-of-Northwestern-and-Southwestern-Pond |
| Effective removal of the American bullfrog (<i>Lithobates catesbeianus</i>) on a landscape level: long term monitoring and removal efforts in Yosemite Valley, Yosemite National Park (2020). Kamoroff C, Daniele N, Grasso RL, Rising R, Espinoza T, Goldberg CS. | Case study of successful bullfrog eradication effort to support native wildlife recovery. | https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10530-019-02116-4 |
| Effects of drought on western pond turtle survival and movement patterns (2017). Purcell KL, McGregor EL, Calderala K | Case study of the impacts of drought on movement, survival, and resiliency of western pond turtle. | https://research.fs.usda.gov/treesearch/54886 |
| Drivers of Non-Random Nest-Site Selection in an Oviparous Vertebrate (2019). St. John WA | Case study of nesting ecology and nest-site selection in western pond turtle. | https://scholarworks.calstatelibrary.org/concern/theses/z890rt90c |

Table 4. Reference Plans for Western Ridged Mussels

| Reference or Plan | Description | Weblink |
|--|---|--|
| Freshwater Mussels of the Pacific Northwest (2nd ed.). The Xerces Society for Invertebrate Conservation (2009) | Provides species-specific information on distribution, habitat, life history, and conservation needs. | 09-002_02_XercesSoc_Freshwater-Mussels-of-the-PNW_web.pdf |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Oregon Conservation Strategy (2016). ODFW | Identifies freshwater mussels and aquatic habitats as conservation priorities. | www.oregonconservationstrategy.org |
| Assessment and Status Report on the Rocky Mountain Ridged Mussel (<i>Gonidea angulate</i>) in Canada (COSEWIC 2003) | Offers additional context on species status and threats across its range | Rocky Mountain Ridged Mussel (<i>Gonidea angulata</i>) |

DRAFT



OWEB Focused Investment Partnership Priority **OREGON CLOSED LAKES BASIN WETLAND HABITATS - 2025 Draft Revisions**

Summary Statement of Priority

The OWEB Board will consider proposals for investment in **Closed Lakes Basin Wetland habitats** for Initiatives that address habitat conservation and restoration needs to achieve ecological outcomes over time at the landscape scale, which will restore and protect ecologically meaningful areas.

OWEB's Focused Investment Priority for Closed Lakes Basin wetland habitats guides voluntary actions that address primary limiting factors related to the quality of this habitat type. These actions also support and/or improve watershed functions and processes. **Actions will be guided by the habitat, limiting factors, ecological outcomes, and conservation approaches outlined in Oregon's State Wildlife Action Plan (SWAP), the Intermountain West Joint Venture's (IWJV) Habitat Conservation Strategy Implementation Plan, and other plans listed at the end of this document.**


Background

Where it occurs

The Closed Lakes Basin wetlands exist within the Southern Oregon Northeast California (SONEC) region, which is a portion of the Closed Lakes network within the Great Basin (see map). The SONEC region geography and habitat has been defined by the IWJV and in the federal North American Waterfowl Management Plan. The Closed Lakes Basin within the SONEC region is an important part of the Pacific Flyway. Within the SONEC region, a significant amount of wetland and floodplain habitat is located on private land, most of which is managed as flood-irrigated hay and pastureland. These habitats are critical for migratory and resident birds and also support native fish species.

In Oregon, Closed Lakes Basin wetland habitat exists primarily in Lake and Harney Counties (including Malheur National Wildlife Refuge), with a small portion in Malheur County. Closed Lakes Basin wetland habitats include shallow lakes and marshes, wet meadows, and irrigated pasturelands. Many of the region's smaller historical wetlands have been lost due to conversion or degradation from stream channelization, water use, water diversions, and historical overgrazing. Many of the managed wetland/pastures exist in the floodplain of tributaries and lakes in the area. Closed Lakes Basin wetlands represent a unique chain of desert oases that, as an integrated network, provide critical habitat and food for waterbirds throughout the year.

Focused Investment Priority for Oregon Closed Lakes Basin Wetland Habitats



Indicator species and/or species of interest supported by this habitat

The SONEC region, which includes the Oregon Closed Lakes Basin, provides essential wetland habitats important for migratory birds. Moreover, the Closed Lakes Basin provides crucial breeding and wintering habitats for many bird species. The majority of North America's snowy plovers (federally listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA)), North America's eared grebes, long-billed dowitchers, white-faced ibis, and many Species of Greatest Conservation Need as identified in the Oregon SWAP breed, nest, or otherwise use Oregon's Closed Lakes Basin during migration. Additional migratory and resident bird species also rely on this habitat.

Of particular importance is habitat for migratory bird species during spring migration. This region provides a diversity of food production at different salt regimes throughout the year; thus, seasonal water conditions drive habitat function and productivity. Additionally, the Closed Lakes Basin wetlands support native fish species such as Warner and Modoc sucker fish (ESA-listed), tui chub, and redband trout.

Why it is significant to the state

Closed Lakes Basin wetlands are ecologically unique high-desert wetlands that provide critical habitat for numerous migratory and resident bird species. This region has international importance as habitat for migratory birds, including the ESA-listed species cited above. Oregon's Closed Lakes Basin wetland habitats are a significant portion of the greater SONEC complex of wetlands that are so critical to the millions of birds that travel the Pacific Flyway each year. The IWJV recognizes the SONEC region as one of two priority areas in the Intermountain West for wetland-dependent birds. Greater sage-grouse depend on these wetland habitats for foraging habitat for brooding (see related priority). ESA-listed Warner and Modoc sucker fish also are found in this habitat, as referenced above.

Indigenous people in the region have long utilized the lake and wetland resources for food, tools, and shelter. The region fosters a historic and vitally important ranching community and associated economy that depends on the ecological health of these wetland habitats. Malheur National Wildlife Refuge and other wildlife areas in the Closed Lakes Basin are critical recreation and economic resources for these rural counties.

Water is extremely limited in this region. Climate change is expected to affect wetlands through shifting precipitation patterns, increased droughts, more high-severity wildfire, and warmer temperatures. This may further reduce water availability, which could slow habitat recovery, increase invasive vegetation, and lead to higher salinity levels in lakes and wetlands. This lends added urgency to the importance of conservation efforts in this unique habitat.

Key limiting factors and/or ecological threats, with a focus on ecosystem function and process

- Loss and degradation of wetland habitat, including salinization and an imbalance of seasonal saline gradients.
- Seasonal water availability as a result of altered natural hydrologic functioning, including the conversion to sprinkler irrigation from flood irrigation that provided surrogate wetland habitat, and impacts of climate change.
- Fragmented habitat as a result of dam building that altered stream networks to facilitate land drainage and agriculture development.
- Proliferation of invasive common carp, whose feeding behavior has destroyed vast natural marsh habitat by uprooting vegetation and increasing suspended sediments and turbidity. This significantly reduces vegetation otherwise available as a food source for birds and other wildlife.
- Invasive plant and macroinvertebrate species, which can reduce food production for native bird species.
- Landscape-scale disturbance, including wildfire, landslides, flooding or similar events may occur within the FIP geography. Post-disturbance restoration actions addressing landscape-scale disturbance may be eligible FIP actions.
- Loss of wildlife habitat connectivity. Many species rely on the ability to move throughout the landscape to fulfill their daily and seasonal needs for access to food, shelter, and opportunities to reproduce. ODFW produced [Priority Wildlife Conservation Areas \(PWCAs\) maps](#) to show where habitat connectivity is most important. Fifty-four species were selected for the project as surrogates, representing a variety of taxa, movement types, dispersal capabilities, and sensitivity to anthropogenic threats. FIP Initiatives may include actions enhancing PWCAs within the geographic boundary of their FIP Initiative.

Reference plans

- 1) Oregon State Wildlife Action Plan
(<https://dfw.state.or.us/SWAP-Revision/>)
- 2) North American Waterfowl Management Plan
(<https://www.fws.gov/partner/north-american-waterfowl-management-plan>)
- 3) Intermountain West Joint Venture Habitat Conservation Strategy Implementation Plan
(<http://iwjv.org/2013-implementation-plan>)
- 4) Intermountain West Joint Venture Implementation Plan
(<https://iwjv.org/resource/implementation-plan/>)
- 5) Alvord Lake Subbasin TMDL and WQMP
(<https://www.oregon.gov/deq/wq/tmdls/Pages/closedlakestmdl.aspx>)



OWEB Focused Investment Partnership Priority

DRY-TYPE FOREST HABITAT-2025 Draft Revisions

Summary Statement of Priority

The OWEB Board will consider proposals for investment in **dry-type forest habitat** for initiatives that address habitat conservation and restoration needs to achieve ecological outcomes over time at the landscape scale, which will restore and protect ecologically meaningful areas.

OWEB's Focused Investment Priority for dry-type forest habitat guides voluntary actions that address primary limiting factors related to the quality of this habitat type. These actions also support and/or improve watershed functions and processes. **These actions will be guided by the habitat, limiting factors, ecological outcomes, and conservation approaches outlined in Oregon's State Wildlife Action Plan and other plans listed at the end of this document.**

Background


Where it occurs

Dry-type forests exist east of the Cascade Mountains and southwest in the Umpqua and Rogue watersheds of the Siskiyou and Klamath Mountains. This forest type spans 14 million acres in Oregon, constitutes roughly half of all forests in the state, and accounts for approximately 25 percent of the state's land cover. These forests are associated with nine national forests in Oregon and encompass land managed by the Bureau of Land Management in southwest Oregon. "Dry-type" is a general term for forests that consist of dry pine forests, dry mixed conifer, moist-mixed conifer, and moist-cold forests.

Indicator species and/or species of interest supported by this habitat

Dry-type forest habitat contains a wide variety of tree and understory species. Historically, these forests experienced more frequent low- intensity fires that would burn off the understory and small trees on a 7-15 year cycle, resulting in a diverse and robust mosaic of older, larger aforementioned tree species mixed with areas of younger trees, stands, and forests. Fire suppression practices in the past century have altered forest species composition and succession and increased susceptibility to uncharacteristic large wildfires due to elevated fuel loads. In addition to the building of fuel levels, forest management practices during the last century have reduced diversity of species and age structures and increased densities of trees within this forest type.

Dry-type forest habitats support a variety of fish and wildlife species, including white-headed woodpecker and northern goshawk, ringtail, fisher, Pacific marten, red-tree vole, Northern Spotted Owl, salmon, Rocky Mountain elk, mule deer, and white-tailed deer.



Why it is significant to the state

Dry-type forests cover vast acreages in Oregon and are at critical risk for severe wildfires. These forest systems support a diverse range of aquatic and terrestrial species, including federally listed fish and bird species. Properly functioning dry-type forests are also critical to maintaining healthy watershed function and processes. Dry-type forests are iconic in Oregon, of cultural significance to Native American tribes, provide people with clean water, and have economic importance related to natural resource-based economies in rural communities. In addition, these areas support an increasingly important recreation-based economy.

Key limiting factors and/or ecological threats, with a focus on ecosystem function and process

Departure from historic disturbance regimes has increased the risk of more severe disturbance from hotter burning wildfires. In order to restore ecosystem function and process and protect culturally important areas (including food), the following limiting factors and ecological threats need to be addressed:

- Severe wildfires as a result of fuel buildup in the absence of fire, past and some current landscape forest management practices, and hotter and drier conditions due to climate change.
- Altered fire regimes resulting in forest densification, changes in species composition, and more continuous, homogeneous fuel conditions across the landscape.
- Loss of multi-age class, complex forests with habitat mosaics due to wildfire and past logging practices, and habitat connectivity.
- Invasive species and more widespread and uncharacteristic insect and disease outbreaks leading to accelerated tree mortality.
- Lack of land management capacity, including ability to implement prescribed and/or cultural burns.
- Landscape-scale disturbance, including wildfire, landslides, flooding or similar events may occur within the FIP geography. Post-disturbance restoration actions addressing landscape-scale disturbance may be eligible FIP actions.
- Loss of wildlife habitat connectivity. Many species rely on the ability to move throughout the landscape to fulfill their daily and seasonal needs for access to food, shelter, and opportunities to reproduce. ODFW produced [Priority Wildlife Conservation Areas \(PWCAs\) maps](#) to show where habitat connectivity is most important. Fifty-four species were selected for the project as surrogates, representing a variety of taxa, movement types, dispersal capabilities, and sensitivity to anthropogenic threats. FIP Initiatives may include actions enhancing PWCAs within the geographic boundary of their FIP Initiative.

Reference plans

- 1) Oregon State Wildlife Action Plan <https://dfw.state.or.us/SWAP-Revision/>
- 2) Restoration of Dry Forests in Eastern Oregon <https://www.conservationgateway.org/ConservationPractices/FireLandscapes/FireLearningNetwork/NetworkProducts/Pages/Dry-Forest-Guide-2013.aspx>

- 3) General Technical Report – The Ecology and Management of Moist Mixed-Conifer Forests in Eastern Oregon and Washington: A Synthesis of the Relevant Biophysical Science and Implications for Future Land Management
<https://research.fs.usda.gov/treearch/47086>
- 4) Haugo, R., Zanger, C., DeMeo, T., Ringo, C., Shlisy, A., Blakenship, K., Simpson, M., Mellen-McLean, K., Kertis, J., Stern, M. 2015. A New Approach to Evaluate Forest Structure Restoration Needs Across Oregon and Washington, USA. Forest Ecology and Management 335: 37-50.
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378112714005519>
- 5) Landowners' Options for Prescribed Burning
<https://extension.oregonstate.edu/catalog/pub/em-9496-landowners-options-prescribed-burning>



OWEB Focused Investment Partnership Priority

ESTUARY HABITATS - 2025 Draft Revisions

Summary Statement of Priority

The OWEB Board will consider proposals for investment in **estuary habitats** for Initiatives that address habitat conservation and restoration needs to achieve ecological outcomes over time at the landscape scale, which will restore and protect ecologically meaningful areas.

OWEB's Focused Investment Priority for estuary habitats guides voluntary actions that address primary limiting factors related to the quality of this habitat type. These actions also support and/or improve watershed functions and processes to benefit fish and wildlife that depend on estuary habitats. **Actions will be guided by the habitat, limiting factors, ecological outcomes, and conservation approaches outlined in Oregon's State Wildlife Action Plan and other plans listed at the end of this document.**

Background

Where it occurs


Estuaries exist at the confluence of freshwater rivers and the ocean. Estuarine habitat at these confluences is determined by the extent of tidal influence on these freshwater rivers (see map). Estuarine tidal basins typically include a marine-dominated zone, a mixing zone, and a brackish-to-fresh zone that can extend many miles inland away from the ocean. Estuary habitats experience regular fluctuations in salinity, water levels, sunlight, and oxygen.

The spatial extent of Oregon estuaries and tidal wetlands has been significantly reduced over the past 150 years due to human development and agriculture. The greatest losses of historic estuarine habitat have occurred within low-lying estuarine tidal basins. Anthropogenic alterations to habitat and natural hydrologic processes, including diking, tide gates, dredging, and channelization, among other impacts, have contributed to estuarine habitat losses and impairments, including large expanses of historic forested tidal wetlands (>90%), substantial saltwater and freshwater marshes, and other tidal wetlands (ODFW, 2026).

Indicator species and/or species of interest supported by this habitat

Oregon estuaries provide a diversity of complex, productive habitat that is critical for many species of fish and wildlife, including salmon, rockfish, crab, shrimp, invertebrates, marine mammals, and birds. Estuaries provide critical breeding and nursery areas for rockfish, lingcod, and greenling, as well as rearing grounds for juvenile coho, Chinook, and chum salmon. Oregon estuaries support some component of the life cycle for up to three-quarters of all harvested fish species (ODFW, 2026), largely due to the high productivity and diversity of habitats, including those provided by eelgrass beds. Native eelgrass is an important component of an estuary, providing habitat for Species of Greatest Conservation Need and other species of interest, including Black Brant, Dungeness crab, black rockfish, copper rockfish, and kelp greenling.

Focused Investment Priority for Estuary Habitats



Why it is significant to the state

Oregon's Statewide Planning Goal 16 seeks to recognize and protect the unique environmental, economic, and social values of estuaries and their associated wetlands and (where appropriate) to protect, maintain, and restore the long-term environmental, economic, and social values, diversity, and benefits of Oregon's estuaries. The Lower Columbia River estuary and Tillamook Bay estuary are each designated as an "estuary of national significance" by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (two of 28 National Estuary Programs managed under the Clean Water Act). Many Oregon estuaries have Total Maximum Daily Loads developed for water quality in these habitats, as estuaries play an important role in filtering sediment, nutrients, pathogens, and other contaminants from aquatic environments.

Estuary habitats are integral to the existence and success of various Endangered Species Act listed fish and wildlife species. Numerous species are dependent upon estuary habitats because they are adapted to the unique habitat conditions that estuaries provide. Estuaries are of cultural significance to Native American tribes and also provide critical services for the people of Oregon. Healthy estuaries help store carbon, mitigate ocean acidification, and buffer storm wave damage to stabilize shorelines from erosion and protect coastal communities from increased storms and floods.

Key limiting factors and/or ecological threats, with a focus on ecosystem function and process

- Increasing development and land-use conversions;
- Alteration of natural hydrological processes and streamflow, including limited salt- and fresh-water exchange due to such issues as tide gates;
- Water-quality degradation (including increased bacterial loads; decreased dissolved oxygen; and toxic contaminants from industry, agriculture, and urban development)
- Loss of habitat complexity and connectivity degrades tidal areas;
- Invasive aquatic plant and animal species;
- Impacts of climate change (e.g., sea-level rise, increased acidification);
- Nutrient cycling and sediment transport;
- Landscape-scale disturbance, including wildfire, landslides, flooding or similar events may occur within the FIP geography. Post-disturbance restoration actions addressing landscape-scale disturbance may be eligible FIP actions; and
- Loss of wildlife habitat connectivity. Many species rely on the ability to move throughout the landscape to fulfill their daily and seasonal needs for access to food, shelter, and opportunities to reproduce. ODFW produced [Priority Wildlife Conservation Areas \(PWCAs\) maps](#) to show where habitat connectivity is most important. Fifty-four species were selected for the project as surrogates, representing a variety of taxa, movement types, dispersal capabilities, and sensitivity to anthropogenic threats. FIP Initiatives may include actions enhancing PWCAs within the geographic boundary of their FIP Initiative.

Reference plans

- 1) Oregon State Wildlife Action Plan
(<https://dfw.state.or.us/SWAP-Revision/>)
- 2) NOAA Fisheries Columbia River Estuary ESA Recovery Plan Module for Salmon and

Steelhead, 2011

(<https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/resource/document/columbia-river-estuary-esa-recovery-plan-module-salmon-and-steelhead>)

- 3) ODFW Lower Columbia River Conservation and Recovery Plan for Oregon Populations of Salmon and Steelhead (http://www.dfw.state.or.us/fish/CRP/lower_columbia_plan.asp)
- 4) Oregon Coastal Multi-Species Conservation and Management Plan, 2014 (http://www.dfw.state.or.us/fish/CRP/coastal_multispecies.asp)

DRAFT



OWEB Focused Investment Partnership Priority

OAK AND PRAIRIE HABITAT- 2025 Draft Revisions

Summary Statement of Priority

The OWEB Board will consider proposals for investment in **oak** and **prairie habitats** for initiatives that address habitat conservation and restoration needs to achieve ecological outcomes over time at the landscape scale, which will restore and protect ecologically meaningful areas.

OWEB's Focused Investment Priority for oak and prairie habitat guides voluntary actions that address primary ecological threats and limiting factors related to the quality of this habitat type. **These actions will be guided by the habitat, limiting factors, ecological outcomes, and conservation approaches outlined in Oregon's State Wildlife Action Plan and other plans and strategies listed on the last page of this document.**


Background

Where it occurs

Oak and prairie habitats are often in conflict with other land-uses associated with a higher economic value, which has led to the loss of approximately 72% of its historical habitat range since the 1800s. However, oak and associated prairie habitats still exist throughout the state. Three types of oak habitats in Oregon include: "oak savannah" (5-25% oak coverage), "oak woodlands" (25-75% oak coverage), and "oak forests" (greater than 75% oak coverage). These oak habitats primarily occur in three areas of the state: 1) Oak and prairie habitats of the Willamette Valley ecoregion; 2) Oak woodlands of the East Cascades ecoregion and foothills along the Columbia Gorge, including both Hood and Wasco counties and south to White River; and 3) Southern Oregon oak and chaparral habitats of the Klamath, Umpqua and Rogue River ecoregions. Current habitat data layers as mapped may not fully capture all existing oak habitat; partnerships' mapped areas will also be considered eligible in future FIP applications.

