

OWEB Listening Session – Webinar Thursday May 31, 2012

Question 1: Looking 10 years into the future, what outcomes should OWEB achieve through its investments and how will we know we have achieved them?

I would contend that without strong communities and economies we won't have any conservation gains.

Provide restoration of high impact riparian areas--restoration of ecosystem function and habitat. E.g. linear habitat corridors along >60% of Oregon waterways

Outcomes: strong, sustainable watershed councils, each with a strategic plan that includes measurable objectives. Strong and broad community support for locally-based restoration programs, and an effective outreach and education program focused on evaluating the effects of the restoration efforts.

Provide incentives for landowners along rivers to take land out of production and or protect what already exists.

But there is no economic incentive to not develop land in the riparian areas.

Raise current support for restoration *and monitoring* to ensure that we can learn from our mistakes as well as successes.

Continue to provide funding for on the ground projects that protect and preserve the long-term viability of their ecologically significant private lands. The number of projects successfully funded, acres included in the projects, and the monitoring outcomes.

Restore process as much as possible -- e.g. beavers in rural riparian areas, fires to restore upland areas. Of course, this will not work in more developed areas but many areas of the state are still relatively undeveloped.

We already know what most of the habitat issues are, if not specifically then at least generally. I feel like we don't really know what scale we need to work at to be effective. For instance: How many miles of stream do I need to plant to have a 10% increase in juvenile salmon summer rearing survival? How does that change if I spread that planting work over a large area versus concentrate it in a single 6th field? I think the main goal of OWEB is to have healthy salmon and trout populations, so in 10 years if they are still in poor condition, then we haven't been effective.

Whatever the area(s) of focus, be sure to establish good baselines before moving forward, so you have something to measure against in 10 years. As ODA is finding out, it's easy to show outputs but not so easy to show outcomes.

Building capacity within watershed councils, SWCD and partner alliances (such as The Intertwine Alliance) in both urban and rural areas of the state so they can be effective in delivering on the ground restoration and educating the public regarding watershed health issues.

Involvement of all stakeholder types Investment in local watershed issues in a way that is responsive to local priorities

One major outcome in 10 years would be if the general public knows what OWEB is and why it is important to their lives in Oregon.

Need to continue to focus on the entire watershed, ridge top to ridge top, and not just on the riparian areas. Build strong local watershed councils through a streamlined support grant process and changes to funding rules that allow them to build towards the future. Focus on education for and partnership with private landowners. OWEB should get away from any attempts or support for taking land out of private stewardship and should instead work to provide farmers and ranchers with the tools they need to successfully take care of the land themselves.

Review areas not heretofore studied to determine if there habitat areas with resources not currently understood as to their contributions to the overall ecological fabric of regions and include those findings in new data.

Support ecosystem market approaches to provide greater landowner incentives to place land into conservation, support local and restoration economics, and achieve greater rates and volumes of restoration.

I would disagree with the previous comment...I think the goal of OWEB is to have healthy watersheds which will bring healthy fish and healthy wildlife. Investments should be targeted with specific goals, but the goals should have a broad impact. Planting 60% of the total stream miles in Oregon is a great goal, but will it have an impact if 90% of those plants die within the first 5 years?

Make OWEB relevant for ALL Oregonians. Keep up the good marketing work of the OWEB program.

Ten years from now urban areas are habitable for a wide variety of fish and wildlife species.

I would like to see OWEB support/save education initiatives like Outdoor School.

OWEB should advance investments that 1) align with the intent of Measure 76 2) have measurable, time specific outcomes 3) advance the Oregon Conservation Strategy 4) address the key limiting factors affecting watersheds 5) "move the needle" in terms of Oregon's native fish and wildlife habitats

Baseline info will be key in determining effectiveness. Also, I believe that incentives for keeping water in stream will be very valuable.

The social, community, and economic outcomes are very important. Strong working resource lands with ecological management protections can not only enhance watersheds but also further these other values. 10 years out I would love to see a mature program for protecting working lands.