Indicator species and/or species of interest supported by this habitat

The Oregon white oak is the indicator species for oak and associated prairie habitats. Species that are supported by these habitats include: streaked horned lark, the western meadowlark, Lewis' woodpecker, white-breasted nuthatch, western bluebird, acorn woodpecker, western gray squirrel, Columbian white-tailed deer, Fender's blue butterfly, Taylor's checkerspot butterfly, Kincaid's lupine, and the Willamette daisy, among many other plant species depending on the region. At least seven federally listed Endangered Species Act (ESA) species are dependent on these habitats.



Why it is significant to the state

In a national assessment, oak and associated prairie and chaparral habitats are one of the most endangered ecosystems in the U.S. due to land conversions and altered fire regimes. These habitats are home to a variety of wildlife and plant species addressed in the State Wildlife Action Plan. Maintaining the connectivity of oaks and their associated habitats is crucial to support species utilization of greater habitat range, but also to facilitating the gradual movement of species to the north from California in response to climate change. In addition, these habitat types are iconic and culturally important to Native American tribes. Tribes utilize cultural fire to sustain culturally important foods. Cultural fire practices are also important to maintain the health and biodiversity of oak and prairie habitats.

Key limiting factors and/or ecological threats, with a focus on ecosystem function and process

- Habitat loss and fragmentation due to land-use conversion (e.g., residential, timber, agricultural).
- Habitat degradation, including shrub-tree and conifer encroachment, invasive species encroachment, including Mediterranean oak borer and disease such as sudden oak death, a fungal tree pathogen.
- Impaired habitat persistence, due to loss of fire disturbance regimes, over-grazing, and the subsequent lack of recruitment of young oaks.
- Loss of large diameter oak trees with lateral limb structure and cavities due to densely stocked trees, grazed trees, shaded trees and fire stressed trees that do not develop lateral limbs, cavities or higher acorn crops of open-grown trees.
- Lack of land management capacity, including ability to implement prescribed and/or cultural burns.
- Landscape-scale disturbance, including wildfire, landslides, flooding or similar events may occur within the FIP geography. Post-disturbance restoration actions addressing landscape-scale disturbance may be eligible FIP actions.
- Loss of wildlife habitat connectivity. Many species rely on the ability to move throughout the landscape to fulfill their daily and seasonal needs for access to food, shelter, and opportunities to reproduce. ODFW produced [Priority Wildlife Conservation Areas \(PWCAs\) maps](#) to show where habitat connectivity is most important. Fifty-four species were selected for the project as surrogates, representing a variety of taxa, movement types, dispersal capabilities, and sensitivity to anthropogenic threats. FIP Initiatives may include actions enhancing PWCAs within the geographic boundary of their FIP Initiative.

Reference plans

- 1) Oregon State Wildlife Action Plan
(<https://dfw.state.or.us/SWAP-Revision/>)
- 2) Recovery Plan for Prairie species of Western Oregon and SW Washington (USFWS 2010)
([Recovery Plan for the Prairie Species of Western Oregon and Southwestern Washington | U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service](#))
- 3) Oregon White Oak Restoration Strategy for National Forest System Lands East of the Cascade Range (USFS 2013)
([Oak Strategy final.pdf](#))



OWEB Focused Investment Partnership Priority SAGEBRUSH/SAGE-STEPPE HABITAT- 2025 Draft Revisions

Summary Statement of Priority

The OWEB Board will consider proposals for investment in **sagebrush/sage-steppe habitat** for initiatives that address habitat conservation and restoration needs to achieve ecological outcomes over time at the landscape scale, which will restore and protect ecologically meaningful areas.

OWEB's Focused Investment Priority for sagebrush/sage-steppe habitat guides voluntary actions that address primary ecological threats and limiting factors related to the quality of this habitat type. These actions also will support and/or improve ecosystem functions and processes, including those required by Greater sage-grouse, which is an indicator species for this habitat type. **These actions will be guided by the habitat, limiting factors, ecological outcomes, and conservation approaches outlined in Oregon's State Wildlife Action Plan and other plans listed at the end of this document.**


Focal areas for this Priority are: 1) Existing healthy, functioning sagebrush/sage-steppe habitats that support a variety of species, and areas of opportunity to grow this habitat identified by partners in the Sagebrush Conservation Design, and 2) Priority Areas for Conservation (PACs) for sage-grouse and the important connectivity corridors between these areas. PACs do not represent individual populations, but rather key areas that have been identified as crucial to ensure adequate representation, redundancy, and resilience for conservation of its associated sage-grouse population or populations. Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife's (ODFW's) sage-grouse strategy identifies core areas of habitat that align with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's PAC habitats. The core area approach uses biological information to identify important habitats with the objective of protecting the highest density breeding areas.

Background

Where it occurs

Sagebrush/sage-steppe habitat occurs throughout eastern Oregon and in parts of Central Oregon. Several ecoregions identified in the Oregon State Wildlife Action Plan (i.e., Northern Basin and Range, Blue Mountains, Columbia Plateau, and East Cascades) contain this habitat type. Since the 1800s large areas of sagebrush habitat have been lost, including 82% of the habitat in the Blue Mountains ecoregion and an estimated 59% of habitat in the Northern Basin and Range ecoregion.

These habitats are both extensive and diverse. In general, sagebrush habitats occur on dry flats and plains, rolling hills, rocky hill slopes, saddles and ridges where precipitation is low. Sagebrush-steppe is dominated by grasses and forbs (more than 25 percent of the area) with an open shrub layer. In sagebrush steppe, natural fire regimes historically maintained a patchy distribution of shrubs and predominance of grasses. Connectivity corridors of similar habitats between these areas are important to connect otherwise fragmented sage-steppe habitat.



Sage-grouse Areas

- Core Area Habitat
- Low-Density Area Habitat

Sagebrush Areas

- Core Area Habitat
- Growth Opportunity Area Habitat

NOTE: Sage-grouse Areas data from ODFW and Sagebrush Areas data from Sagebrush Conservation Design.
<https://www.sciencebase.gov/catalog/item/62d57e89d34e87fffb2dda62>



Indicator species and/or species of interest supported by this habitat

State Wildlife Action Plan Species of Greatest Conservation Need associated with sagebrush include Greater sage-grouse, ferruginous hawk, loggerhead shrike, sage sparrow, Brewer's sparrow, sagebrush lizard, Washington ground squirrel, and pygmy rabbits. Other wildlife closely associated with sagebrush include black-throated sparrow, sage thrasher, sagebrush vole, and pronghorn.

Why it is significant to the state

Sagebrush/sage-steppe habitat is an imperiled habitat that supports a range of species. These areas have deep historic and cultural significance to Native Americans and are associated with an economically and socially important ranching and agricultural industry in communities throughout a large portion of the state. Healthy sagebrush/sage-steppe habitat provides opportunities for carbon storage, which can be quickly lost with catastrophic wildfire and resulting proliferation of invasive annual grasses that offer limited carbon storage benefits.

Key limiting factors and/or ecological threats, with a focus on ecosystem function and process

- Altered fire regimes, including decades of fire suppression and climate change have resulted in changes to native plant communities and increased risk of habitat loss due to intense wildfires.
- Juniper encroachment on sagebrush/sage-steppe habitat and proliferation of invasive annual grasses, which increase the frequency, intensity and extent of wildfires.
- Conversion to other land uses, which results in habitat loss and connectivity.
- Limitations of current restoration techniques and the need for additional restoration approaches, particularly in low-elevation areas that face severe challenges to native plant species regeneration following wildfire.
- Landscape-scale disturbance, including wildfire, landslides, flooding or similar events may occur within the FIP geography. Post-disturbance restoration actions addressing landscape-scale disturbance may be eligible FIP actions.
- Loss of wildlife habitat connectivity. Many species rely on the ability to move throughout the landscape to fulfill their daily and seasonal needs for access to food, shelter, and opportunities to reproduce. ODFW produced [Priority Wildlife Conservation Areas \(PWCAs\) maps](#) to show where habitat connectivity is most important. Fifty-four species were selected for the project as surrogates, representing a variety of taxa, movement types, dispersal capabilities, and sensitivity to anthropogenic threats. FIP Initiatives may include actions enhancing PWCAs within the geographic boundary of their FIP Initiative.

Reference plans

- 1) Oregon State Wildlife Action Plan
<https://dfw.state.or.us/SWAP-Revision/>
- 2) ODFW's Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Assessment and Strategy for Oregon
https://www.dfw.state.or.us/wildlife/sagegrouse/docs/GRSG_Conservation_Assessment_and_Strategy_April_25-11.pdf
- 3) Bureau of Land Management Sage-Grouse Habitat Plans
<https://www.blm.gov/programs/fish-and-wildlife/sagegrouse/blm-sagegrouse-plans>
- 4) Oregon Sage Grouse Action Plan
<https://hub.oregonexplorer.info/pages/sagebrush-oregon-sage-grouse-action-plan>



OREGON
WATERSHED
ENHANCEMENT BOARD

Agenda Item J

Focused Investment Partnership

**Cohort 2 Report - Warner Basin
Partnership**

January 27-28, 2026, OWEB Board Meeting
Staff report – Agenda Item J. FIP Cohort 2 Reporting

MEMORANDUM

To: Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board
From: Denise Hoffert, Partnerships Coordinator

Supports OWEB’s Strategic Plan priority #3: Use our funding to strengthen and leverage capacity of people and organizations to achieve healthy watersheds.

I. Introduction

At the January board meeting, representatives from the Warner Basin Partnership will update the board on progress with their FIP initiative.

II. Background

In January 2019, the board selected five partnerships for FIP funding beginning in the 2019-2021 biennium. These partnerships comprise OWEB’s second cohort of FIP initiatives and include the Warner Basin Partnership. The first Progress Tracking Reports (PTRs) from the second FIP cohort were provided to the board at the March 2021 meeting, with the second PTR and a supporting presentation by partners in January 2023. The third PTR for the second cohort of FIP partnerships was provided to the board in January 2025.

The second cohort of FIP partnerships are now on the verge of completing their initiatives. Presentations were provided by two partnerships at the July 2025 board meeting, one presented to the board in October 2025, one will be presenting at the January 2026 meeting, and one will present at a future meeting.

III. January Board Meeting Presentation

In 2019, the board selected the Warner Basin Partnership for a \$5,863,000 million FIP initiative to restore native fish habitat connectivity in priority waterways within the basin. At the January meeting, representatives from the partnership will present progress to the board on their FIP initiative.

The most recent progress tracking report can be found on OWEB’s website: [2024-FIP-WarnerBasin.pdf](#).

IV. Recommendation

This is an information item only.



OREGON
WATERSHED
ENHANCEMENT BOARD

Agenda Item L

Summer 2025 Open Solicitation

Grant Offering Board Awards

January 27-28, 2026 OWEB Board Meeting

Staff report – Agenda Item L. Summer 2025 Open Solicitation Grant Offering

MEMORANDUM

To: Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board

From: Eric Williams, Restoration Grants Manager

Courtney Shaff, Monitoring and Reporting Manager

Katie Duzik, North Coast Regional Program Representative

Mark Grenbemer, Southwest Oregon Regional Program Representative

Liz Redon, Willamette Basin Regional Program Representative

Greg Ciannella, Central Oregon Regional Program Representative

Coby Menton, Eastern Oregon Regional Program Representative

Amy Charette, Mid-Columbia Regional Program Representative

Ken Fetcho, Effectiveness Monitoring Coordinator/Tribal Liaison

Supports all of OWEB's Strategic Plan priorities.

I. Introduction

This staff report describes the Summer 2025 Open Solicitation Grant Offering and funding recommendations. Staff request the board approve the funding recommendations outlined in Attachment D to the staff report, including funding for:

- 40 Restoration grants
- 20 Technical Assistance grants
- 6 Engagement grants
- 12 Monitoring grants

II. Summer 2025 Grant Offering Background and Summary

A total of 176 applications were received requesting almost \$38.5 million. Attachment A shows applications submitted by region, project type, and funding request.

III. Review Process

Staff facilitated a review process where all eligible grant applications were evaluated by Technical Review Teams (TRT), including the agency's six Regional Review Teams (RRTs) and the Oregon Plan Monitoring Team (OPMT). TRTs are made up of technical experts from multiple state and federal agencies and tribes who are local to each region. Staff scheduled site visits for as many proposed projects as possible, with all RRT members invited to attend.

OWEB then facilitated RRT meetings in each region to evaluate Restoration, Technical Assistance, and Engagement grant applications and OPMT to evaluate Monitoring grant applications. Reviewers considered the likelihood of success of each proposed project based on evaluation criteria in rule, Attachment B. After classifying applications as “Recommended,” “Recommended with Conditions,” or “Not Recommended,” the TRTs prioritized the projects recommended for funding by application type. The OPMT prioritized projects by region.

The project evaluations and recommendations were distributed to all applicants. Attachment C includes the number of applications recommended for funding in each region by application type, as well as staff-recommended award totals by application type and region. Staff will forward to the board any written comments received before the comment deadline regarding the project award recommendations.

IV. Salmon License Plate Projects

Staff recommends distributing \$250,000 in salmon license plates funds to three recommended restoration projects:

- 226-1005, Siletz Basin Estuary Channel Restoration Actions Phase V - \$100,000
- 226-3005, Lower South Fork McKenzie River Valley Reconnection Project Phase 3 - \$100,000
- 226-4009, Powerdale River Mile 3 Habitat Enhancement Project - \$50,000

V. Recommendation

Staff considered the TRT recommendations, funding availability, and evaluation criteria in developing the staff funding recommendations provided in Attachment D. The funding recommendations for the Summer 2025 Open Solicitation Grant Offering are summarized in Table 1. This will be the **first of three** Open Solicitation grant awards for the 2025-2027 biennium and the first of two grant awards for monitoring applications,

Staff recommend the board award funds for the staff-recommended projects listed in Attachment D with an award date of January 28, 2026.

Table 1: 2025-2027 Spending Plan and Funding Recommendations for Summer 2025 Grant Offering

| Grant Type | Current Spending Plan* | Awards to Date | Staff Recommendation for Award | Remaining Spending Plan Balance |
|----------------------|------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Restoration | \$39,880,000 | \$0 | \$12,596,927 | \$27,283,073 |
| Technical Assistance | \$8,000,000 | \$0 | \$2,529,986 | \$5,470,014 |
| Engagement | \$2,000,000 | \$0 | \$662,089 | \$1,337,911 |
| Monitoring | \$5,000,000 | \$0 | \$2,880,536 | \$2,119,464 |
| TOTAL | \$54,880,000 | \$0 | \$18,669,538 | \$36,210,462 |

*Spending plan amount includes funds anticipated to be added in July 2026.

VI. Attachments


- A. Grant Applications Submitted
- B. Evaluation Criteria
- C. Technical Review Team and Staff Funding Recommendations
- D. Regions 1-6 Funding Recommendations

Summer 2025 Open Solicitation application evaluations can be found in the [Application Evaluations](#) document and funding recommendations are included in Attachment D.

Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board Summer 2025 Open Solicitation Grant Offering

Applications Received by Type


| | Engagement | Technical Assistance | Restoration | Monitoring | Totals |
|---------------|------------|----------------------|-------------|------------|------------|
| Region 1 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 24 |
| Region 2 | 6 | 10 | 12 | 10 | 38 |
| Region 3 | 7 | 10 | 16 | 8 | 41 |
| Region 4 | 2 | 8 | 9 | 4 | 23 |
| Region 5 | 2 | 3 | 18 | 3 | 26 |
| Region 6 | 3 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 24 |
| Totals | 25 | 40 | 78 | 33 | 176 |



Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board Summer 2025 Open Solicitation Grant Offering

Dollar Amounts Requested by Application Type


| | Engagement | Technical Assistance | Restoration | Monitoring | Totals by Region |
|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Region 1 | \$470,228 | \$647,288 | \$3,287,185 | \$1,041,746 | \$ 5,446,447 |
| Region 2 | \$567,181 | \$1,146,624 | \$3,677,362 | \$1,672,680 | \$ 7,063,847 |
| Region 3 | \$890,123 | \$1,551,487 | \$6,897,373 | \$1,376,216 | \$ 10,715,199 |
| Region 4 | \$226,308 | \$1,351,905 | \$2,910,344 | \$1,128,813 | \$ 5,617,370 |
| Region 5 | \$213,584 | \$292,935 | \$4,034,025 | \$909,510 | \$ 5,450,054 |
| Region 6 | \$161,564 | \$555,571 | \$2,928,472 | \$523,512 | \$ 4,169,119 |
| Total Requested | \$ 2,528,988 | \$ 5,545,810 | \$ 23,734,761 | \$ 6,652,477 | \$ 38,462,036 |



Open Solicitation- OAR Divisions 10, 15, 25, and 30

PROVIDE PUBLIC BENEFIT FOR WATER QUALITY, NATIVE FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT, OR WATERSHED/ECOSYSTEM FUNCTION

Recommend



DO NOT FUND

Technical team reviews & evaluates each project individually based on how well project meets criteria


Prioritize



CRITERIA

How well project meets criteria for project evaluation & preferences, including:

- Causes over symptoms of disturbance
- Whole watershed approach over site-specific
- Collaboration over single-party



CERTAINTY OF SUCCESS

Certainty of success, based on the organizational capacity of the applicant & the likelihood the project will meet its ecological objectives



BENEFIT TO OREGON PLAN

Benefit to the Oregon Plan for Salmon & Watersheds, as evidenced by its expected benefits to watershed functions, fish habitat or water quality



COST BENEFIT

Project costs relative to the anticipated watershed health benefits

Recommendation to Staff

Staff review recommendations from each technical team & make a statewide funding recommendation to the Board base on available resources for the grant period & type.

RESTORATION

Evaluation Criteria
OAR 695-010-0060

All projects must meet the following:

- Will the project provide public benefit by supporting improved water quality, habitat, &/or ecosystem functions?
- Does the project demonstrate sound watershed management principles?
- Are project methods adapted to the project location?
- Will professionally accepted restoration approaches be followed?

Is the project ready to be implemented?

Does the application provide an overall budget that reflects expected & quantified watershed health benefit?

Does the budget reflect necessary costs & reasonable rates for direct costs?

Does the applicant have capacity for successful long-term stewardship & maintenance of the project?


Does the applicant have a proven track record managing projects, completing projects as proposed & reporting?

Will appropriate partners be engaged in the project?

How did/will engagement with local communities disproportionately impacted by climate change inform project?

Does the application clearly state the project objectives & provide information about how those objectives will be met?

Will project be implemented using a clearly defined methods appropriate for addressing the problem?



Does the project address limiting factors or watershed issues by treating the causes rather than the symptoms of disturbance?

Were alternatives to address the identified problem identified & evaluated?

How are watershed benefits adequately quantified in the application?

How are changing climate conditions incorporated & how will project contribute to durable adaptation & resilience for ecosystems?

How has consideration of greenhouse gas emissions or long-term carbon sequestration or storage informed project?

How were likely impacts to the site & adjacent properties during & after project implementation considered?

What specific action(s) will be implemented that are within an explicit geography prioritized in a watershed restoration plan?

How does the project address watershed function & ecosystem processes, including water quality & the life stages of fish & wildlife?

How does the project fit within the context of past & planned future restoration efforts in the watershed?

How will the project promote public awareness that may lead to opportunities for watershed restoration?

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Evaluation Criteria
OAR 695-030-0045

Technical Design & Engineering


= project feasibility reports, designs, or engineering materials that directly lead to site-specific restoration or acquisition projects within a specified timeframe.

Resource Assessment & Planning

= information about existing water quality or habitat conditions and processes at an identified scale, and relates those conditions and processes to actions that will directly lead to desired future conditions within a specified timeframe.

Do costs align with work necessary to accomplish the project objectives?

Does the application describe a clear need?



Technical Design & Engineering

- How does the project address limiting factors in existing conservation or recovery plans?
- Was an alternative analysis completed that demonstrates a range of options were considered?
- Will appropriate data be collected to inform designs?
- Will professionally accepted technical or engineering approaches will be used?
- How are changing climate conditions incorporated & how will project contribute to durable adaptation & resilience for ecosystems?
- How has consideration of greenhouse gas emissions or long-term carbon sequestration or storage informed project?

Resource Assessment & Planning

- Is the project scope & scale feasible? Have the partners demonstrated the ability for collaborative work at this scale?
- Is the process by which data will be managed & shared with partners appropriate?
- Will professionally accepted methods & parameters will be used?
- How are changing climate conditions incorporated & how will project contribute to durable adaptation & resilience for ecosystems?
- How has consideration of greenhouse gas emissions or long-term carbon sequestration or storage informed project?

Does applicant have the organizational capacity to implement the proposed project?

Are staff or consultants qualified to accomplish the proposed activities?

Are appropriate audiences engaged in the project?

How did/will engagement with local communities disproportionately impacted by climate change inform project?


ENGAGEMENT

Evaluation Criteria
OAR 695-015-0070

“Engagement Project” means a project whose purpose is to communicate and engage with landowners, organizations and the community about the need for, feasibility, and benefit of a specific eligible restoration or acquisitions project or program that leads to development of eligible projects within an identified geography.

Projects whose
primary purpose is
education are NOT
ELIGIBLE

Are costs reasonable & necessary for the proposed work?



How will applicant engage with appropriate audiences in the appropriate geography?

How did/will engagement with local communities disproportionately impacted by climate change inform project?

How is the multi-directional communication among the applicant & audiences likely to be effective?

What is the evidence linking engagement to eligible restoration or acquisition projects or programs?

Will the outcomes of the expected restoration or acquisitions protect or restore fish or wildlife habitat, watershed function, &/or water quality or quantity?

How are changing climate conditions incorporated & how will project contribute to durable adaptation & resilience for ecosystems?

How has consideration of greenhouse gas emissions or long-term carbon sequestration or storage informed project?

How is the applicant qualified to implement the project? Do they have relevant experience?

Will engagement result in timely development of eligible restoration or acquisition projects or programs?

MONITORING

Evaluation Criteria

OAR 695-025-0140

Purpose

Monitoring activities necessary for carrying out projects that protect or restore native fish or wildlife habitats, or protect or restore natural watershed or ecosystem functions to improve water quality or stream flows.

Eligibility

Projects that gather & analyze data to:

1. Describe current watershed conditions
2. Establish trends about watershed conditions
3. Evaluate the specific effects of a restoration or acquisition project

Monitoring relates to limiting factors, habitat conditions, watershed processes or actions described in local plans

Need, relevance, applicability, & timeliness of proposed monitoring to inform future projects

Complements existing data or current or planned monitoring efforts

Proposed costs are appropriate for the work necessary to accomplish the objectives

How the appropriate technical experts & community members are engaged

Organizational capacity relative to past experience & successful implementation of monitoring projects

Proposal Clarity

Monitoring questions & how proposed monitoring methods will answer these questions

Professionally accepted monitoring & analysis protocols, including quality assurance / quality control procedures to be utilized

Process by which data & results will be stored, reported, & made publicly available

Consideration of greenhouse gas emissions or long-term carbon sequestration or storage

Changing climate conditions incorporated; & contribution to durable adaptation & resilience for ecosystems

Technical Soundness

SWEET SPOT:
Likelihood for Success
Necessary for future eligible restoration or acquisition

Capacity of Applicant

Qualifications & ability of applicant technical staff, consultants, or project partners to apply appropriate monitoring approaches & data collection & analysis methods to successfully complete monitoring activities

Engages & applies input from local communities disproportionately impacted by climate change

Cost Effectiveness

RRT and Staff Funding Recommendations for the Summer 2025 Open Solicitation Grant Offering

Tables compare the number of projects recommended by each Regional Review Team (RRT) with projects recommended by Staff based on funds available in the 2025-2027 Spending Plan.

| Restoration | | | |
|--------------------|------------|--------------|------------|
| Region | RRT | Staff | % |
| 1 | 5 | 5 | 100% |
| 2 | 11 | 7 | 64% |
| 3 | 10 | 6 | 60% |
| 4 | 7 | 6 | 86% |
| 5 | 16 | 6 | 38% |
| 6 | 14 | 10 | 71% |
| Total | 63 | 40 | 63% |

| Technical Assistance | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------|--------------|------------|
| Region | RRT | Staff | % |
| 1 | 2 | 2 | 100% |
| 2 | 7 | 5 | 71% |
| 3 | 7 | 4 | 57% |
| 4 | 5 | 4 | 80% |
| 5 | 3 | 2 | 67% |
| 6 | 4 | 3 | 75% |
| Total | 28 | 20 | 71% |

| Engagement | | | |
|-------------------|------------|--------------|------------|
| Region | RRT | Staff | % |
| 1 | 3 | 1 | 33% |
| 2 | 4 | 1 | 25% |
| 3 | 5 | 1 | 20% |
| 4 | 2 | 1 | 50% |
| 5 | 2 | 1 | 50% |
| 6 | 3 | 1 | 33% |
| Total | 19 | 6 | 32% |

| Monitoring | | | |
|-------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|
| Region | OPMT | Staff | % |
| 1 | 4 | 2 | 50% |
| 2 | 8 | 2 | 25% |
| 3 | 6 | 2 | 33% |
| 4 | 4 | 2 | 50% |
| 5 | 2 | 2 | 100% |
| 6 | 3 | 2 | 67% |
| Total | 27 | 12 | 44% |

Funding amounts are the totals for Staff Recommended projects

| Region | Restoration | Technical Assistance | Engagement | Monitoring | Total |
|---------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | \$ 2,471,064 | \$ 257,510 | \$ 85,152 | \$ 149,556 | \$ 2,963,282 |
| 2 | \$ 1,421,035 | \$ 568,702 | \$ 174,639 | \$ 631,913 | \$ 2,796,289 |
| 3 | \$ 2,322,513 | \$ 554,856 | \$ 172,972 | \$ 321,328 | \$ 3,371,669 |
| 4 | \$ 2,003,676 | \$ 658,100 | \$ 81,788 | \$ 561,818 | \$ 3,305,382 |
| 5 | \$ 2,325,331 | \$ 235,163 | \$ 106,004 | \$ 754,215 | \$ 3,420,713 |
| 6 | \$ 2,053,308 | \$ 255,655 | \$ 41,534 | \$ 461,706 | \$ 2,812,203 |
| Total | \$ 12,596,927 | \$ 2,529,986 | \$ 662,089 | \$ 2,880,536 | \$ 18,669,538 |

All Regions Summer 2025 Funding Recommendations

Funding Recommendations

Status

- Staff Recommended Funding
- Below Funding Line

OWEB Regions


- Region 1
- Region 2
- Region 3
- Region 4
- Region 5
- Region 6



775 Summer St, NE Suite 360
Salem, OR 97301-1290
(503) 986-0178


<https://www.Oregon.gov/OWEB/>

This product is for information purposes, and may not be suitable for legal, engineering or surveying purposes. This information or data is provided with the understanding that conclusions drawn from such information are the responsibility of the user.



Esri, CGIAR, USGS, Sources: Esri, USGS, Sources: Esri, TomTom, Garmin, FAO, NOAA, USGS, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

North Coast - Region 1 Summer 2025 Funding Recommendations



C:\Users\willspk\GIS C Drive\GIS_Files_on_Z_Drive\Projects\Review Team Meetings\2025SummerCycle\
NAD 1983 Oregon Statewide Lambert (Intl Feet) 12/3/2025 1:42 PM

Funding Recommendation

●

Staff Recommendation For Funding (SRF)

●

Below Funding Line (BFL)

Previous Grants 1998 - Fall 2024

■

Land Acquisition

◆

Restoration

▲

Region 1 Cities

—

Region 1 Streams


▭

OWEB Region 1 Boundary



775 Summer St, NE Suite 360
Salem, OR 97301-1290
(503) 986-0178
<https://www.Oregon.gov/OWEB/>

This product is for information purposes, and may not be suitable for legal, engineering or surveying purposes. This information or data is provided with the understanding that conclusions drawn from such information are the responsibility of the user.



| Region 1 - North Coast Restoration | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|
| Projects RECOMMENDED for Funding in Priority Order | | | | |
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Recommended |
| 226-1005 | Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians | Siletz Basin Estuary Channel Restoration Actions Phase V | Continue to create large wood structures that obstruct linear flow paths and in doing so create scour and fill as well as sorting of grain sizes all of which shift channel morphologies from simple linear features and flow patterns to more complex point bars with scour holes, back eddies and a range of sediment grain sizes (see attached Appendix). The project is proposed for a 1.6 mile project reach where the Tribe has carried out hydraulic modeling and has been fully permitted for the work. | \$ 596,398 |
| 226-1007 | Lower Nehalem Community Trust | McCoy Marsh Wetland Restoration Project | Restore tidal processes to the entirety of the 9-acre McCoy Wetland, which are currently inhibited by perimeter dikes, to create critical estuarine habitats. | \$ 512,076 |
| 226-1002 | Tillamook Estuaries Partnership | Clear Creek Instream Restoration | The aim of this project is to improve salmonid habitat in Clear Creek by increasing habitat complexity, increasing spawning gravel retention, and providing overwintering habitat for juvenile salmonids. | \$ 232,587 |
| 226-1003 | Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians | Siletz Basin FreshwaterTributaries Restoration Actions Phase V | Continue to create large wood structures that obstruct linear flow paths and in doing so create scour and fill as well as sorting of grain sizes all of which shift channel morphologies from simple linear features and flow patterns to more complex bars and jams with scour holes, back eddies and a range of sediment grain sizes (Appendix A). The project proposes to construct 12 large log and boulder jams across each of two properties with each property receiving 480 logs and 480 boulders. | \$ 410,773 |
| 226-1008 | Lower Nehalem WC | Salmonberry Confluence Thermal Refugia Habitat Enhancement | The primary goal of this project is to provide cover and habitat complexity for juvenile salmonids in critical thermal refugia along the Nehalem River during summer low-flow periods when mainstem water temperatures are high. This project will improve gravel retention, pool development, and instream wood volumes. The secondary goal of this project is to serve as a demonstration that large wood structures can be installed at thermal refugia confluences, be stable, and provide fish benefits. | \$ 719,230 |
| Total Restoration Projects Recommended for Funding by RRT and OWEB Staff | | | | \$ 2,471,064 |

| Projects Recommended but NOT FUNDED in Priority Order | | | | |
|---|---------|---------------|------------------------------------|------------------|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Requested |
| N/A | | | | |

| Projects NOT RECOMMENDED for Funding by RRT | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|------------------|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Amount Requested |
| 226-1001 | Lincoln SWCD | Big Elk and Little Elk Riparian Restoration Project | \$ 93,248 |
| 226-1004 | Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians | Siletz Basin Mainstem Riparian Restoration Actions Phase I | \$ 224,262 |
| 226-1006 | Columbia SWCD | McBride Creek Habitat Restoration & Enhancement | \$ 123,793 |
| 226-1009 | Lower Nehalem WC | Sha-Ne-Mah Landowners Riparian Restoration | \$ 374,818 |
| | | | |

| Region 1 - North Coast Technical Assistance | | | | |
|--|---------------------|--|---|-----------------------|
| Projects RECOMMENDED for Funding in Priority Order | | | | |
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Recommended |
| 226-1010 | Trout Unlimited Inc | Davis Creek Wetland Habitat Enhancement Fish Passage Restoration Project | The goal of the TA at the project site is to obtain funding to hire a contracted engineer to develop concept, 30%, BOD, 60%, 90%, and 100% shovel ready designs for the project. The selected engineer would also complete hydraulic modeling, geotechnical surveys, a wetland delineation, and other tasks to create an informed design. These designs would allow TU to move forward with project implementation which would restore access to critical rearing habitat while removing fish passage barriers. | \$ 184,269 |
| 226-1012 | Scappoose Bay WC | South Scappoose Posey and Vlautin Property Technical Designs | The goal will be to develop a restoration plan to the 30% design phase after including an alternatives analysis that will include landowner cooperation and key partner input. | \$ 73,241 |

| | |
|--|-------------------|
| Total Technical Assistance Projects Recommended for Funding by RRT and OWEB Staff | \$ 257,510 |
|--|-------------------|

| Projects Recommended but NOT FUNDED in Priority Order | | | | |
|--|---------|---------------|------------------------------------|------------------|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Requested |
| N/A | | | | |

| Projects NOT RECOMMENDED for Funding by RRT | | | | |
|--|------------------|--|--|------------------|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | | Amount Requested |
| 226-1011 | Upper Nehalem WC | East Fork Nehalem Fish Passage Improvement - Design | | \$ 67,137 |
| 226-1013 | Scappoose Bay WC | South Scappoose and Raymond Creek Confluence Floodplain Design | | \$ 96,525 |
| 226-1014 | Necanicum WC | Columbia Pacific Pollinator Collaborative | | \$ 226,116 |

| Region 1 - North Coast Engagement | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|---|---|-----------------------|
| Projects RECOMMENDED for Funding in Priority Order | | | | |
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Recommended |
| 226-1021 | Tillamook Estuaries Partnership | Tillamook Bay Watershed Coho Strategic Action Plan: Phase 2 | The goals of this engagement grant application are threefold: 1) sign up landowners identified in the TSAP riparian plan for planting projects in prioritized areas through personal engagement, 2) coordinate a system for wood supply, project support, and project implementation with ODF and private forest landowners through increased dialogue, and 3) continue to engage with and coordinate the partnership's implementation of the TSAP workplan through an MOU and a formally structured partnership. | \$ 85,152 |
| Total Engagement Projects Recommended for Funding by RRT and OWEB Staff | | | | \$ 85,152 |

| Projects Recommended but NOT FUNDED in Priority Order | | | | |
|--|---------------|--|--|------------------|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Requested |
| 226-1020 | Lincoln SWCD | Land and Waters Conservation Outreach Series | Our goal is to connect to a diverse range of stakeholders across Lincoln County, to inform and uplift engagement in implementing conservation projects and practices that improve water quality. The District will host 16 workshops and 16 river kayak events over a 4 year period with a projected participation of at least 15 people per workshop. The implementation goal for engagement is the development and funding of at least 2 projects per year that address water quality impairments. | \$ 124,568 |
| 226-1022 | Columbia SWCD | Clatskanie Landowner Engagement | The goal of this project is to engage the landowner community in the Clatskanie River Basin to develop awareness and restoration projects to restore watershed function through stream restoration, riparian area rehabilitation and fish passage/aquatic habitat improvements. Direct contact with landowners, and community engagement activities will lead to the development of at least 3 restoration projects in priority reaches. | \$ 72,105 |

| Projects NOT RECOMMENDED for Funding by RRT | | | | |
|--|---------------------|--|--|------------------|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | | Amount Requested |
| 226-1023 | Necanicum WC | Don't Be Shellfish: Community engagement to improve water quality and stream flow in the Necanicum | | \$ 60,454 |
| 226-1024 | North Coast WS Assn | Big Creek Watershed Restoration Charrette | | \$ 127,949 |

| Region 1 - North Coast Monitoring | | | | |
|---|---------------------|---|---|-----------------------|
| Projects RECOMMENDED for Funding in Priority Order | | | | |
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Recommended |
| 226-1019 | North Coast WS Assn | NCWA Water Quality Analysis and Hot Spot Monitoring | <p>1. To continue stream temperature monitoring and add air temperature monitoring at 8 critical sites.</p> <p>2. To analyze NCWA monitoring data from multiple projects and NetMaps modeling with the help of a technical team of experts for the purpose of generating future projects and honing future monitoring.</p> <p>3. To create and host an interactive, local water quality dashboard to share all of this information.</p> | \$ 21,568 |
| 226-1016 | Trout Unlimited Inc | 6PPD Monitoring on the Oregon Coast | The goal of this project is to collect water quality data (both outfall and instream data) in six watersheds within coastal coho distribution, during storm events following prolonged dry periods (>1 week) to assess whether 6PPD-quinone is present, and if so, at what levels, and the extent of its distribution. Sample data will then be used to prioritize actions in the watershed. | \$ 127,988 |
| Total Monitoring Projects Recommended for Funding by RRT and OWEB Staff | | | | \$ 149,556 |

| Projects Recommended but NOT FUNDED in Priority Order | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|--|---|------------------|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Requested |
| 226-1018 | PSU - Portland State University | Monitoring Coastal Fen Conditions to Identify Management and Restoration Needs | The goal of this project is to collect up-to-date fen condition and water table monitoring data for 20 sites along the Oregon Coast and use this information to identify site-specific, spatially-explicit management and restoration activities that are needed to maintain habitat for rare and endangered species. | \$ 441,222 |
| 226-1017 | Lincoln SWCD | Siletz Strategic Implementation Area Water Quality Monitoring | To form a comprehensive baseline dataset on current conditions in the Siletz River, and assess whether the parameters chosen for monitoring are meeting water quality criteria as defined by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. | \$ 164,697 |

| Projects NOT RECOMMENDED for Funding by RRT | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|---|------------------|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Amount Requested |
| 226-1015 | Lower Columbia Estuary Partnership | Assessing Effectiveness of Tidal Freshwater Restoration Sites in lower Columbia River | \$ 286,272 |

| | |
|---|-------------|
| Region 1 Total OWEB Staff Recommended Board Award | \$2,963,282 |
|---|-------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Region 1 - 6 Grand Total OWEB Staff Recommended Board Award | \$18,669,538 |
|---|--------------|

South Coast - Region 2 Summer 2025 Funding Recommendations



Funding Recommendation

- Staff Recommendation For Funding (SRF)
- Below Funding Line (BFL)


Previous Grants 1998 - Spring 2024

- Land Acquisition
- ◆ Restoration
- ▲ Region 2 Cities
- Region 2 Streams
- ▭ OWEB Region 2 Boundary

OREGON WATERSHED ENHANCEMENT BOARD

775 Summer St, NE Suite 360
Salem, OR 97301-1290
(503) 986-0178
<https://www.Oregon.gov/OWEB/>

This product is for information purposes, and may not be suitable for legal, engineering or surveying purposes. This information or data is provided with the understanding that conclusions drawn from such information are the responsibility of the user.