OWEB should see watershed councils and soil and water conservation districts working together to complete on the ground project work for fish and for agriculture water quality. The finished conservation work should show completed best management practices including shade, fencing,

in-stream work, etc. Fish numbers hopefully will be improved along with other aquatic species. Partnerships should be in place.

Watershed improvement benefits through the state, stabilizing hydrographs, progress toward recovery of listed species etc.

Involvement of all stakeholder types Engagement in local watershed issues in a way that is responsive to local priorities

Set up measurable targets and work toward them -- e.g. there are ~3500 small dams in Oregon. Maybe work toward fish passage at 25% in 10 years

Effectiveness monitoring should be required and funded for all projects and should guide restoration work. Watershed Councils are somewhat insular in that the people who know about them tend to think everyone knows about them. Speaking to friends, family, neighbors, most people I speak with have never heard of a watershed council. OWEB needs a better marketing strategy to inform people about what watershed councils do, who they are, and how the public can participate.

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

Have competitive technical assistance and monitoring grants. Targeted grants to improve individual council capacity where it's recognized as lacking, i.e., "if you do this, we'll give you \$\$." Provide incentives to councils to cooperate with other organizations and recruit private landowners and other partners. Open calls for proposals for Strategic Investment Partnerships, especially ones involving private landowners. Lots of tools are out there, but councils need to have sufficient time (i.e., funding) to be able to effectively use them. Long term, consultants aren't as effective as having council staff doing the work because it's cheaper and has longer lasting effect.

Use an electronic grant application process. Copy the NFWF Easy Grant process, or better yet contract with NFWF to administer the grant application process. In addition, simplify the grant process. Grant apps continue to grow in length and time required to complete them.

Provide funds to update watershed assessments that are now very dated. Expanding the small grant program or reassessing that programs allocations. It seems clear that the small grant program works really well in some parts of the state and not at all in others. Might there be a way to expand its use (i.e.; available funds) in those areas where it is most effective?

Support of regionally based watershed health plans that integrate urban and rural watershed restoration efforts focused on protecting regional biodiversity.

Projects begin and end at the local level. Watershed Councils and SWCD's need additional small grant, education, and outreach funding to help them build relationships with local landowners.

The protection and restoration of urban habitats is critical to watershed health. OWEB has historically focused more on rural watershed projects. Providing programs and funding focused on urban issues and some of the opportunities to improve watershed health in more developed

areas will provide multiple benefits and will serve to raise awareness of the importance of functioning habitats in larger population centers.

Restoration work in the watershed will only be successful with the cooperation of the landowners. One way of accomplishing this is to have successful conservation easements that protect and preserve privately owned working landscapes that remain privately owned working landscapes.

Providing more funds for technical assistance grants will assist newer watershed councils to get baseline data to direct conservation and restoration projects.

While the Strategic Investment Partnerships (SIPs) are a reasonable investment approach, there hasn't been an open call for proposals (we were told "you do fine with the regular grant program"). As a result, all the current SIPs were negotiated with Federal agencies and/or foundations. We could bring a significant private timber company to the table, but have no avenue to do so.

I would like to have more support with outreach, fundraising, and volunteer recruitment. That takes up a LOT of time. Most of my time as a coordinator is taken up by project development and implementation. I don't have a lot of time to plan effective fundraising events and it isn't my expertise as a biologist. Our council doesn't have funds to hire anyone to do this fundraising work but it is invaluable to our success as a council.

Funding for monitoring of OWEB funded projects, funding to support all watershed council operations (basic level) as long as you have a solid system for filtering out watershed councils that are not producing tangible results for priority fish/wild spp./plans, stable funding & findings based on grant by grant does not produce results as beneficial as long term funding. Western Oregon stream restoration program provides critical technical assistance to watershed councils.

A grant making program that includes strong effectiveness monitoring measures to ensure strategic investments are made and do indeed "move the needle" - in OWEB's history, 1% of its funding has been dedicated to EM. In addition, when one considers an entire watershed and the numerous factors upstream that can influence its short- and long-term health, there must be effectiveness monitoring. Lastly, required use of databases to share information about watershed health, e.g., iMapInvasives, will help to advance gains in dealing with invasives.