| Region 2 - Southwest Oregon Restoration | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|-----------------------|
| Projects RECOMMENDED for Funding in Priority Order | | | | |
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Recommended |
| 226-2006 | Coos SWCD | East Fork Coquille River Water Quality Improvement | Enhance riparian function and water quality in the East Fork Coquille River and along lower Elk Creek through control of non-native vegetation and exclusion of livestock from sensitive areas facilitating restoration of native streamside vegetation to increase shade, reduce water temperatures, and filter runoff, in order to support coho salmon recovery and protect municipal drinking water sources . | \$ 254,144 |
| 226-2005 | Applegate Partnership, Inc. | McCann Dam Removal Project | McCann Dam to restore year-round fish passage to ~2.5 miles of upstream coho habitat on Cheney Creek, improve channel stability and sediment transport, and support recovery of native fish populations. Actions include dam removal, bank regrading and stabilization with large wood, and native riparian planting to improve habitat and watershed function. | \$ 149,811 |
| 226-2013 | Coos SWCD | Albertson-Gatov Tidal Working Landscapes Restoration Project_RESUBMIT #3 | This project will restore ecological function to 35 acres of tidally influenced habitat on two private working lands sites in the Lower Coquille. Actions will improve fish access for ESA-listed coho salmon, exclude livestock from sensitive riparian and wetland areas, restore riparian buffers to enhance water quality, and increase resilience to climate change while maintaining agricultural productivity . | \$ 487,189 |
| 226-2012 | Partnership for the Umpqua Rivers | Whitehorse Creek Instream Restoration | The project's goal is to restore essential salmonid habitat and enhance aquatic habitat conditions along 1.83 miles of lower Whitehorse Creek by using a line-puller and/or excavator to install 20 large wood structures that mimic natural wood accumulations. These instream structures will enhance habitat complexity, gravel retention, juvenile fish refuge, and floodplain connectivity . | \$ 210,510 |
| 226-2004 | The Understory Initiative | Climate Adapted Native Plant Materials for Southwest Oregon 2026-2029 | Our near-term goal is to develop native plant materials for priority riparian sites, restoring them over the next three years. Long-term, we aim to strengthen the grower network and expand native seed and plug production to support restoration across hundreds of acres. Building on RNPP's upland seed mix success, we will apply this model to riparian understory communities . | \$ 176,746 |
| 226-2001 | Douglas SWCD | Buckhorn Creek Ag water quality and riparian restoration project Phase I. | The overall goal is to increase ecological uplift within the Little River watershed by improving water quality and habitat conditions for fish, wildlife and humans. And to assist the landowner to better manage their land. 1) Provide alternative watering facility. 2) Protect and restore the riparian area. 3) Increase riparian plant diversity. | \$ 88,585 |
| 226-2011 | Siskiyou Field Institute | Deer Creek Invasives Removal | Treat 33 acres of riparian and meadow habitat along Deer Creek for invasive Himalayan blackberry. Apply Vastlan herbicide via foliar spray in spring 2026, followed by mechanical cutting of treated biomass. Focus efforts in priority zones identified in SFI's Invasive Plant Management Plan to improve riparian function, reduce fire risk, and prepare the site for native plant recovery . | \$ 54,050 |
| Total Restoration Projects Recommended for Funding by RRT and OWEB Staff | | | | \$ 1,421,035 |

Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board: Region 2 Restoration, Technical Assistance, Monitoring and Engagement

| Projects Recommended but NOT FUNDED in Priority Order | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|------------------|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Requested |
| 226-2002 | Douglas SWCD | Douglas SWCD Water Quality and Restoration Project Completion. | The goal of this funding is to extend our ability to, 1) Complete 8 OWEB projects in implementation in 2026/2027, and begin monitoring for 5 years. 2) Begin implementation of 5 recently SIA/OWEB funded projects to be completed in 2028 | \$ 74,360 |
| 226-2008 | Coos SWCD | Cunningham Creek Fish Passage and Riparian Improvement Project | The goal of this restoration project is to improve fish passage and water quality in Cunningham Creek and adjacent habitats through culvert replacement and riparian restoration, and to improve access for the landowner, who uses the pastures for hay production and forest management. The project also serves as a model in the Coquille River Basin for working collaboratively with landowners to improve fish access and habitat while supporting continued agricultural use on a working landscape. | \$ 975,607 |
| 226-2010 | Partnership for the Umpqua Rivers | Lally Creek Fish Passage Improvement | The goal of the restoration is to improve fish passage in Lally Creek by replacing an undersized, perched culvert with a fish-passable structure that meets NOAA and ODFW criteria, restoring access to 1.7 miles of high-quality upstream habitat for Oregon Coast Coho and other native fish species. | \$ 794,887 |
| 226-2007 | Elk Creek Watershed Coalition | Parker Creek Instream Habitat Restoration | The overall goal of the Parker Creek Habitat Project is to restore natural hydrologic processes, and to improve spawning and rearing habitat for coho salmon and steelhead in more than 2 miles of Parker Creek. The addition of 36 large wood structures will retain bedload, increase pool complexity, and allow the stream to sort and distribute gravel. Complex pools with adequate cover will increase juvenile survival and growth rates, and the number of healthy smolts that migrate to the ocean. | \$ 271,985 |

| Projects NOT RECOMMENDED for Funding by RRT | | | |
|---|----------------------|---|------------------|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Amount Requested |
| 226-2003 | Illinois Valley SWCD | Monarch Butterfly and Franklin's Bumble bee Habitat Enhancement (Klamath Mountains Ecoregion) | \$ 139,488 |

| Region 2 - Southwest Oregon Technical Assistance | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|--|---|--------------------|
| Projects RECOMMENDED for Funding in Priority Order | | | | |
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Recommended |
| 226-2017 | Rogue River WC | Big Butte Creek Complex Project | The project's goal is to work with a technical team to develop preliminary designs for ecological restoration of up to 200 acres throughout the Big Butte Creek Complex. These designs are intended to guide the implementation of actions outlined in the short-term actions of the Upper Rogue Coho SAP targeting stressors such as altered riparian function, water quality, instream complexity, and floodplain connectivity | \$ 77,660 |
| 226-2023 | MEDFORD IRRIGATION DISTRICT | Medford Irrigation District Canal Piping Phase 1 | The goal of the project is to produce 30% engineering designs for piping 2.7 miles of the Medford Canal from Bradford Drop to Yankee Creek to address water loss, improve fish and aquatic habitat in Little Butte Creek, and improve water supply and delivery reliability for MID patrons. Completing this work will enable MID to move to advanced design and construction. Once installed, the project will conserve ~4.2 cfs, of which 25% will be dedicated instream. | \$ 152,250 |
| 226-2022 | Trout Unlimited Inc | Deer Creek Illinois Valley Instream Restoration Design Project | The goal of this project site is to develop designs that will provide a set of site-specific restoration recommendations and designs to improve the aquatic ecosystem processes, enhance fish passage, and improve the quality and quantity of 2.4 mi of habitat for coho and chinook salmon, winter steelhead, and cutthroat trout. This project will improve over 2.4 miles of high IP spawning and rearing habitat for coho salmon and provide continued access to 9 miles of anadromous fish habitat upstream | \$ 147,171 |

Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board: Region 2 Restoration, Technical Assistance, Monitoring and Engagement

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|--|--|-------------------|
| 226-2018 | Rogue River WC | Bear Creek RM 4.5 - Design and Permitting | The project's goal is to work with a technical team to conduct partner and landowner outreach, develop final designs, and secure permits for construction of an ecological rehabilitation project at Bear Creek RM 4.5 (near Central Point, OR) that address limiting factors affecting anadromous and resident aquatic species. | \$ 57,613 |
| 226-2016 | Coquille Watershed Association | South Fork Off-Channel Refugia_Final Designs | The goal for the South Fork Off-Channel Refugia Project TA is to deliver a 100% engineered restoration design and preparation of all required permit applications so that the project will be "shovel-ready" for implementation in 2027. | \$ 134,008 |
| Total Technical Assistance Projects Recommended for Funding by RRT and OWEB Staff | | | | \$ 568,702 |

| Projects Recommended but NOT FUNDED in Priority Order | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|--|------------------|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Requested |
| 226-2015 | Partnership for the Umpqua Rivers | Lower Dean Creek Tide Gate Design | The goal is to develop 30% design plans to replace or remove two failed tide gates and restore tidal connectivity at lower Dean Creek, improving fish passage and estuarine habitat for juvenile salmonids and other native estuary-dependent species. This technical assistance will evaluate restoration options, address landowner needs, and produce designs that are implementation-ready and suitable for future permitting and funding. | \$ 212,553 |
| 226-2019 | Douglas SWCD | Douglas SWCD TA for Water Quality and Restoration Project Planning. | The goal of this funding is to extend our ability to, 1) Complete and submit 2 project proposals for funding by 2026. 2) Complete project 10 proposals that are currently in planning. To be completed by 2027/28. 3) Complete assessments to begin 10 project planning and proposal write ups to submit by 2027. | \$ 86,940 |

| Projects NOT RECOMMENDED for Funding by RRT | | | |
|--|---------------------------|--|------------------|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Amount Requested |
| 226-2014 | Oregon Agricultural Trust | Statewide Farm and Ranch Protection Plan | \$ 57,574 |
| 226-2020 | Illinois Valley SWCD | Reclaiming Rural Landscapes: Evaluating Environmental Risks of Cannabis Site Abandonment | \$ 152,820 |
| 226-2021 | Umpqua SWCD | Umpqua Estuary Fish Passage & Water Quality Improvement Project | \$ 68,035 |

| Region 2 - Southwest Oregon Engagement | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---|---|--------------------|
| Projects RECOMMENDED for Funding in Priority Order | | | | |
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Recommended |
| 226-2034 | Trout Unlimited Inc | Rogue Basin Flow Restoration Stakeholder Engagement Project | To engage the water user community and partner with other restoration practitioners in order to increase the pace and scale of flow restoration in the Rogue Basin and increase the participation of priority stakeholders in voluntary, incentivized flow restoration projects. These projects will by develop a better balance of instream and out of stream water use in the face of a changing climate and increased drought frequency. | \$ 174,639 |
| Total Engagement Projects Recommended for Funding by RRT and OWEB Staff | | | | \$ 174,639 |

| Projects Recommended but NOT FUNDED in Priority Order | | | | |
|--|--------------|---|---|------------------|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Requested |
| 226-2039 | Douglas SWCD | Branching Out: Growing Oak Habitat Through Landowner Leadership | The goal is to increase oak habitat acres restored, climate resiliency, & watershed function in the Umpqua Basin by increasing awareness of invasive species control opportunities as a threat-specific strategy integral to oak habitat restoration and to build a strategic, landowner-informed project pipeline that identifies restoration opportunities, assesses project readiness, and aligns projects with appropriate technical and financial assistance programs. | \$ 106,847 |

Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board: Region 2 Restoration, Technical Assistance, Monitoring and Engagement

| | | | | |
|----------|--|--|--|-----------|
| 226-2036 | Applegate Partnership, Inc. | Slate Cr Landowner Engagement | The primary goal of this engagement effort is to build trust-based relationships with landowners throughout the Slate Creek Watershed. By fostering open dialogue and mutual understanding, we aim to lay the groundwork for voluntary, community-supported restoration and assessment projects. | \$ 78,728 |
| 226-2037 | OSU Office of Sponsored Research & Award Admin | City of Bandon Source Water Protection Area Planning | The goal of engagement is for project team members and landowners within Bandon's drinking water source watersheds to better understand the watershed hydrology and management challenges that contribute to sediment pollution and low streamflow. Team members are then equipped to provide technical and financial resources to landowners, and landowners are prepared to implement practices and actions that improve water quality and quantity. | \$ 56,721 |

| Projects NOT RECOMMENDED for Funding by RRT | | | | |
|--|--------------------|--|------------------|--|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Amount Requested | |
| 226-2035 | Douglas SWCD | The Missing Link: Integrating Private Pump Chances into Countywide Wildfire & Ecosystem Resilience | \$ 90,109 | |
| 226-2038 | Illinois Valley WC | Rooted in the River: Community Engagement Pilot for Illinois River Watershed Restoration | \$ 60,137 | |

| Region 2 - Southwest Oregon Monitoring | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------|
| Projects RECOMMENDED for Funding in Priority Order | | | | |
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Recommended |
| 226-2026 | Coquille Watershed Association | Lower Coquille Tide Gate and Fish Passage Monitoring Extension | <p>We strive to aid in salmon recovery by providing data to guide future projects with these goals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Inform how juvenile coho and Chinook respond to the varied sizes and complexities of MTR tide gates and restored floodplain habitat 2. Document the migratory habits of juvenile coho and Chinook in the Coquille floodplain to inform tideland restoration 3. Aid in the adaptive management of tide gate projects to further improve floodplain habitat access for threatened salmon populations | \$ 458,190 |
| 226-2024 | Cascade Pacific RC&D | Tenmile Lakes Basin Partnership Wetland Effectiveness Monitoring | The goal of this monitoring proposal is to evaluate the early effectiveness of TLBP's efforts in setting the groundwork for the return of natural floodplain processes that support improved habitat conditions for native and endangered species in Tenmile Lakes. Given the two-year timeframe, this monitoring will focus on indicators that reflect the development of key physical and ecological conditions necessary for self-sustaining processes. Results will inform adaptive management and future plans. | \$ 173,723 |
| Total Monitoring Projects Recommended for Funding by RRT and OWEB Staff | | | | \$ 631,913 |

| Projects Recommended but NOT FUNDED in Priority Order | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|---|------------------|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Requested |
| 226-2031 | Partnership for the Umpqua Rivers | Umpqua Basin Stream Temperature Monitoring Project | To collect another two years (2027 and 2028) of summer stream and corresponding air temperature data at long-term monitoring sites in the Umpqua Basin to add to the 26-year dataset. The data at these representative reference sites can be used to compare to study areas lacking long-term records and would extend the DEQ trend analysis to document long-term stream temperature trends in the basin. This information would continue to inform science-based instream restoration by PIIR and partners. | \$ 42,381 |
| 226-2028 | Southern Oregon University | BACI Effectiveness Monitoring of the Mount Ashland Exit Wildlife Bench and Mariposa Wildlife Overpass | Collect pre- and post-construction data needed to document wildlife responses (including frequency and diversity of species, distribution, and WVCs) to wildlife passage infrastructure projects designed to restore wildlife connectivity across I-5. | \$ 221,845 |


Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board: Region 2 Restoration, Technical Assistance, Monitoring and Engagement

| | | | | |
|----------|--------------------------------|---|--|------------|
| 226-2029 | Curry SWCD | Elk, Sixes, and Floras Creek/New River Temperature Monitoring | This project's goal is to collect high-quality water temperature data in high-priority reference sites and to establish new monitoring sites throughout the Elk, Sixes, and Floras Creek/New River basins to best understand thermal regimes and inform future resource management and restoration actions. | \$ 89,579 |
| 226-2027 | The Understory Initiative | Vernal Pool Restoration Effectiveness Monitoring: Vegetation and ESA-Listed Population Dynamics | The goal of this project is to collect, analyze, and synthesize data related to vegetation composition and ESA-listed species populations pre- and post-restoration to inform the planning, and track the effectiveness, of restoration activities within Rogue Basin vernal pool habitats. | \$ 146,132 |
| 226-2033 | Douglas SWCD | South Umpqua SIA Water Quality Monitoring. | The main goal of this monitoring effort is to extend the current monitoring project from 2025-2026 to 2027-2028 to be able to conduct status and trend monitoring within the South Umpqua Strategic Implementation Area (SIA), The second goal is to add additional monitoring stations as additional restoration projects begin and work towards additional funding sources to extend this monitoring effort beyond 2028 | \$ 47,942 |
| 226-2030 | Coquille Watershed Association | Beaver Hill Wetland Reserve Restoration Effectiveness Monitoring | Evaluate ecological responses to wetland enhancement at the Beaver Hill Wetland Reserve by monitoring surface and groundwater dynamics, vegetation community structure, macroinvertebrate assemblages as indicators of food web support, and habitat use by key wildlife species including beaver and western pond turtle to assess whether the site is on a trajectory toward improved wetland function | \$ 101,473 |

| Projects <i>NOT RECOMMENDED</i> for Funding by RRT | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|------------------|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Amount Requested |
| 226-2025 | Illinois Valley SWCD | IV WQM 2026-8 | \$ 134,145 |
| 226-2032 | Partnership for the Umpqua Rivers | Umpqua Basin eDNA Collaborative Monitoring | \$ 257,270 |

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| Region 2 Total OWEB Staff Recommended Board Award | \$2,796,289 |
| Region 1 - 6 Grand Total OWEB Staff Recommended Board Award | \$18,669,538 |

Willamette Basin - Region 3 Summer 2025 Funding Recommendations



C:\Users\willspk\GIS C Drive\GIS_Files_on_Z_Drive\Projects\Review Team Meetings\2025SummerCycle\
NAD 1983 Oregon Statewide Lambert (Intl Feet) 12/3/2025 1:55 PM

Funding Recommendation

- Staff Recommendation For Funding (SRF)
- Below Funding Line (BFL)

Previous Grants 1998 - Fall 2024

- Land Acquisition
- ◆ Restoration
- ▲ Region 3 Cities
- Region 3 Streams
- ▭ OWEB Region 3 Boundary



775 Summer St, NE Suite 360
Salem, OR 97301-1290
(503) 986-0178
<https://www.Oregon.gov/OWEB/>

This product is for information purposes, and may not be suitable for legal, engineering or surveying purposes. This information or data is provided with the understanding that conclusions drawn from such information are the responsibility of the user.



| Region 3 - Willamette Basin Restoration | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------|
| Projects RECOMMENDED for Funding in Priority Order | | | | |
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Recommended |
| 226-3003 | Institute for Applied Ecology | Restoring upland habitat at Henry Hagg Lake to support rare species | The goal of this project is to expand and enhance native prairie habitat at Hagg Lake to support the recovery of Fender's blue butterfly and Kincaid's lupine by achieving the population and habitat quality benchmarks necessary for their delisting under the Endangered Species Act. | \$ 223,489 |
| 226-3008 | Greenbelt Land Trust | Proactive Ash Forest Enhancement | This project will proactively enhance 52 acres of ash forest and 84 acres of adjacent transition habitats to increase habitat value and minimize near-future habitat impacts from the invasive emerald ash borer. Work will result in a more diverse and resilient mosaic of riparian/wetland forest/wet prairie habitat that will continue to provide hydrological function and avian/fish/wildlife habitat and serve as demonstration sites to engage local landowners and managers in ash forest enhancement. | \$ 395,704 |
| 226-3010 | Long Tom WC | Monroe Dam Removal - Finish Line Funding | The goal of the project is to restore aquatic migration corridors, fluvial processes, and instream and riparian habitat in the lower Long Tom River at the Monroe Drop Structure to benefit native fish and wildlife species. | \$ 266,412 |
| 226-3005 | McKenzie Watershed Alliance | Lower South Fork McKenzie River Valley Reconnection Project Phase 3 | The goal of the project is to restore the physical, chemical, and biological processes that once maintained a healthy and resilient ecosystem on the lower South Fork McKenzie River. Restored natural processes will create and sustain diverse aquatic, wetland, and riparian habitats over time, benefiting numerous native species and enhancing ecosystem resilience to climate change uncertainty. | \$ 399,885 |
| 226-3001 | Institute for Applied Ecology | Habeck Oaks Prairie Restoration | The goal of this project is to restore 136 acres of pasture and timber to native prairie that provides resources for wildlife and supports rare, threatened, and endangered species. | \$ 552,023 |
| 226-3004 | Upper Willamette SWCD | Bear Creek Fish Passage Expansion | Restore fish passage and ecological function in Bear Creek by removing two passage barriers to reconnect 1.3 miles of habitat, installing a roughened channel and floodplain-spanning bridge to improve hydrologic processes, and revegetating 1 acre of riparian corridor with native plants to enhance water quality, shade, and future habitat complexity. | \$ 485,000 |
| Total Restoration Projects Recommended for Funding by RRT and OWEB Staff | | | | \$ 2,322,513 |

| Projects Recommended but NOT FUNDED in Priority Order | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|--|---|------------------|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Requested |
| 226-3006 | Metro | Eagle Creek Oak Habitat Recovery Project | Restore native plant communities, hydrology, and ecosystem processes by restoring (a) 145 acres of oak woodland with mixed-age oaks, 30–65% canopy cover, native understory, downed and standing dead wood, and minimal roads; (b) 125 acres of oak savanna with up to 20% oak canopy, a grass and forb-rich understory, and can be managed with fire and has infrastructure removed; (c) 18 acres of wetlands that support native amphibians and improved water quality for the Clackamas River. | \$ 558,300 |
| 226-3012 | North Santiam WC | Breitenbush Stage 0 Floodplain Reconnection: Rebuilding Ecological Function After Wildfire | Restore 40 acres of historic floodplain and 0.7 river mile to provide a complex mosaic of in-stream and riparian habitat for all native species. | \$ 593,793 |
| 226-3013 | Pudding River WC | Aamodt Dam Removal Implementation | The goal of this project is to allow year-round fish passage on Rock Creek and open up access to upstream juvenile spawning/rearing habitat and cold water refugia. | \$ 259,971 |
| 226-3015 | Middle Fork Willamette WC | Sand Prairie Floodplain Restoration & Northwest Pond Turtle Habitat Enhancement | The goal of the Sand Prairie Floodplain Restoration project is to restore hydrologic processes and ecological function to the Middle Fork Willamette River by reconnecting approximately one river mile to its historic floodplain across 175 acres, returning dynamism to the floodplain and associated side channel and pond habitats to improve habitat availability and quality for key species of concern including spring Chinook, bull trout, northwest pond turtles. | \$ 216,540 |

| Projects NOT RECOMMENDED for Funding by RRT | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|--|------------------|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Amount Requested |
| 226-3002 | Institute for Applied Ecology | Restoring Nesting Habitat for Northwestern Pond Turtle | \$ 355,256 |
| 226-3007 | Coast Fork Willamette WC | Salyers Family Ranch: Oak Woodland Restoration Phase 3 | \$ 340,069 |
| 226-3009 | Calapooia WC | Albany Oxbows Floodplain Habitat Restoration | \$ 300,490 |
| 226-3011 | Washington County LUT | Campbell Creek Culvert Replacement | \$ 1,262,700 |

Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board: Region 3 Restoration, Technical Assistance, Monitoring and Engagement

| | | | | |
|----------|-------------------------|---|----|---------|
| 226-3014 | Abbot of Trappist Abbey | Abbey Restoration | \$ | 187,741 |
| 226-3016 | City of Sherwood | Former Frontier Leather Tannery Wetland Restoration | \$ | 500,000 |

Region 3 - Willamette Basin Technical Assistance

| Projects RECOMMENDED for Funding in Priority Order | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Recommended |
| 226-3019 | Clackamas River Basin Council | Upper Clear Creek Large Wood Enhancement | The goal of the technical assistance is to take the project from the current concept level to a ready-to-bid stage. We intend to have fully developed plans identifying the specific locations and numbers of logs, project extents and prescriptions for addressing riparian health, expected costs and budgets, and all designs, permits, and permissions needed to implement the project. | \$ 150,243 |
| 226-3018 | Benton SWCD | Project Development on Private Oak Lands in Benton County | The goal of the technical assistance provided in this proposal is to develop projects that will restore, conserve, and enhance high-quality oak habitat on private lands in Benton County. | \$ 32,736 |
| 226-3023 | Marion County Public Works | Advancing Riparian Restoration through Strategic Shade Assessment in Marion County | To identify and prioritize riparian areas across the Pudding River, Claggett Creek, and North Santiam watersheds where restoration will reduce stream temperatures, improve habitat conditions, and support future implementation of riparian shade projects. | \$ 142,888 |
| 226-3025 | Farmers Conservation Alliance (FCA) | Lacomb Irrigation District Fish Screen and Main Canal Improvement - 30 Percent Design Project | Develop 30% designs for improving Lacomb Irrigation District's fish screen facility and the first 3.5 miles of the District's Main Canal and fish screen facility in a manner that enhances conditions for resident and anadromous fish and their habitat in Crabtree Creek while improving District operations. | \$ 228,989 |
| Total Technical Assistance Projects Recommended for Funding by RRT and OWEB Staff | | | | \$ 554,856 |

| Projects Recommended but NOT FUNDED in Priority Order | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|---|--|------------------|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Requested |
| 226-3024 | Mt Hood Community College | Kelly Creek Restoration Project: Final Design | The goal of the Technical Assistance requested is to complete final design and permitting for the Kelly Creek Restoration Project, so implementation of the cornerstone project to address habitat limiting factors in the Beaver Creek watershed can begin in 2027. | \$ 495,472 |
| 226-3017 | Clackamas County | Upper Sandy River Channel Migration Phase II Mitigation Feasibility Study- Clackamas County | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal 1: Reestablish a self-sustaining, dynamic floodplain that expands cold water and near shore habitat suitable for spawning, rearing, and overwintering of ESA listed Steelhead, Coho, and Chinook populations. • Goal 2: Reduce stream energy at channel margins and/or water surface elevations during high water events to better manage erosion hazards within the project area. • Goal 3: Create backwater and riparian habitat suitable for native bird and amphibian species | \$ 71,246 |
| 226-3022 | Middle Fork Willamette WC | Island Park Slough GSI & Restoration Feasibility Study | The goal of the Island Park Slough (IPS) Feasibility Study is to determine the feasibility, select preferred restoration approaches, and develop preliminary cost estimates for Green Stormwater Infrastructure (GSI) projects and Island Slough restoration zones identified through the 2024 Stakeholder Engagement process. The IPS Feasibility Study will result in 30% design iterations for GSI projects and an Island Park Slough Restoration Priority and Phasing Plan to inform restoration implementation. | \$ 74,987 |

| Projects NOT RECOMMENDED for Funding by RRT | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|------------------|--|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Amount Requested | |
| 226-3020 | Ducks Unlimited Inc | South Yamhill Floodplain Conservation Area: Wetland and Channel Restoration Project | \$ 116,968 | |
| 226-3021 | Tualatin River WC | The Williams Creek Habitat Complexity and Cold Water Storage Project | \$ 70,752 | |
| 226-3026 | Farmers Conservation Alliance (FCA) | TVID System Evaluation and Preliminary Design Project | \$ 167,206 | |

| Region 3 - Willamette Basin Engagement | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|-----------------------|
| Projects RECOMMENDED for Funding in Priority Order | | | | |
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Recommended |
| 226-3035 | North Clackamas Urban Watershed's Council | Kellogg Dam Removal Landowner Engagement in Final Design | This engagement will bring landowners into the larger Kellogg Project design process and its multiple benefits for native fish populations and stream health. It will 1) ensure concerns are addressed early in the design process, and 2) set the stage for negotiation of construction access agreements, restoration on parts of their property, and possible purchase of easements/fee simple by Metro & the City. It will also prevent last-minute objections from delay/derail the once-in-a-generation project | \$ 172,972 |
| Total Engagement Projects Recommended for Funding by RRT and OWEB Staff | | | | \$ 172,972 |

| Projects Recommended but NOT FUNDED in Priority Order | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|--|---|------------------|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Requested |
| 226-3037 | Institute for Applied Ecology | Mid-Valley Prescribed Burn Association | This project will engage landowners and management organizations about the need for and logistics of prescribed fire in the Mid-Willamette Valley through events, workshops, site visits, and meetings. This will develop the MVPBA into a resourced network that can sustainably carry out multiple burns each year, thus increasing the quality and quantity of prairie and oak ecosystems with native diversity, and their resilience to conversion/degradation over time. | \$ 83,134 |
| 226-3038 | Oregon Agricultural Trust | Engaging Central Willamette Valley Landowners to Protect Land and Restore Oak Habitat | The goal of engagement is to encourage ag landowners with associated oak habitat to voluntarily engage in conservation programs to protect their land from development and the loss of ag and oak habitat conservation values. OAT can hold ag easements, but will refer landowners to other easement holders in case there is a better fit. We will also refer landowners interested in oak habitat restoration to the right organization, and encourage all landowners to convey cultural access agreements | \$ 89,962 |
| 226-3040 | Coast Fork Willamette WC | Engaging Neighbors in Restoring Fish, Flow, and Habitat Connectivity in the Hill Creek Watershed | The engagement aims to build trust with landowners and work with agency stakeholders to assess 4.5 miles of Hill Creek for future restoration. The project will use site visits, maps, and meetings to communicate the need, feasibility, and benefits of reconnecting the stream. Expected outcomes include improved fish passage, restored riparian habitat, better flow regimes, and enhanced water quality and quantity, supporting native species and watershed resilience in the Willamette Valley | \$ 49,215 |
| 226-3036 | Clean Water Services | Landscape Action to Address Environmental Stressors in the Tualatin River Watershed | The goal of the engagement is to communicate the need, feasibility, and benefits of future projects that will connect habitats and restore a healthy tree canopy. Through targeted outreach with trusted messengers in 6 priority geographies, the engagement will help identify locally supported, nature-based solutions. Outcomes will guide near-future projects that protect or restore native fish and wildlife habitat and enhance natural watershed functions for improved water quality and streamflow | \$ 216,379 |

| Projects NOT RECOMMENDED for Funding by RRT | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|------------------|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Amount Requested |
| 226-3039 | Greater Yamhill Watershed Council | Chehalem Mountain Groundwater Stakeholder Engagement | \$ 34,505 |
| 226-3041 | Marys River WC | Floodplains in Waiting: Developing Partnerships for Mid-Willamette Mainstem Restoration | \$ 243,956 |

| Region 3 - Willamette Basin Monitoring | | | | |
|--|---------|---------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Projects RECOMMENDED for Funding in Priority Order | | | | |
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Recommended |

Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board: Region 3 Restoration, Technical Assistance, Monitoring and Engagement

| | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|---|--|-------------------|
| 226-3033 | Middle Fork Willamette WC | EBSP Floodplain Restoration Pre-Implementation Monitoring | The goal of pre-implementation monitoring is to gather baseline conditions data to evaluate the effectiveness of process-based restoration focusing on biophysical parameters—vegetation, geomorphic, and hydrologic – to help quantify the extent, distribution, and complexity of aquatic, wetland, and riparian habitats created or influenced by restoration actions at EBSP. | \$ 197,830 |
| 226-3028 | Long Tom WC | Monitoring Green Stormwater Infrastructure to Enhance Water Quality | This pilot will collect and analyze a suite of water quality data from the influent and effluent of GSI facilities to aid regional understanding of the relative effectiveness of existing combinations of design features under real-world conditions in removing pollutants that impair water quality in order to protect drinking water, native fish, and overall ecosystem health. Results will guide design, maintenance, and long-term GSI monitoring strategy regionally. | \$ 123,498 |
| Total Monitoring Projects Recommended for Funding by RRT and OWEB Staff | | | | \$ 321,328 |


| Projects Recommended but NOT FUNDED in Priority Order | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|---|---|-------------------------|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Requested |
| 226-3029 | Institute for Applied Ecology | Effectiveness Monitoring of Prairie and Oak Woodland Restoration in the West Eugene Wetlands 2025 | The goals of this project are to 1) assess the effectiveness of restoration actions undertaken to restore 5 sites (see Project Map) comprising approximately 124 acres of prairie and oak habitat in the West Eugene Wetlands to support the recovery of Bureau-sensitive and state-listed T&E plant species, and 2) to inform adaptive management of these species at these and similar sites. | \$ 122,634 |
| 226-3027 | Marys River WC | Marys River Watershed Council Monitoring Phase 2 | This project intends to collect stream temperature data in both existing and new monitoring stations, stream flow characteristics, and eDNA data in streams around the Marys River watershed to inform local restoration project prioritization, design, and implementation in line with local planning efforts. We aim to gather information about stream water quality (temperature) and aquatic species presence (eDNA) to prioritize future restoration projects by potential impact. | \$ 174,513 |
| 226-3030 | Institute for Applied Ecology | Effectiveness Monitoring of Habitat Restoration Actions at Hagg Lake | The goals of this project are to 1) assess the effectiveness of restoration actions undertaken to improve prairie habitat and increase the populations and spatial extent of Fender's blue butterfly and Kincaid's lupine at Hagg Lake, 2) measure the progress of these species to achieve delisting, and 3) inform adaptive management of these species at these and similar sites. | \$ 99,637 |
| 226-3034 | Institute for Applied Ecology | Monitoring Restored Nesting Habitat for Northwestern Pond Turtle | The goals of this project are to 1) assess the effectiveness of restoration actions undertaken to restore 66 acres of NWPT nesting habitat at nine sites in the Willamette Valley to support the recovery of an Oregon Conservation Strategy Species proposed in 2023 for federal listing under the Endangered Species Act, and 2) inform adaptive management for NWPT conservation at these sites and for other sites across the species' range. | \$ 325,385 |

| Projects NOT RECOMMENDED for Funding by RRT | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Amount Requested |
| 226-3031 | Bird Alliance of Oregon | Birds as indicators for habitat restoration and connectivity along the Willamette River | \$ 289,134 |
| 226-3032 | Greater Yamhill Watershed Council | Chehalem Mountain Groundwater Level Monitoring - Yamhill County | \$ 43,585 |

| | |
|--|--------------------|
| Region 3 Total OWEB Staff Recommended Board Award | \$3,371,669 |
|--|--------------------|

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| Region 1 - 6 Grand Total OWEB Staff Recommended Board Award | \$18,669,538 |
|--|---------------------|

Central Oregon - Region 4 Summer 2025 Funding Recommendations



C:\Users\willspk\GIS C Drive\GIS_Files_on_Z_Drive\Projects\Review Team Meetings\2025SummerCycle\NAD 1983 Oregon Statewide Lambert (Intl Feet) 12/3/2025 1:55 PM

Funding Recommendation

●

Staff Recommendation For Funding (SRF)

●

Below Funding Line (BFL)

Previous Grants 1998 - Fall 2024

■

Land Acquisition

◆

Restoration

▲

Region 4 Cities

—

Region 4 Streams

▮

OWEB Region 4 Boundary




OREGON
WATERSHED
ENHANCEMENT BOARD

775 Summer St, NE Suite 360
Salem, OR 97301-1290
(503) 986-0178

<https://www.Oregon.gov/OWEB/>

This product is for information purposes, and may not be suitable for legal, engineering or surveying purposes. This information or data is provided with the understanding that conclusions drawn from such information are the responsibility of the user.



| Region 4 - Central Oregon Restoration | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|-----------------------|
| Projects RECOMMENDED for Funding in Priority Order | | | | |
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Recommended |
| 226-4005 | Lakeview SWCD | Upper Chewaucan SIA - South Creek Restoration Phase2 | Our goal is to open up fish passage for the endemic Chewaucan redband trout. The South Creek channel downstream from weir will be raised to distribute 6 ft of fall over a longer channel profile. Adjacent floodplain will be shaped to for flood event overbank flows, with streambank bioengineering on the roughened channel edge. The reconstructed floodplain will be planted with willows. Meadow connectivity and riparian restoration will increase and complement Phase 1 restoration. | \$ 455,920 |
| 226-4009 | Hood River WS Group | Powerdale River Mile 3 Habitat Enhancement Project | The overall goal of the project is to improve aquatic habitat and ecological functions that support ESA listed salmon and steelhead populations, as well as other native fish that utilize the mainstem. Specific goals include increasing and restoring off-channel rearing and spawning habitat and reducing peak flows in the mainstem by reestablishing floodplain and side channel connectivity. | \$ 396,258 |
| 226-4001 | Klamath Watershed Partnership | Bluemile Cross-Boundary Landscape Restoration | The project will provide time-sensitive alignment of private land health and resiliency treatments with federal efforts, creating 182,000+ acres of phased treatments in dry-type forests that may be maintained through prescribed fire. Ecosystem condition will be restored by 1) thinning overstocked forests to site appropriate densities, 2) enhancing the structure and function of meadow and aspen systems, and 3) strategically mitigating the risk of catastrophic wildfire across the landscape. | \$ 256,965 |
| 226-4004 | Jefferson SWCD | Little Trout Creek Habitat Improvement Project - Phase 2 | The restoration aims to restore natural stream and floodplain processes along 1.7 miles of Little Trout Creek, supporting summer steelhead recovery and improving habitat for aquatic and riparian species. By reconstructing the channel and enhancing the floodplain, we seek to improve floodplain connectivity, reduce sediment, increase instream habitat, lower temperatures, and foster healthy riparian vegetation, benefiting spawning and rearing habitat and boosting fish populations. | \$ 326,770 |
| 226-4006 | Lake County Umbrella Watershed Council | Cougar Peak Post Fire Restoration - Continued | The goal of the Cougar Peak Post-Fire Restoration Project is to continue to mitigate the negative effects of post-fire sedimentation and channel incision on four priority stream channels to promote natural fluvial processes that ultimately lead to the development a healthy and dynamic aquatic ecosystem. | \$ 338,091 |
| 226-4002 | Crooked River WC | Improving Habitat and Landscape Resilience in the Upper Prineville Reservoir Watershed | The project goal is to restore degraded upland habitat and improve rangeland resiliency, reduce wildfire fuels, improve watershed health, and work with the landowner to apply best management practices that will bolster the long-term sustainability of their operations and meet conservation objectives. At project completion, the sagebrush ecosystem will see improved habitat for wildlife, most notably, Mule Deer and Rocky Mountain Elk, while also improving the ranching operations. | \$ 229,672 |
| Total Restoration Projects Recommended for Funding by RRT and OWEB Staff | | | | \$ 2,003,676 |
| Projects Recommended but NOT FUNDED in Priority Order | | | | |
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Requested |
| 226-4003 | Crook SWCD | High Desert Shrub Steppe | Improve habitat for sagebrush-dependent species such as sage grouse, mule deer, and pronghorn by removing encroaching post-settlement western juniper on 1,900 acres (900 BLM, 1,000 private). Juniper removal restores native vegetation, enhances carbon storage, biodiversity, water availability, forage for wildlife and cattle, and reduces wildfire risk. All phases of encroachment are targeted to ensure long-term climate resilience. | \$ 295,407 |
| | | | | |
| Projects NOT RECOMMENDED for Funding by RRT | | | | |
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Amount Requested | |
| 226-4007 | Wasco SWCD | Upper Muddy Creek Rangeland Health Improvement | \$ 242,202 | |
| 226-4008 | Trout Unlimited Inc | Leonard Creek Culvert Replacement | \$ 369,059 | |
| | | | | |

| Region 4 - Central Oregon Technical Assistance | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|-----------------------|
| Projects RECOMMENDED for Funding in Priority Order | | | | |
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Recommended |
| 226-4014 | Upper Deschutes WC | Paulina Meadows-Casey Tract Restoration Design Project | The project goal is to develop restoration designs to meet primary restoration objectives, through a full range of projected flows, that will improve OSF breeding, rearing, migration, and overwintering habitat and achieve multi-species uplift where OSF habitat overlaps other key fish and wildlife species. Objectives include increasing year-round wetted areas, increasing heterogeneity in off-channel elevations, and planting desired vegetation and removing <u>undesired invasive vegetation</u> . | \$ 250,916 |
| 226-4013 | Lake County Umbrella Watershed Council | Thomas Creek Fish Passage V - Planning and Design | The goal of the Technical Assistance for this project site is to develop 60–90% design plans and prepare compliance documentation to advance the site toward full implementation. The project aims to enable fish passage upstream of the irrigation diversion, allowing native fish to access critical spawning, rearing, and cold-water refuge habitat—ultimately supporting <u>population resilience and abundance</u> . | \$ 90,612 |
| 226-4016 | Deschutes Land Trust | Priday Ranch Middle Trout Creek Preliminary Design | The goal of this Technical Assistance request is to create a preliminary stream and floodplain restoration design that promotes physical and biological stream processes that boost spawning <u>and rearing habitats</u> for ESA-listed Middle Columbia River summer steelhead. | \$ 147,481 |
| 226-4010 | Crooked River WC | McKay Creek Enhancement TA- River Mile 3 | The goal of the Technical Assistance grant is to obtain completed engineered design plans that have been fully approved and vetted by all stakeholders (USFS, ODFW, Engineer, and landowner) and to obtain permits that will authorize restoration work. At the completion of this Technical Assistance grant, the Crooked River Watershed Council will have obtained stamped engineered design plans along with permits that will allow us to apply for a <u>restoration grant to implement the shovel-ready work</u> . | \$ 169,091 |
| Total Technical Assistance Projects Recommended for Funding by RRT and OWEB Staff | | | | \$ 658,100 |

| Projects Recommended but NOT FUNDED in Priority Order | | | | |
|---|----------------|--|--|------------------|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Requested |
| 226-4017 | Jefferson SWCD | Upper Willow Creek Habitat Enhancement | The goal is to develop an engineered design plan, fully permit in-water works and prepare for the implementation stage of restoring over a 2-mile stretch of Willow Creek. This project will restore habitat functions of the highly degraded stream channel and associated riparian area <u>while preventing direct impacts from cattle</u> . | \$ 171,861 |

| Projects NOT RECOMMENDED for Funding by RRT | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|--|------------------|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Amount Requested |
| 226-4011 | Crook SWCD | Paulina's Beaver Creek Enhancement | \$ 84,075 |
| 226-4012 | Institute for Applied Ecology | Oregon Native Seed Strategy Business Plan Development | \$ 162,744 |
| 226-4015 | Wasco SWCD | Fifteenmile Managed Underground Storage Pilot Testing 2026 | \$ 275,125 |