Provide restoration and education funds for work on private land. We cannot have public and NGO fee-title for all that we need to conserve. Under Partnership Investments - Should partnerships with major conservation investors like Meyer Memorial Trust be considered to advance priorities that align with OWEB's (their model watershed program is markedly similar to whole watershed restoration partnership with USFS etc.).

Simplify the project management, pre-implementation, and administration parts of grants into one "indirect costs" budget item. I know this seems small scale and less than the "40,000 ft." level, but in general a more streamlined grant process will give those on the ground more time to spend completing projects.

Provide dedicated funding to support positions in addition to council coordinators, such as project managers, IT staff, etc. Without dedicated funding it is difficult to attract and retain quality professionals.

Develop a programmatic "restoration permitting pathway" with the State and Federal regulatory agencies that would greatly simplify or eliminate the need to permit individual restoration projects. This would save precious time and resources.

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

Make project-specific effectiveness monitoring in restoration grants easier -- right now it's really constrained. Had a hard time getting the \$3.5K we needed to evaluate tide gates, which has made it really difficult to work with the regulatory agencies and landowners.

I have seen that as funds are drying up people are using the small grant process to supplement larger grants which eats up a lot of funding.

More protections for working lands would greatly help watersheds, especially in the agricultural areas of the state.

Organizing Watershed Councils to administer non-restoration items together -- how about somehow organizing group benefits (healthcare, so watershed councils can pool their resources and buying power. Most watershed council personnel are not marketing, hr., admin experts. Could there be a pool of resources connected to Council Support grants to help with these items? How about an attorney to review our landowner agreements and contracts with contractors?

Increase the threshold for individual small grants (currently capped at \$10,000) to account for increased costs in materials and labor

We have a large urban area as part of our watershed, but it is questionable that major conservation gains will not be made in areas with large amounts of impervious surface. Incentivize local monies & partnering with their watershed councils to do pilot programs that could break through on things like Low Impact Development and "gold-standard" stormwater best management practices. In our area we are working on retrofit to private commercial lands that would otherwise not be addressed in 20-50 years (whenever they redevelop), in the meantime polluting that entire time.

In my watershed(s) area education is needed as well as outreach. Funds are needed to get this education and outreach process moving. The return would be landowners eventually coming on-line to complete project work.

Help with the nightmare of the permitting process!!!

1) It is important to ensure that what OWEB does aligns with Measure 76 and the Oregon Conservation Strategy. 2) OWEB can help make linkages with other partners in the region to leverage funding. 3) OWEB can lead an effort to identify where the highest priority strategic investments should occur - this can be an inclusive process with entities around the state -- but there must be a strategic vision at a landscape scale to effect real change in Oregon's key eco-

regions. This approach doesn't have to be top-down; it can be developed with the assistance of dedicated and committed watershed councils. But we're seeing significant reductions in state and federal agency natural resource budgets - we have to be more strategic on a statewide scale with the limited resources that are available.

OWEB currently funds projects based on individual watersheds. There is a broader opportunity to fund regional efforts that include multiple watersheds across urban and rural landscapes.

Not necessarily differently, but keep the performance-based funding for watershed councils. This is a major incentive to improve council performance and if it becomes just an entitlement, effectiveness will decrease over time. I disagree about grant-by-grant funding: it keeps you focused and entrepreneurial and can be sustained over time if you're quick on your feet.

Building capacity -- how about a capacity or equipment portion of the Council Support grant? For example, we do large projects that encompass both upland and riparian areas over several thousand acres. Yet, it is almost to purchase an ATV to conduct the restoration work and monitoring. We have borrowed from landowners in the past, but what happens when that ATV breaks while we are riding it, or heaven forbid there is an accident? Other examples are surveying equipment such as laser levels, GPS, computer software? Again, could we pool some OWEB resources between watershed councils or purchase software as a group?