| Region 4 - Central Oregon Engagement | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|---|---|-----------------------|
| Projects RECOMMENDED for Funding in Priority Order | | | | |
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Recommended |
| 226-4022 | Fort Rock/Silver Lake SWCD | Partnership for Lake Abert and the Chewaucan: Landowner, Tribes, and Community Engagement | The goal of the Engagement is for private landowners, Tribes, public agencies, environmental organizations, and residents in the Chewaucan watershed to 1) have a shared understanding of community and ecosystem water needs, 2) understand what it will take to withstand drought years for both the ecosystem and agriculture, and 3) understand how various restoration and water management actions affect ecological health of Lake Abert and the entire Chewaucan <u>River watershed</u> . | \$ 81,788 |
| Total Engagement Projects Recommended for Funding by RRT and OWEB Staff | | | | \$ 81,788 |

| Projects Recommended but NOT FUNDED in Priority Order | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|--|---|------------------|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Requested |
| 226-4023 | Inquiring Systems Inc | Expanding Beaver Conservation on Eastern Oregon Working Landscapes | To increase Community Readiness for beaver-based restoration and, ultimately, the number of successfully completed and shovel-ready projects first across four priority areas of Eastern Oregon while laying the groundwork for adjacent communities. This will be achieved through coordinated strategies that SUPPORT practitioners with training, PUSH tools and resources to agencies for landowner engagement, and PULL landowners into contacting local agencies to pursue beaver-compatible restoration. | \$ 144,520 |

| Projects NOT RECOMMENDED for Funding by RRT | | | | |
|---|---------|---------------|------------------|--|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Amount Requested | |
| | | N/A | | |

| Region 4 - Central Oregon Monitoring | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--------------------|
| Projects RECOMMENDED for Funding in Priority Order | | | | |
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Recommended |
| 226-4020 | OSU Office of Sponsored Research & Award Admin | Armstrong - Defining salmonid-relevant water quality thresholds in Upper Klamath Lake | The goal of this project is to compile, collect and analyze monitoring data to understand how water quality conditions in Upper Klamath Lake influence salmonid habitat use. We will integrate complementary datasets on refuge movements to develop indicators of habitat suitability. | \$ 297,121 |
| 226-4018 | Upper Deschutes WC | 2026-2027 Whychus Creek Restoration Effectiveness Monitoring | The goal of the proposed monitoring is to integrate water temperature, flow, and climate data into a real-time water temperature forecast model that alerts water managers and restoration partners to forecasted exceedances at RM6 and supports future development of specific plans of action to responsively increase flow to avert forecasted exceedances; and to collect continuous temperature and macroinvertebrate data to evaluate and inform stream flow and habitat restoration effectiveness. | \$ 264,697 |
| Total Monitoring Projects Recommended for Funding by RRT and OWEB Staff | | | | \$ 561,818 |


| Projects Recommended but NOT FUNDED in Priority Order | | | | |
|---|--------------------|---|---|------------------|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Requested |
| 226-4021 | Upper Deschutes WC | Monitoring Oregon Spotted Frog and Wetland Habitat Restoration in the Upper Deschutes Basin | Our goal is to build information that enables USFWS, BLM, USFS, and State and non-profit land managers to evaluate recently implemented restoration and inform planning for upcoming restoration projects toward Recovery of the threatened OSF and their wetland habitats, including baseline data collection in reaches slated for restoration. | \$ 481,021 |
| 226-4019 | Crooked River WC | Lower Crooked Trend & Analysis- Baseline 2 | The goal of the project is to provide monitoring of instream and riparian habitat ecological outcomes that are the result of multi-year passive and active restoration actions throughout the project reach using water quality data as baseline reference. We will generate and submit high-quality data that can be used to consistently compare changes attributed to future restoration actions and can be used by state agencies in their water quality programs (total maximum daily loading, for example). | \$ 85,974 |

| Projects NOT RECOMMENDED for Funding by RRT | | | | |
|---|---------|---------------|------------------|--|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Amount Requested | |
| | | N/A | | |

| | |
|---|-------------|
| Region 4 Total OWEB Staff Recommended Board Award | \$3,305,382 |
|---|-------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Region 1 - 6 Grand Total OWEB Staff Recommended Board Award | \$18,669,538 |
|---|--------------|

Eastern Oregon - Region 5 Summer 2025 Funding Recommendations



C:\Users\willspk\GIS C Drive\GIS_Files_on_Z_Drive\Projects\Review Team Meetings\2025SummerCycle\
NAD 1983 Oregon Statewide Lambert (Intl Feet) 12/3/2025 2:20 PM

Funding Recommendation

- Staff Recommendation For Funding (SRF)

- Below Funding Line (BFL)

Previous Grants 1998 - Fall 2024

- Land Acquisition

- ◆ Restoration

- ▲ Region 5 Cities

- Region 5 Streams

- OWEB Region 5 Boundary




OREGON
WATERSHED
ENHANCEMENT BOARD

775 Summer St, NE Suite 360
Salem, OR 97301-1290
(503) 986-0178

<https://www.Oregon.gov/OWEB/>

This product is for information purposes, and may not be suitable for legal, engineering or surveying purposes. This information or data is provided with the understanding that conclusions drawn from such information are the responsibility of the user.



| Region 5 - Eastern Oregon Restoration | | | | |
|---|-------------------|--|--|-----------------------|
| Projects RECOMMENDED for Funding in Priority Order | | | | |
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Recommended |
| 226-5017 | Malheur WC | The Malheur Needs Wood To Be Good Implementation | The overall goal of this project is to improve the complexity, connectivity, and habitat value of this section of the Malheur River for aquatic species such as Bull Trout. Improve the hydrologic function of historic side channels and protect vegetation and habitat. | \$ 399,094 |
| 226-5005 | Malheur WC | From Sages to Sedges: Summit Creek Phase II | Improve watershed and wildfire resiliency across approximately 500 acres of Summit Creek valley bottom and adjacent uplands by thinning overstocked timber stands, using wood to create instream and floodplain structures, and redistributing alluvial fill material to raise incised channels. Restore 4.75 miles of degraded instream habitat by increasing lateral and vertical connectivity, raising the water table, promoting riparian hardwood cover, and restoring depositional processes. | \$ 639,186 |
| 226-5008 | Powder Basin WC | Run, Bull, Run! | Using stage-zero restoration techniques, channel reconstruction, large wood placements, riparian plantings, and enclosure fencing: restore surface flow and stream function throughout the 1.0-mile Bull Run Creek project reach to reconnect 4.6-miles of aquatic habitat for Columbia Basin redband trout, to expand and enhance complex aquatic, riparian, and wetland habitats for fish and wildlife, and to increase watershed resiliency to climate change impacts. | \$ 493,556 |
| 226-5018 | Wallowa Resources | Integrated Weed Management for Restoration Resilience in Bear/Lostine Watersheds | The goal of this project is to improve watershed health and resilience in the Bear Creek and Lostine watersheds by reducing noxious weeds in upland and riparian areas, restoring native vegetation, and enhancing habitat connectivity for mule deer, whitetail deer, and elk, while promoting soil health and sustainable land use across public and private lands. | \$ 143,089 |
| 226-5002 | Keating SWCD | Grange Lane Water Improvement | The goal of the Grange Lane Water Improvement Project is to improve water quality by eliminating flood irrigation runoff from entering the Powder River. This will be accomplished by converting 60 acres of flood irrigated ground to a more efficient pivot sprinkler system, wheel lines and k-line while also fencing off the irrigation ditch to restrict livestock access. Reducing flood irrigation runoff on 60 acres of pasture ground can directly improve water quality parameters addressed in DEQ's S (project goal truncated, please reference full application) | \$ 165,802 |
| 226-5006 | Powder Basin WC | Uplifting Anthony Creek for Native Trout and Beaver: Implementation | The goal of the project is to reconnect Anthony Creek with its historic floodplain, restore 78 acres of riparian and floodplain habitats, improve water quality, improve aquatic habitat for native trout (Bull Trout and Columbia Basin redband trout) and Columbia spotted frog along 1.3 miles of Anthony Creek and create conditions to encourage recolonization by beaver. | \$ 484,604 |
| Total Restoration Projects Recommended for Funding by RRT and OWEB Staff | | | | \$ 2,325,331 |

| Projects Recommended but NOT FUNDED in Priority Order | | | | |
|---|------------------|---|---|------------------|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Requested |
| 226-5013 | Malheur SWCD | Boon for the Malheur River II | This project aims to meet the allocation loads outlined in the Malheur River Basin Agricultural Water Quality Management Area Plan from January 2015, specifically section 2.3.5 on Basin TMDLs and Agricultural Load Allocations. By converting 114 acres from furrow irrigation to a zero-runoff system, we can significantly improve the watershed conditions in the Malheur River, reducing sediments, nutrients, and E. coli in the water. | \$ 121,718 |
| 226-5004 | Malheur WC | Just South of Bully Creek Reservoir Water Quality Improvement | The goal of this project is to improve water quality by eliminating the irrigation return flows from this property. This will be accomplished through the conversion of 144.2 acres from flood to sprinkler irrigation. The property drains between 2,600 and 3,600 ft away into Bully Creek. This means that Bully Creek, the Malheur River, and Snake River will be impacted by the installation of this system. | \$ 121,942 |
| 226-5001 | Burnt River SWCD | Bull Run Creek Irrigation Improvement | To improve water use, irrigation efficiency and water quality conditions in the Burnt River Watershed by converting from flood to sprinkler on 113 acres at the project site, eliminating flood irrigation runoff, as well as eliminating the ongoing soil erosion, sedimentation and ditch loss by piping and/or decommissioning the open earthen irrigation ditches. | \$ 295,654 |

Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board: Region 5 Restoration, Technical Assistance, Monitoring and Engagement

| | | | | |
|----------|------------------------|---|--|------------|
| 226-5014 | Owyhee WC | Roadside Water Quality Improvement Project | The primary goal of the Road Side Water Quality Improvement Project is to improve water quality in the Owyhee and Snake River watersheds by converting 115 acres of flood-furrow irrigated cropland to efficient sprinkler irrigation. This involves installing 1 pivot, Certa set solid sprinklers, underground pipelines, settling pond, and a pressurized pump system to eliminate tailwater runoff carrying sediment, nutrients, and bacteria, enhancing habitat and increasing climate resilience. | \$ 203,231 |
| 226-5015 | Owyhee WC | Plumb Bob Water Quality Improvement_CLONE | The goal of the Plumb Bob Water Quality Improvement project is to convert 96 acres from flood to sprinkler irrigation and eliminate tailwater containing sediment, nutrients, and bacteria from flowing off the project site through the Plummer Slough then into the Snake River. Implementation of this project will address non-point source pollutants contributing to poor water quality, and improve fish/aquatic life and contact recreation beneficial uses in the Snake River. | \$ 236,547 |
| 226-5003 | Eagle Valley SWCD | Boulder Flat Irrigation Phase 2 | The primary objective of the Boulder Flat Irrigation Phase 2 project is to build upon the successes achieved in Phase 1 by enhancing water efficiency, improving water quality, and improving fish habitat in both Clear Creek and Pine Creek. This phase aims to convert 64 acres of pasture ground into a more sustainable use, while also providing off-channel livestock watering solutions. Through these efforts, we seek to promote ecological health and support local wildlife, thereby fostering a balance (<i>project goal truncated, please reference full application</i>). | \$ 174,404 |
| 226-5010 | Malheur SWCD | Double the Money/Double The Benefits | The objective of this project is to eliminate irrigation runoff from 80 acres of farmland, switching from traditional flood irrigation to a sprinkler system to prevent any runoff. By stopping runoff that carries sediment and nutrients into Willow Creek, the Malheur River. The project will significantly reduce erosion, improve water quality, and contribute to enhanced air quality and soil health. Therefore, it will reduce erosion, improve water quality, air quality, and soil health. | \$ 101,132 |
| 226-5007 | The Nature Conservancy | Downey Lake Wetland Restoration | The overall goal of this project is to enhance ecosystem function and process of the unique and high value Downey Lake wetland/upland complex. An important element of this project is the return of gathering culturally significant plants by Native American tribal members. The landowner has in the past hosted these gatherings, and looks forward to continuing to do so in the future, at a site that has much greater viability than what exists under the current conditions. | \$ 131,307 |
| 226-5016 | Owyhee WC | Dirt Road Water Quality Improvement Project | Convert 55 acres of flood irrigated farmland to sprinkler irrigation to eliminate irrigation tailwater runoff containing sediment, nutrients, and bacteria from entering the Kingman Drain and ultimately the Snake River. Addressing these water quality limiting factors will enhance aquatic habitat and improve overall stream health. | \$ 55,619 |
| 226-5012 | Malheur SWCD | HawkEye v2 Revised | The goal of the proposed project is to reduce irrigation runoff in the Morgan Bench Priority Area, which contains nutrients and E. coli, from the irrigation systems that feed into the Malheur River and the Snake River through irrigation conversion on 94 acres. | \$ 122,589 |

| Projects NOT RECOMMENDED for Funding by RRT | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|------------------|--------|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Amount Requested | |
| 226-5009 | EcoSource Native Seed and Restoration | Continuing Sagebrush Restoration Within The Miller Homestead Fire Perimeter | \$ | 73,500 |
| 226-5011 | Malheur SWCD | Circling Loop Road | \$ | 71,051 |

| Region 5 - Eastern Oregon Technical Assistance | | | | |
|--|-------------------|---|--|--------------------|
| Projects RECOMMENDED for Funding in Priority Order | | | | |
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Recommended |
| 226-5020 | Wallowa Resources | Wallowa Valley Improvement Canal Fish Passage and Irrigation Efficiency Project | There are two primary goals of this TA: 1.) Provide a comprehensive look at fish passage needs throughout the canal including final designs for the major points of diversion and potential solutions for all captured tributaries, and 2.) complete an assessment of the irrigation canal and provide alternatives for efficiency to increase water savings within the affected watersheds while still meeting the needs of the irrigators. | \$ 177,548 |

Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board: Region 5 Restoration, Technical Assistance, Monitoring and Engagement

| | | | | |
|--|----------------------------------|--|---|-------------------|
| 226-5021 | Grande Ronde Model WS Foundation | Shaw Creek Culvert Replacement- Technical Assistance | The goal of this Technical Assistance project is to develop a complete, permit-ready design that includes the replacement of one perched, undersized culvert and the removal of another on Shaw Creek. The scope of work includes evaluating design alternatives, conducting detailed site assessments, and completing all necessary environmental, cultural, and regulatory reviews to ensure the project is fully compliant with permitting and consultation requirements. This work will result in a shovel-ready (<i>project goal truncated, please reference full application</i>) | \$ 57,615 |
| Total Technical Assistance Projects Recommended for Funding by RRT and OWEB Staff | | | | \$ 235,163 |

| Projects Recommended but NOT FUNDED in Priority Order | | | | |
|---|------------|---|---|------------------|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Requested |
| 226-5019 | Malheur WC | Gotta Gear Up To Deal With Sutter Creek | <p>The goal of this TA is to develop a feasibility analysis that provides a survey, standard design, potential restoration techniques, yardages, and a discussion of alternatives. The selected alternative must be cost effective and give us reasonable assurance that the implemented project will improve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Collection and retention of excess sediment -Maintain and improve riparian vegetation -Reduce erosion -Filter sediment and nutrients -Address post fire conditions -Improve rangeland conditions | \$ 57,772 |

| Projects NOT RECOMMENDED for Funding by RRT | | | | |
|---|---------|---------------|------------------|--|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Amount Requested | |
| | | N/A | | |

| Region 5 - Eastern Oregon Engagement | | | | |
|--|-------------------|--|--|--------------------|
| Projects RECOMMENDED for Funding in Priority Order | | | | |
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Recommended |
| 226-5026 | Wallowa Resources | Cross-Boundary Monitoring Partnership & All Lands Convening for the Northern Blues | To engage landowners, Tribes, and agency partners in applying shared monitoring to guide adaptive, cross-boundary restoration. Through collaborative tools, facilitation, and the 2026 All Lands Meeting, this project will bridge data and decision-making to support fire resilience, watershed function, and project design across public, Tribal, and private lands. | \$ 106,004 |
| Total Engagement Projects Recommended for Funding by RRT and OWEB Staff | | | | \$ 106,004 |

| Projects Recommended but NOT FUNDED in Priority Order | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--------------------|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Recommended |
| 226-5025 | High Desert Partnership | Harney Groundwater Engagement 2025 | The goal of this engagement project is to facilitate discussions, enhance understanding, and develop community-based agreements to implement groundwater reductions to benefit groundwater dependent ecosystems and allow groundwater irrigators determine the mechanism for the reductions. This engagement project is a logical next step for the recently completed Harney Basin Community-Based Integrated Water Resource Plan. | \$ 107,580 |

| Projects NOT RECOMMENDED for Funding by RRT | | | | |
|---|---------|---------------|------------------|--|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Amount Requested | |
| | | N/A | | |

| Region 5 - Eastern Oregon Monitoring | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|---|--|-----------------------|
| Projects RECOMMENDED for Funding in Priority Order | | | | |
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Recommended |
| 226-5023 | Powder Basin WC | Powder Basin Project Effectiveness Monitoring 2026-2028 | We are looking to improve the planning, design, and implementation of restoration projects in the Powder Basin by identifying their shortcomings and successes and applying these lessons to future projects. This will be accomplished by monitoring restoration project outcomes related to stream morphology and function, vegetation productivity and composition, stream flow permanence and temperature, fish composition and abundance, beaver activity, and LTPBR structure impacts. | \$ 213,229 |
| 226-5022 | High Desert Partnership | Oregon Rangeland Monitoring Project 2025 | The goal of this project is to collect post-treatment metrics measuring ecological condition and vegetation composition on SOWR restoration efforts and compare them to previously collected pre-treatment data to provide pertinent information to SOWR project partners, other restoration practitioners, researchers, land managers, funders and policy-makers on the success of rangeland restoration projects in increasing the quantity and quality of sagebrush habitat in Oregon's rangelands. | \$ 540,986 |
| Total Monitoring Projects Recommended for Funding by RRT and OWEB Staff | | | | \$ 754,215 |

| Projects Recommended but NOT FUNDED in Priority Order | | | | |
|---|---------|---------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Recommended |
| N/A | | | | |

| Projects NOT RECOMMENDED for Funding by RRT | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|--|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Amount Requested | |
| 226-5024 | High Desert Partnership | Harney Springs Monitoring 2025 | \$ 155,295 | |

| | |
|---|-------------|
| Region 5 Total OWEB Staff Recommended Board Award | \$3,420,713 |
|---|-------------|

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Region 1 - 6 Grand Total OWEB Staff Recommended Board Award | \$18,669,538 |
|---|--------------|

Mid-Columbia - Region 6 Summer 2025 Funding Recommendations



C:\Users\willspk\GIS C Drive\GIS_Files_on_Z_Drive\Projects\Review Team Meetings\2025 Summer Cycle\NAD 1983 Oregon Statewide Lambert (Intl Feet) 12/3/2025 2:20 PM

Funding Recommendation

●

Staff Recommendation For Funding (SRF)

●

Below Funding Line (BFL)

Previous Grants 1998 - Fall 2024

■

Land Acquisition

◆

Restoration

▲

Region 6 Cities

—

Region 6 Streams

▭

OWEB Region 6 Boundary



OREGON

WATERSHED

ENHANCEMENT BOARD

775 Summer St, NE Suite 360

Salem, OR 97301-1290

(503) 986-0178

<https://www.Oregon.gov/OWEB/>

This product is for information purposes, and may not be suitable for legal, engineering or surveying purposes. This information or data is provided with the understanding that conclusions drawn from such information are the responsibility of the user.



| Region 6 - Mid-Columbia Basin Restoration | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|-----------------------|
| Projects RECOMMENDED for Funding in Priority Order | | | | |
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Recommended |
| 226-6007 | South Fork John Day WC | Murderers Creek Phase 2 Implementation | The goal of this project is to: 1. Increase habitat diversity and complexity for salmonids 2. Increase the rate of channel evolution 3. Improve the riparian corridor, floodplain vegetative diversity and health within the project area 4. Establish channel conditions and riparian conditions that promote beaver habitat within the project area 10-years of project completion. | \$ 353,751 |
| 226-6004 | Walla Walla Basin Watershed Foundation | North Fork Walla Walla RM 5.2-6.5 Floodplain Restoration | The desired outcome of this holistic watershed restoration project is a healthy environmental condition and a properly functioning, complex, self-sustaining riverine ecosystem with an expanded, reconnected floodplain that provides suitability for all age classes of several ESA-listed salmonid species. | \$ 297,903 |
| 226-6010 | Gilliam SWCD | Hay Creek Riparian Fencing and Planting | Install 3.93 miles of riparian exclusion fencing and 28,294 native plants to protect recently completed beaver dam analog infrastructure, establish sustainable riparian vegetation, reduce livestock impacts, and create optimal conditions for Mid-Columbia steelhead habitat recovery while ensuring long-term restoration success in the Hay Creek watershed. | \$ 133,243 |
| 226-6009 | Gilliam SWCD | Big Mossy Riparian Fencing, Planting, and Livestock Distribution | Restore natural floodplain processes and cold-water habitat function across 2.0 miles of steelhead habitat and upland function through process-based restoration, riparian protection, and livestock management, establishing foundation for watershed-scale conservation on this strategically located 17,342-acre property in the Thirtymile watershed. | \$ 260,364 |
| 226-6013 | Gilliam SWCD | Upper Thirtymile Low-Tech Process-Based Restoration Phase 2 | The goal of this project is to restore and sustain perennial streamflow and high-quality instream habitat in Upper Thirtymile Creek by enhancing channel complexity, promoting floodplain connectivity, and supporting natural hydrologic and ecological processes. This work will ultimately improve habitat conditions for threatened Mid-Columbia River steelhead and increase the watershed's resilience to climate-driven stressors. | \$ 138,952 |
| 226-6002 | Mid John Day WC | Alder/Lake Creek Watershed Improvement 3 | Address watershed health issues in the Alder Creek watershed, including juniper encroachment, conifer encroachment in quaking aspen, and wildlife habitat issues presented by woven wire fencing. | \$ 219,087 |
| 226-6003 | Monument SWCD | Courtrock/Rail Ridge Fire Recovery Project | The goal of this project is to restore 933 acres of private land impacted by the 2024 Courtrock and Rail Ridge wildfires. Through mechanical and chemical site preparation and planting of native trees, the project will restore upland plant communities, reduce post-fire erosion, and minimize runoff to improve long-term watershed health and resilience. | \$ 360,399 |
| 226-6014 | North Fork John Day WC | Lower Owens Creek Planting and Fencing | Restore ecological function along Owens Creek by excluding livestock from riparian areas, reducing streambank erosion, and reestablishing native vegetation to improve water quality, reduce summer stream temperatures, and enhance habitat for native fish, including ESA-listed Mid-Columbia steelhead. | \$ 83,638 |
| 226-6001 | Umatilla SWCD | Bridge Creek Riparian Protection and Wildlife Fence Phase I | By installing 3.48 miles of riparian fence in Phase I, ODFW will begin excluding cattle from the riparian area on Bridge Creek Wildlife Area. Bacteria and sediment inputs into the stream will be reduced and riparian vegetation will have a chance to regenerate. | \$ 124,739 |
| 226-6012 | North Fork John Day WC | Camas Creek Riparian Protection Fencing | By excluding livestock from sensitive riparian zones and wet meadow habitat, this project aims to reestablish riparian shading to mitigate high summer stream temperatures—a primary limiting factor for native salmonids in the Camas Creek watershed—and to strengthen floodplain connectivity and climate resilience across the restoration site | \$ 81,232 |
| Total Restoration Projects Recommended for Funding by RRT and OWEB Staff | | | | \$ 2,053,308 |

| Projects Recommended but NOT FUNDED in Priority Order | | | | |
|---|---------------------|---|--|------------------|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Requested |
| 226-6011 | Trout Unlimited Inc | Phase 2: Bull Run Meadows Restoration Project | The overall project goal is to re-establish a connected river-wetland corridor in a degraded meadow system, restore floodplain hydrology and function, enhance climate resilience, and encourage natural habitat-forming processes for a biodiverse community of species. This meadow complex has the potential to support core habitat and corridors for species including ESA-listed steelhead and bull trout, Chinook salmon, Pacific lamprey, OR Spotted Frog, and other key native fauna and flora species. | \$ 477,845 |

Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board: Region 6 Restoration, Technical Assistance, Monitoring and Engagement

| | | | | |
|----------|------------------------|--|---|------------|
| 226-6008 | South Fork John Day WC | Aldrich Forest Resilience | The goal is to create a fire resilient, health forest ecosystem for all species on U.S. Forest Service lands while continuing cross boundary collaboration with Widows Creek Ranch, ODFW Phillip W. Schneider Wildlife Area, and Oregon Department of Forestry. | \$ 167,159 |
| 226-6006 | Morrow SWCD | Morrow County Grassland Restoration of Annual Grass-Invaded Habitat II | The goal of this project is to apply an annual grass selective herbicide to increase livestock forage, improve wildlife habitat, and create a landscape that is resilient to fire. | \$ 92,840 |
| 226-6005 | Mid John Day WC | West Branch Bridge Creek Diversion Replacement | The goal of this project is to return all flows above the legal diversion rate to the 360 ft dewatered section of West Branch Bridge Creek, provide fish passage at the diversion/culvert, reduce ditch maintenance between the diversion and the fish screen, and provide better irrigation water control. | \$ 137,320 |

| Projects NOT RECOMMENDED for Funding by RRT | | | |
|--|---------|---------------|------------------|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Amount Requested |
| N/A | | | |
| | | | |

| Region 6 - Mid-Columbia Basin Technical Assistance | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|-----------------------|
| Projects RECOMMENDED for Funding in Priority Order | | | | |
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Recommended |
| 226-6017 | Walla Walla Basin Watershed Foundation | Dry Creek and Lower Pine Creek Assessment | Develop a Subwatershed Assessment and Action Plan for Dry and Lower Pine Creeks to prioritize conservation actions that improve riparian health, aquatic organism passage, floodplain connectivity, and shallow groundwater function. Deliver at least two implementation-ready designs to support future restoration and landowner engagement. | \$ 90,978 |
| 226-6016 | Umatilla SWCD | Snipe and Owens Creek Assessment | Assess instream and floodplain restoration needs and strategies on Owens and Snipe Creeks, near Ukiah, Oregon (roughly 15-30 miles of stream), and work with the landowners to begin discussions on site potential design for regrading and eventual BDA implementation. | \$ 56,263 |
| 226-6019 | Walla Walla Basin Watershed Foundation | Dryland Agricultural Water Quality Support | Build a restoration-ready foundation for erosion control and riparian health in the dryland portions of the Walla Walla Basin by delivering site-specific technical assistance, spatial assessment, and targeted outreach. | \$ 108,414 |
| Total Technical Assistance Projects Recommended for Funding by RRT and OWEB Staff | | | | \$ 255,655 |

| Projects Recommended but NOT FUNDED in Priority Order | | | | |
|--|--------------|---|--|------------------|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Requested |
| 226-6018 | Wheeler SWCD | Connectivity, Protection, Remediation (CPR) for the Heart of Kahler Creek Watershed | This project will create a holistic multi-phased restoration effort to restore aquatic habitat and fish passage, rectify agriculture water quality concerns, and improve upland function through completing a series of design sets that complement each other to benefit wildlife habitat and watershed health. | \$ 299,916 |

| Projects NOT RECOMMENDED for Funding by RRT | | | |
|--|---------|---------------|------------------|
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Amount Requested |
| N/A | | | |
| | | | |

| Region 6 - Mid-Columbia Basin Engagement | | | | |
|--|---------------|---|--|-----------------------|
| Projects RECOMMENDED for Funding in Priority Order | | | | |
| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Recommended |
| 226-6025 | Umatilla SWCD | Water Control District Collaborative Engagement | The Water Control District Collaborative seeks to revitalize their constituents, educate and inform partners and landowners, and pave the way for future restoration projects in each watershed. | \$ 41,534 |
| Total Engagement Projects Recommended for Funding by RRT and OWEB Staff | | | | \$ 41,534 |

Projects Recommended but NOT FUNDED in Priority Order

| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Requested |
|-----------|------------------------|---|--|------------------|
| 226-6026 | South Fork John Day WC | South Fork John Day RCPP Engagement | The goal of this engagement effort is to successfully implement the South Fork John Day Watershed RCPP and subsequent restoration of the uplands | \$ 61,180 |
| 226-6024 | Umatilla SWCD | Lower Birch Creek Resoration Engagement | To identify, recruit, and work together with landowners and partners in the designated reaches to form a river restoration project(s). | \$ 58,850 |

Projects NOT RECOMMENDED for Funding by RRT

| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Amount Requested |
|-----------|---------|---------------|------------------|
| | | N/A | |

Region 6 - Mid-Columbia Basin Monitoring**Projects RECOMMENDED for Funding in Priority Order**

| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Recommended |
|--|--|---|--|-----------------------|
| 226-6022 | Monument SWCD | Cottonwood Creek Instream Restoration Response Monitoring | The goal of this monitoring is to quantify the response of smallmouth bass, juvenile steelhead, and instream water quantity to stream corridor restoration with BDAs and large wood structures. These quantitative monitoring data will then be able to inform adaptive management of planned restoration actions to maximize effectiveness within Cottonwood Creek. | \$ 332,569 |
| 226-6021 | Walla Walla Basin Watershed Foundation | Hydrologic Trend Monitoring in the Walla Walla Basin | The goal of this project is to produce accurate and reliable datasets describing groundwater levels in the alluvial aquifer and stream flows, and water temperatures in the Walla Walla River, its tributaries, and distributaries. Data will guide projects to address flow and water temperature limitations in the basin. | \$ 129,137 |
| Total Monitoring Projects Recommended for Funding by RRT and OWEB Staff | | | | \$ 461,706 |

Projects Recommended but NOT FUNDED in Priority Order

| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Project Goal (From Application) | Amount Requested |
|-----------|------------------------|---|--|------------------|
| 226-6020 | South Fork John Day WC | South Fork John Day Monitoring Strategy | Create a comprehensive monitoring strategy in which we build on past monitoring data to strengthen existing datasets, fill data gaps, and assess impacts from restoration and conservation projects, as well as establishing baseline conditions against which future changes can be measured. | \$ 61,806 |

Projects NOT RECOMMENDED for Funding by RRT

| Project # | Grantee | Project Title | Amount Requested |
|-----------|---------|---------------|------------------|
| | | N/A | |

Region 6 Total OWEB Staff Recommended Board Award**\$2,812,203****Region 1 - 6 Grand Total OWEB Staff Recommended Board****\$18,669,538**



OREGON
WATERSHED
ENHANCEMENT BOARD

Agenda Item M

Commission Appointments

Oregon Agricultural Heritage Program

January 27-28, 2026 OWEB Board Meeting

Staff report – Agenda Item M. 2026 Oregon Agricultural Heritage Commissioner Appointments

MEMORANDUM

To: Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board

From: Taylor Larson, Oregon Agricultural Heritage Program Coordinator

Renee Davis, Acquisitions and Special Programs Manager

Supports OWEB’s Strategic Plan priority #5: Increase investment connecting urban and working lands to watershed health.

I. Introduction

The Oregon Agricultural Heritage Commission (OAHC) oversees the Oregon Agricultural Heritage Program (OAHP) and makes funding recommendations to the OWEB board for all applications funded through the Oregon Agricultural Heritage Fund. The OAHC is made up of 12 members appointed by the OWEB Board (Attachment A). Due to shifting professional roles, expiring terms, and term limits, there are currently three vacancies on the OAHC. At the January 2026 meeting, staff will provide an overview of the nomination process for the three vacant seats, present the nominated candidates, and request the OWEB Board appoint candidates to fill the vacancies.

II. Background

House Bill 3249 established the OAHP and was signed into law on August 15, 2017. In January 2018 the OWEB Board appointed the first 12 members to serve on the OAHC. Voting members of the OAHC can serve no more than two consecutive terms.

Vacant OAHC Seat Representing Agriculture

Doug Krahmer has served on the OAHC, as chair, since its inception in 2018. Doug was nominated by the Board of Agriculture to serve on the commission to represent the interests of farmers and ranchers throughout the State. Doug’s second term expires in January 2026.

In coordination with Oregon Department of Agriculture (ODA), staff solicited applications to fill Doug’s seat and received three applications. The applications were shared with the Board of Agriculture and on December 5, 2025, ODA informed OWEB about the formal nomination of John Deck (Attachment B). If appointed to this seat, John would serve through January 2030 and be eligible for a second four-year term.

Vacant OAHC Seat Representing Land Conservation

Nancy Duhnkrack has served on the OAHC since January 2022. Nancy was nominated by the Land Conservation and Development Commission to serve on the commission in order

to bring her expertise in conservation easements and similar land transfers. Nancy's first term expires in January 2026 and is eligible for a second four-year term.

In coordination with staff from the Department of Land Conservation and Development, OWEB staff confirmed that Nancy is interested in serving a second term on the commission. Her letter of interest along with a current resume was provided to the Land Conservation and Development Commission, which voted at its December 5, 2025 meeting to recommend Nancy for reappointment to the OAHC (Attachment C). If appointed to this seat, Nancy would serve through January 2030 and not be eligible for a third four-year term.

Vacant OAHC Seat Representing Indian Tribal Interests

Amanda Lowe has served on the OAHC since she was appointed by the OWEB board in January 2024. Amanda informed OWEB staff in November 2025 that she would be leaving her job as Soil Conservationist with the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation for a new role with the Oregon Water Resources Department in early 2026. This shift in professional affiliation resulted in the need to recruit for the Indian tribal representative seat on OAHC.

Staff worked with OWEB's Tribal Liaison to actively reach out to Tribes to solicit applications to fill Amanda's seat and did not receive any applications. Staff will continue to recruit for this seat in order to fill the role as soon as possible. As a reminder, the OAHC Tribal Interests seat is appointed directly by the OWEB board and is eligible to serve up to two four-year terms.

III. Recommendation

Staff recommend the board appoint John Deck and Nancy Duhnkrack to the Oregon Agricultural Heritage Commission for terms ending January 1, 2030. The Tribal representative seat will be vacant as outreach continues for an interested member.

IV. Attachments

- A. Current OAHC Roster
- B. Recommendation Letter from Board of Agriculture
- C. Recommendation Letter from Land Conservation and Development Commission

OAHF Commission Members 2025

| Name | Recommending Body | Residence City | Interest Represented | Term Ending | Term Number |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Doug Krahmer | Board of Agriculture | St. Paul | Farm/Ranch | Jan 2026 | 2 |
| Amanda Lowe | OWEB Board | Pendleton | Indian tribal | Jan 2026 | 1 |
| Nancy Duhnkrack | Land Conservation & Development Comm. | Portland | Easements | Jan 2026 | 1 |
| Ed Contreras | Fish & Wildlife Comm. | Klamath Falls | Fish & Wildlife | Jan 2027 | 1 |
| Laura Masterson | Board of Agriculture | Portland | Farm/Ranch | Jan 2027 | 1 |
| Sara Evans-Peters | OWEB Board | Independence | Natural Resources | Jan 2027 | 1 |
| James Robert Collins | Board of Agriculture | Mitchell | Farm/Ranch | Jan 2028 | 1 |
| Daniel Bigelow | OSU Extension | Corvallis | OSU Extension | Jan 2028 | 1 |
| Mark Vargas | Fish & Wildlife Comm. | Medford | Fish & Wildlife | Jan 2029 | 1 |
| Jan Lee | Board of Agriculture | Sandy | Ag. Water Quality | Jan 2029 | 1 |
| John O'Keefe | Board of Agriculture | Adel | Farm/Ranch | Jan 2029 | 1 |
| Mark Labhart | OWEB Board | Sisters | Ex Officio, non-voting | *unspecified | *unspecified |



**OREGON
DEPARTMENT OF
AGRICULTURE**

Protect. Promote. Prosper.

State Board of Agriculture

635 Capitol St NE, Salem, OR 97301-2532

503.986.4552 | Oregon.gov/ODA

December 9, 2025

Chair Barbara Boyer
Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board
775 Summer St. NE #360
Salem, OR 97301

RE: Oregon Agricultural Heritage Commission

Dear Chair Boyer,

The Board of Agriculture reviewed the applications received for the upcoming vacancy on the Oregon Agricultural Heritage Commission (OAHC) at the quarterly meeting on December 5, 2025. It is our understanding that the second term for Doug Krahmer (farmer/rancher) is expiring as of January 1st, 2026.

The State Board of Agriculture voted to recommend **John Deck** from Junction City to fill the farmer/rancher representative position.

The Board of Agriculture looks forward to our continued partnership with OAHC. If you have any questions, please contact me or our Board Coordinator, John Boyes.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Elin Miller".

Elin Miller
Chairperson, Oregon State Board of Agriculture

Cc: Sara O'Brien, Executive Director, OWEB
Taylor Larson, Ag Heritage Program Coordinator, OWEB
Lisa Charpillouz Hanson, Director, ODA
John Boyes, Board Coordinator, ODA



Oregon

Tina Kotek, Governor

Department of Land Conservation and Development

635 Capitol Street NE, Suite 150

Salem, Oregon 97301-2540

Phone: 503-373-0050

Fax: 503-378-5518

www.oregon.gov/LCD

December 5, 2025

To: Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board
Oregon Agricultural Heritage Program Commission

From: Brenda Ortigoza Bateman, Ph.D., Director

CC: Anyeley Hallová, LCDC Chair

Subject: **Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC)
Appointment – Nancy Duhnkrack**



Recommendation to the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB)

Dear members of the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board and the Oregon Agricultural Heritage Program Commission,

Pursuant to 541.983, Oregon Agricultural Heritage Commission, (e) One member shall be a person recommended by the Land Conservation and Development Commission who has expertise in conservation easements and similar land transfers.

On behalf of the Land Conservation and Development Commission, I am happy to recommend Nancy Duhnkrack. As a long-term volunteer at the Coalition of Oregon Land Trusts (COLT), and as a frequent speaker on conservation easement design and enforcement, the Oregon Agricultural Heritage Commission will benefit with Ms. Nancy Duhnkrack's valuable contribution.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or need further assistance.

Best Regards,

Brenda Ortigoza Bateman, Ph.D.

Director, Department of Land Conservation and Development



OREGON
WATERSHED
ENHANCEMENT BOARD

Agenda Item N

ODFW Update

State Wildlife Action Plan

January 27-28, 2026, OWEB Board Meeting
Staff report – Agenda Item N. State Wildlife Action Plan Update

MEMORANDUM

To: Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board
From: OWEB Staff and Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife Staff

I. Introduction

Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife (ODFW) Staff, Wildlife Division Administrator Bernadette Graham Hudson and Wildlife Diversity Program Coordinator Emily VanWyk, will provide an overview on ODFW's updated State Wildlife Action Plan.

II. Background

The Oregon State Wildlife Action Plan (SWAP), previously referred to as the Oregon Conservation Strategy (OCS) and Oregon Nearshore Strategy (ONS), is Oregon's comprehensive strategy for conserving fish and wildlife. The goals of the SWAP are to maintain healthy fish and wildlife populations by maintaining and restoring functioning habitats, and to address limiting factors to prevent or reverse declines of at-risk species. It provides a set of priorities for addressing Oregon's conservation needs, creating a broad vision and conceptual framework for long-term conservation of Oregon's native fish, wildlife, invertebrates, plants, and algae. The SWAP is one important framework for strategic prioritization, among many state, federal, local, and Tribal action plans that OWEB grant applicants can use to identify high-priority project opportunities.

The State Wildlife Action Plan is a required document for funding through the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) State and Tribal Wildlife Grants program and must be revised every ten years. The SWAP was initially drafted and published in 2006, updated in 2016, and is currently being updated for the third iteration.