Become more efficient as a delivery system for the funding the citizens of Oregon have designated for the OWEB mission as defined in the constitution. Be more concerned about advancing projects than complicating the process. Delineate between fee title acquisition and placing conservation easements on privately owned lands that remain privately owned. Many rural Board of Counties Commissioners and Watershed Boards in the rural areas oppose conversion of private land to public land. Using the term acquisition to describe fee title acquisitions and conservation easements is confusing. Boards of Counties Commissioners and Watershed Boards in the rural do not oppose Conservation Easements on privately owned lands that remain privately owned.

Make education and outreach a larger priority. 3% is not enough.

Perhaps OWEB should target one priority at a time over 5 years. For example, all planting in one five year period unless there is no planting to be done, in which case all other restoration projects could be funded.

Helping to protect agriculture will necessarily help protect watershed health, especially if conservation easements and agricultural easements are carefully designed to work together. Keeping land in agriculture, rather than allowing it to be parceled and developed will greatly help with the management and improvement of watersheds. With fewer landowners, fewer hard surfaces, and carefully crafted management requirements there can be great benefits for watersheds. I can tell you that there is a large demand for agricultural easements paired with conservation easements in the state.

Allow Watershed Councils to build towards the future by carrying over excess funding, investing in infrastructure, and providing funding for large purchases such as vehicles.

Create a more efficient grant process. I hate to repeat it but I feel like I have to drill it in. Fund projects that address ALL watershed issues -- from uplands to in stream. I agree on the council support funding.

Although many tweaks will be helpful, I think OWEB is doing many things right

Work more closely with the DEQ in regards to priority development.

Encourage local political organizations to use watershed councils as a resource. Why hire consultants if you are a City or County when you could pay your watershed council to provide you with the same technical assistance? This will build stronger partnerships with local governments to rely on watershed councils for technical assistance as well as possible grant funding.

In addition to providing a sound foundation for the grant request by the wcs, the application process could be simplified and emphasize measureable outcomes and accountability through the completion report.

Once a year have a call-for-proposals for "Crazy Ideas" that would be high-risk, high-payoff. Evaluate the results of the original Research Grant program and determine whether to have another opening for these grants. Evaluate the "Salmon Season Emergency" program results where grant applications were continually accepted and quickly decided.

I don't think OWEB's priorities should always align with regulatory agency priorities. Perhaps that's where the creative components will come in.

Invest money in priority locations, priority habitats and priority spp. work with partners -odfw etc. to help review and set/agree on priorities. Help the councils set priorities and form strategic plans with up to date analysis (not just general but specific to each watershed's needs- not just riparian needs....like hydrograph adjustments etc.)

Support a broader array of ecosystems, beyond riparian. Specially support native prairie habitat restoration, and diverse oak habitats.

Develop a budget component for restoration grants that provides monies for long-term maintenance. Relying on landowners alone is unrealistic.

STRONGLY agree

Recognize the unique values of conservation in metropolitan regions. This may mean funding for situations that are not "protecting the best" but rather bringing degraded watersheds to a higher ecological function, benefiting large populations of people and reducing urban impacts on watershed health.

This isn't a change to make - more of a comment about what we like about OWEB! One of the big things we appreciate about OWEB is that they have not taken the limiting approach that ODA and NRCS have been "forced" to take in identifying a priority area that all work has to be focused on. OWEB's "open" approach helps us provide assistance to anyone that comes in with a good watershed project - whether their land is in the priority reach or not. Please don't limit the grants so much that we cannot take advantage of opportunities as they arise. Thanks!

Good comment

Don't preclude projects that have a regulatory nexus - I've been a partner in projects that would meet regulatory water quality goals as well as non-regulatory benefits, but the regulatory nexus was disallowed, thereby canning the whole project because the necessary match wasn't there (the regulated partner had less expensive ways to meet its goals - while the greater ecologic restoration partnership that would have been involved lost out). OWEB has set a good example with its CREP partnership in the Tualatin basin, filling in the funding gaps left by CREP programs that fully fund riparian restorations with landowners, while match was provided by local organization outreach - these projects resulted in regulatory temperature benefits.