The final, revised SWAP was due to USFWS on Oct 1, 2025. Following submission, USFWS developed a technical review team that will consider approval of the revision in 2026. Documents submitted to the USFWS can be viewed on ODFW's website here: <https://dfw.state.or.us/SWAP-Revision/>. Please note that while these are very similar to what the final PDF version of the product will look like, there are some minor adjustments under consideration through the USFWS review process. The final product will be a website similar to the current oregonconservationstrategy.org website and is anticipated to go live shortly after content approval by the USFWS (earliest March 2026).

Major changes from previous versions are described in the Executive Summary (Attachment A).

III. Recommendation

This is an information item only.

IV. Attachments

A. SWAP Revision 2025 Executive Summary



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Oregon State Wildlife Action Plan is a blueprint for conservation in Oregon.


Oregon is home to a rich tapestry of ecosystems, from coastal estuaries and temperate rainforests to high desert and alpine environments. Yet the biodiversity in these ecosystems is increasingly under threat. Habitat loss, climate change, invasive species, and other human-driven pressures have accelerated the decline of native species across the state. At this moment, species are going extinct faster than any time in human history. A recent report by NatureServe ranked Oregon 5th worst in the U.S. for the percentage of animals in the state that are at-risk. Species at risk include over half of our 32 amphibian species, approximately 10% of our bird species, and nearly 20% of our reptile species. In the face of alarming loss and daunting conservation challenges, we need a tool to inform how to effectively and efficiently use our limited resources to make the best conservation decisions. The Oregon State Wildlife Action Plan is our mechanism to provide the information needed to guide and prioritize this work.




BACKGROUND

The Oregon State Wildlife Action Plan (SWAP, previously referred to as the Oregon Conservation Strategy (OCS) and Oregon Nearshore Strategy (ONS)) is Oregon's comprehensive strategy for conserving fish and wildlife. The goals of the SWAP are to maintain healthy fish and wildlife populations by maintaining and restoring functioning habitats, and to address limiting factors to prevent or reverse declines of at-risk species.

It provides a set of priorities for addressing Oregon's conservation needs, creating a broad vision and conceptual framework for long-term conservation of Oregon's native fish, wildlife, invertebrates, plants, and algae.

A photograph of an American Avocet, a long-necked bird with a distinctive black and white plumage and a long, thin, slightly upturned bill. It is standing in shallow water, and its reflection is visible in the calm surface.


American Avocet

A photograph of a Sockeye Salmon swimming in clear, shallow water over a rocky riverbed. The fish has a vibrant red body with a yellowish-gold head and tail.

Sockeye Salmon

A close-up photograph of a Gentner's Fritillary flower. The petals are a deep pinkish-red, heavily speckled with bright yellow spots. The center of the flower is yellow with prominent stamens.

Gentner's Fritillary

A photograph of a Northern Sagebrush Lizard resting on dry, sandy ground. The lizard has a light-colored body with dark, irregular spots and blotches, and its head is slightly raised.

Northern Sagebrush Lizard

The SWAP emphasizes proactive, voluntary conservation of declining species and habitats to reduce the possibility of future federal or state listings. While not a regulatory document, it outlines key issues, opportunities, and recommended voluntary actions to improve the effectiveness of conservation across Oregon. It fosters a shared understanding of the challenges facing the state's fish and wildlife by all Oregonians and sets common priorities for addressing these needs.

The future for many species will depend the willingness of individuals, organizations, to voluntarily take action to protect and improve fish and wildlife habitat. The SWAP provides the tools and resources for all Oregonians, including professionals and individuals new to wildlife conservation, to get started.

The State Wildlife Action Plan is a required document for funding through the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) State and Tribal Wildlife Grants program and must be revised every ten years. The SWAP was initially drafted and published in 2006, updated in 2016, and is currently being updated for the third iteration. The final, revised SWAP is due to USFWS on Oct 1, 2025. Following submission, USFWS will develop a technical review team that will approve the revision in 2026.

Major updates in the third iteration include the addition of Pollution as a new Key Conservation Issue (KCI), changes to naming structures to match national terminology, and complete integration of the ONS and OCS in recognition of the need to present consolidated information on all ecosystems. Additionally, all components of the SWAP were re-evaluated and updated with the latest information, including a full assessment of the status of all sensitive, at-risk, or declining species or other species of concern. Oregon's Conservation Opportunity Areas were revised to incorporate updated, new, and finer resolution spatial data and the Conservation Toolbox was restructured to empower all Oregonians to take conservation actions.

SWAP COMPONENTS

Like its predecessor, the SWAP is organized into seven sections that start broad at the state level and narrow in focus all the way down to the species level. Each section provides information to support understanding of conservation concerns in the state by a broad audience.

1.



KEY CONSERVATION ISSUES
are landscape-scale threats that impact species and habitats throughout the entire state.

2.



ECOREGIONS
are geographic areas of the state with similar climate and vegetation. General characteristics, limiting factors, and recommended conservation actions are described for each of the nine ecoregions in Oregon.

3.



CONSERVATION OPPORTUNITY AREAS
help focus conservation efforts and financial investments in specific areas to increase the likelihood of long-term success over larger landscapes.

4.



KEY HABITATS
are native habitats of conservation concern that are essential to many Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN) within the state.

5.



SPECIES OF GREATEST CONSERVATION NEED
SGCN are defined as being at risk due to factors describing their rarity, population trends, and threats. SGCN include wildlife, fish, invertebrates, plants, and algae.

6.



MONITORING
includes information and guidance on monitoring strategies, community science, and recommendations for data management for SGCN and Key Habitats statewide.

7.



THE CONSERVATION TOOLBOX
provides information and resources for all Oregonians on how to engage in conservation action as individuals. The Toolbox identifies goals for agencies and other organizations to use outreach and education to support and encourage individual Oregonians to take conservation action.



MAJOR UPDATES

In recognition of all that has changed and all that we have learned since the last revision of the SWAP in 2015, all components were reviewed and revised for the third iteration, incorporating new science, data, tools, and resources. This ensures that our SWAP creates a comprehensive picture of the current challenges and opportunities for conservation, and what we anticipate for the next 10 years. We also updated available resources and tools to ensure that all participants, from individuals to large organizations, can execute projects and take actions that will directly benefit Oregon's natural resources.

1. NAME CHANGES

For the 2025 revision, we have updated the name of the plan (previously the ***Oregon Conservation Strategy*** and ***Oregon Nearshore Strategy***). The name change will ensure that Oregon aligns with national terminology and will help facilitate use of our plan by partners that work across state boundaries. Additional terminology changes are also aligned with national terms, including Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN), Species of Greatest Information Need (SGIN), and Key Habitats.

2. OREGON NEARSHORE STRATEGY INTEGRATION

Oregon doesn't stop at the shore, and in recognition of the magnitude of impacts that the ocean has on terrestrial environments and vice versa, the ONS and OCS were integrated to provide a holistic view of conservation needs in our state. ODFW's Marine Resources Program spearheaded the effort to update and integrate all information and ensure that marine threats were well represented throughout the revised SWAP.



3. KEY CONSERVATION ISSUES

We have integrated the threats identified in the 2016 ONS and the OCS into a single, more comprehensive framework. This consolidation provides a clearer and more accessible overview of the broad threats affecting Oregon's fish, wildlife, and habitats—both marine and inland. Addressing these threats together allows for a more complete understanding of large-scale, landscape-level impacts.

All Key Conservation Issues (KCIs) were reviewed and revised for clarity and consistency, and threat descriptions were standardized using the Direct Threats Classification system to align with other states' wildlife action plans. All KCIs were revised with updated information, taking into consideration any changes, new data, or improved understanding of threats since the previous revision. There are several notable updates in the revision of KCIs:

- **A new Key Conservation Issue: Pollution** was added to reflect its growing impact on ecosystems.
- **Content from "Challenges and Opportunities for Private Landowners"** was relocated to the Conservation Toolbox to elevate its visibility and improve accessibility.
- The **Climate Change KCI** has been extensively updated in collaboration with the Northwest Climate Adaptation Science Center to ensure it reflects the most current data and science.



4. SPECIES

Our Species of Greatest Conservation Need, or SGCN, are the species that we've identified as having imperiled conservation status and are what we previously referred to as **Strategy Species**. For the revision, staff led a comprehensive process to revise the criteria for selection of SGCN. The conservation criteria developed were based on the criteria used in the 2015 revision, with changes to make them more inclusive of all taxa. The result was four criteria that were used to evaluate all sensitive, at-risk, or declining species or other species of concern. To be included as SGCN, species assessed must meet two or more of the four criteria.

The revised SWAP also includes Species of Greatest Information Need (**SGIN**, previously **Data Gap Species**), which are species that may be of conservation concern but lack sufficient data to confirm their status in Oregon.

Additional species important to guiding conservation efforts are included throughout the Plan, either within Key Habitats, Key Conservation Issues, or through targeted conservation actions.



5. KEY HABITATS

Key Habitats (formerly **Strategy Habitats**) were reviewed and information updated. No new Key Habitat types were added, as existing categories remain inclusive and relevant. However, the five habitat types in the Nearshore ecoregion are now presented collectively as the 12th Key Habitat, Nearshore Habitats. Instead, the focus was on revising the status and trends of these habitats over the past 25 years. A priority for the 2025 revision was reanalyzing habitat loss, which was last conducted statewide in the late 1990s, to inform our understanding of how habitats of conservation concern have changed in the last 25 years.



Updates also include revised information on threats and conservation actions for each habitat, with specific emphasis on the role of American beaver and beaver-modified habitats in wetlands and riparian areas. Additionally, the Key Habitat map is being refined using updated data and field verification to improve accuracy in the extent and distribution of Key Habitats throughout the state.



6. ECOREGIONS

For the 2025 revision, ecoregion profiles were revised to ensure all information is up-to-date and relevant. Additionally, ecoregion-specific information on climate change impacts were added to each profile. While the broad effects of climate change may be similar across the state, discrete impacts are variable, with climate trends that vary region to region.



7. CONSERVATION OPPORTUNITY AREAS

For the 2025 revision, Conservation Opportunity Areas were reviewed and revised, incorporating updated datasets describing costs (e.g., development, invasive species) and targets (e.g., climate refugia, Key Habitat presence, environmental justice information) for conservation. Draft COAs are presented in a public-facing web map to solicit public input in the finalization of geographic scope. Feedback included local knowledge of landscape suitability not already reflected in the draft, known restoration plans, and known development plans.



8. CONSERVATION TOOLBOX

In 2024, when ODFW surveyed the public and partners about the use and utility of the OCS and ONS, the component that was most in need of improvement was the Conservation Toolbox. The Toolbox, intended to provide information on how to engage all Oregonians in conservation, was completely overhauled with the help of internal and external partners to increase relevancy to all Oregonians.

The Toolbox is built to provide flexibility over the next 10 years. The Goals and Actions for Agencies section will remain static once approved by the Commission and USFWS, while the Actions by Oregonians and Resources sections may be updated and revised without returning to the USFWS or the Commission to ensure continued relevancy to communities in our state. We recognize that resources, opportunities, and knowledge evolve more rapidly than the 10 year revision cycle, and anticipate continuing to update content, spotlights, and language over time that reflects the conservation priorities of all Oregonians in the sections on actions each audience can take.





PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

ODFW began revising the State Wildlife Action Plan (SWAP) in July 2023 by reaching out to partners and the public for feedback on how the SWAP is used and what areas need improvement. Input from the public, partners, and ODFW staff helped shape draft content in 2024, which was shared for technical review during **16 meetings** in early 2025. A dedicated **SWAP Revision web page** was regularly updated with key documents and meeting recordings. To raise broad awareness and drive traffic to the site for more detailed information, ODFW promoted the revision process through events, social media, press releases, and presentations across the state.

The draft content presented to the Commission reflects input gathered through July 2025 from technical reviewers, partners, and public engagement. The final draft is scheduled for submission to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on October 1, 2025.



LOOKING FORWARD

All components of the revised SWAP were made available for public review and comment in July of 2025. Comments submitted by July 31 will be considered and incorporated as appropriate into the draft submitted to the Commission in advance of the August 15 Commission meeting. The final submission to the USFWS is on October 1, 2025. The next full revision is anticipated for fall of 2035 following the ten-year required revision timeline.

The OCS website is currently heavily used, with over 120,000 unique visitors annually. Once the content of the revised SWAP is reviewed and approved by the USFWS in early 2026, updates to the current website will be published. We anticipate that the OCS website will be sunset in 2027 and replaced as a part of the Agency-wide website update process to make sure information is accessible, navigable, and can connect individuals interested in conservation in Oregon with the resources they need.





OREGON
WATERSHED
ENHANCEMENT BOARD

Agenda Item O

**Land Acquisition Grant
Program Modernization
Update**

January 27-28, 2026 OWEB Board Meeting

Staff report – Agenda Item O. Land Acquisition Modernization Update

MEMORANDUM

To: Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board

From: Renee Davis, Acquisitions and Special Programs Manager

Sara O'Brien, Executive Director

Miriam Forney, Land Acquisition Coordinator

Supports OWEB's Strategic Plan priority #6: Take bold and innovative action toward funding projects that advance climate resilience.

I. Introduction

OWEB's Measure(M) 76 Land Acquisition grant program implements key statutory components including "Securing long-term protection for lands and waters that provide significant habitats for native fish and wildlife" (Oregon Revised Statute [ORS] 541.941) and "Acquiring from willing owners, interests in land or water that will protect or restore native fish or wildlife habitats" (ORS 541.956). This staff report provides an overview of the land acquisition grant program modernization process that is in progress.

II. Background

As described at the October 2025 board meeting, the first land acquisition grants were awarded under the Governor's Watershed Enhancement Board, the precursor to OWEB. Administrative rules for the OWEB land acquisition grant program were first adopted in 2005. Since that time, three additional rulemaking processes have been completed to update and refine program rules. In addition to those rulemaking processes, at least five separate processes involving surveys, work groups, and/or facilitated processes have occurred. The intent of these processes—among other topics—was to identify challenges and opportunities to ensure the land acquisition grant program was well utilized to advance conservation outcomes. Despite these collaborative efforts, partners continue to express significant concerns about challenges engaging with the program.

The land acquisition modernization process was launched in early 2025 in response to both direction from Governor Tina Kotek and interest from Executive Director O'Brien in creating more sustainable staffing for the agency, a more integrated program structure, and a more accessible grantee experience across all OWEB grant programs. The modernization process approach is informed by touchpoints with applicants, grantees, and interested parties, including listening sessions co-convened by OWEB and the Coalition of Oregon Land Trusts (COLT) to obtain feedback about persisting issues and

concerns related to the land acquisition grant program and multiple coordination points with federally recognized Tribes.

The land acquisition modernization process was launched in early 2025 to address ongoing concerns and challenges and identify refinements and alternative approaches to solve problems and improve program utilization. The process aims to address feedback sorted into three general categories associated with the land acquisition grant program: philosophical (or “foundational issues”), cultural, and process. Modernization work includes four workstreams that were described at the October 2025 board meeting. Updates about each workstream are described below.

III. Land Acquisition Modernization Workstreams and Status Updates

Board-Level Workstream on Foundational Issues

This workstream involves the Acquisitions, Restoration, and Emerging Topics (ARE) committee and, ultimately, the full OWEB board. It delves into four foundational issues: a) use of conservation easements by OWEB to meet the statutory requirement for a title restriction; b) significant habitat and future conditions; c) other uses such as recreational, cultural uses, and working lands; and d) risk tolerance (which connects to the cultural and process categories noted above). Recent meetings focused on the topic of conservation easements, along with how the agency approaches and manages risk for the land acquisition program relative to other grant programs. At the December meeting, the committee heard input from and engaged in dialogue with representatives from six federally recognized Tribes. Discussion topics included: conservation easements and title restrictions and how different Tribes view these; grantmaking considerations such as required match and stewardship funding; and the importance of Traditional Ecological Knowledge and trust-based relationships between the agency and Tribes. (See update under [Agenda Item H](#) for more information about October and December ARE meetings.)

The committee had planned to delve into the topics of significant habitat and expectations regarding future conditions for OWEB funded land acquisition investments at the December meeting. However, due to the importance of providing necessary time for the Tribal panel and holding space for public comment, this topic will be the focus of the March 2026 ARE meeting. The committee will engage in a substantive discussion of the [habitat memo drafted by staff](#), addressing topics such as interpretation of statutory language regarding “significant habitat;” content and expectations related to conservation values, restored conditions, and prohibited uses in legal documents; and management plan development. The committee already has heard early feedback on habitat related topics through case studies on past OWEB investments presented by grantees at both the September and December ARE meetings. These case studies also have introduced other foundational topics such as other uses (e.g., recreational uses) and concerns about the agency’s perceived low risk tolerance. These topics also will be addressed in more detail during upcoming ARE committee meetings during the first half of 2026. All committee meeting agendas, materials, and recordings can be found on [OWEB’s website](#).

OWEB staff are completing multiple follow-ups from the ARE meetings including:

- Debriefing from the case studies with grantees to gain a shared understand of key challenges and where future changes could enhance both the conservation intent and accessibility of the land acquisition grant program;
- Reviewing example conservation easements from other funding programs—in particular, those that engage with Tribes—to understand where opportunities for refinements may exist that make the land acquisition grant program more approachable while retaining accountability as a public funder;
- Working with COLT to convene another listening session in early January 2026; and
- Reaching out to other interested parties to make them aware of the land acquisition modernization process and ensure the agency is receiving diverse input. To date, OWEB staff have engaged with Association of Oregon Counties, multiple individual county commissioners, legislators, Oregon Farm Bureau, Oregon Water Resources Congress, and Oregon Association of Conservation Districts.

At the January 2026 board meeting, staff will provide an update to the board about follow-ups thus far. In addition, the board will engage in an early discussion about observations to-date regarding foundational questions and provide input as the committee begins to pivot toward problem solving and potential solutions, including program changes at various scales of complexity.

Tribal Workstream

This workstream specifically focuses on substantive and process issues of concern to Tribes. This workstream builds on multiple past touchpoints—beginning in 2021—with federally recognized Tribes about challenges and opportunities they experience both across OWEB’s grant programs and, in particular, with land acquisitions. OWEB leadership and staff completed work to define legal options available to OWEB for land acquisition grants and identified potential policy options that could help address potential barriers to Tribal government access to the land acquisitions program.

In October 2025, OWEB sent a memo outlining this information to Oregon’s nine federally recognized Tribes and the Nez Perce Tribe. Many of these topics were discussed as part of the Tribal panel during the December ARE committee meeting (see section above). In addition to OWEB staff follow-up with Tribes on example conservation easements from other funding program, OWEB’s executive director and Tribal liaison will contact each Tribe to gauge interest in additional meetings to discuss the policy options presented in the memo sent to Tribes. The Tribal and ARE committee workstreams are merging to the degree possible, while recognizing the unique sovereign role of Tribes.

Workstream for Initial Streamlining Prior to 2025 Grant Offering

The 2025 initial streamlining workstream is complete and was described at the October 2025 board meeting. It implemented near-term, relatively minor process refinements prior to launch of the 2025 land acquisition grant cycle. Nine grant applications were received for projects ranging from southwest Oregon to the north coast, and from central to eastern Oregon. The applications request more than \$12.2 million in funding, with more than \$11.6 million in match funding anticipated. By number of applications received, OWEB’s land acquisition grant program has not experienced this level of demand since the 2013-2015

biennium. Review of these grant applications is underway, with staff funding recommendations coming to the OWEB board for consideration in April 2026.

Anticipated Rulemaking Workstream

This workstream is a placeholder as the ARE committee and full OWEB board discuss and provide direction to staff about modernization priorities. Some program refinements or alternative approaches emerging from the modernization process may be possible simply with changes to program guidance and procedures. However, it is anticipated that rulemaking may be required for some refinements or changes. More specificity about direction and timing for this workstream will be available in the coming months. OWEB staff are beginning to compile program refinement ideas and recommendations for the committee's consideration during the first half of 2026. These ideas and recommendations will include proposing a mechanism by which formal direction/guidance from the board could be provided regarding the land acquisition grant program (in addition to potential rulemaking).

IV. Recommendation

This is an information item only.