I would like to see OWEB solicit funds from large private donors. This money could boost council support funds.

Fund organizations in addition to watershed councils, such as non-profits or other groups doing restoration work.

Currently (at least in our region), it is very hard to get a project funded without very detailed designs and very specific activities outlined in the grant. However, there is limited funding from Council Support grants to develop the detailed plans and designs. We try to build some of this work into the grant, but sometimes the project does not get funded because there is not enough information. Incorporate a general project idea phase into the grant process. Sum it up succinctly and have the review teams look at these "project abstracts" and make choices for a second phase with more details. In this way, projects chosen for funding would be based more on ecological merit rather than completeness or thoroughness of the application or total cost. It would also indicate to watershed councils if they should invest more time in developing the project/grant or if the project would not be funded.

Recognizing that watershed councils and habitat restoration projects have become increasingly sophisticated over the past 15 years, there need to be a programs and funding that are responsive to complex projects, technology needs, and multiple partnerships. Provide flexibility for funding projects that have broader landscape and ecological benefits and projects that incorporate innovative approaches to conservation and restoring watershed health.

In some areas of the state "priority areas" might be difficult to achieve due to landowner reluctance to get involved with government supported programs.

I would like to see OWEB fund school based curriculum. For instance watershed council staff could directly support public schools through curriculum development and implementation.

I support the comments regarding metropolitan watershed opportunities above

I think OWEB could trust land trusts more regarding their local knowledge of conservation values and the integrity of their long term management. And the acquisition process needs to move more quickly.

At the heart of restoration outcomes are invested citizens that understand local ecology and are engaged in their watersheds. We encourage the continuation of education funding to support these goals.

Question 4: If you were in charge of designing OWEB's investment strategy, how would you design it to be specific and focused, while allowing opportunities to support new and creative ideas to achieve restoration outcomes?

I would continue to fund projects that promote the investment in privately owned lands with ecologically significant values. Keep in mind that in 2008 96% of the privately owned land in the State of Oregon was classified as working landscapes. The best way to accomplish the aforementioned is to work with Land Trusts to advance their projects. By working with Land Trusts OWEB can accomplish the constitutional mandates and maximize the value of OWEB funds by requiring matching dollars.

I would set a tangible target such as increase state-wide stream cover by 10% over 10 years (or something like that) and only focus on that unless that goal was already met in the watershed in question.

Make investments on a tiered basis (perhaps urban and rural/large water bodies and small tributaries) recognizing that all regions contribute to positive restoration outcomes.

OWEB needs a flexible investment strategy that should be revisited on a regular basis to respond to changing economic and environmental conditions. Set some key priorities in each of the state's eco-regions (Oregon Conservation Strategy) with the involvement of the public and key agency, nonprofit, tribal sovereign nations, and industry partners. Lastly, the State of Oregon needs a strategy to engage industry to create a robust 3-legged stool to support the health and future of Oregon's native fish and wildlife habitats and watersheds. OWEB could be a clear leader in that regard, stimulating a successful financial portfolio to fund much-needed conservation efforts.

State and regional conservation goals and strategies should guide OWEB fund allocations. Regional plans may include urban and rural landscapes that include multiple watersheds and are more specific than the state conservation strategy.

Strategic planning is labor- and listening-intensive; you would benefit by having rules advisory councils in the OWEB regions for both the strategic investments and the council support grants. It's extremely difficult for councils outside the Willamette Valley to effectively participate due to the time required to get to I-5. This is wasted time that we could have been more profitably spent working with our communities and stakeholders. It would also be nice (but I know troublesome) to have the Board travel around the state in small scrums to meet with councils outside the standard Board meeting tour process. Unfortunately, many of the Board members have day jobs that would make this difficult.

I'm in agreement with OWEB funded school based education. Watershed Councils and SWCD's could work together on something like this.

Do not give more focus to urban areas; I can do more good with less money in rural areas. Also, if you provide funding to non-profits and other groups as Intertwine suggested, you will cripple the watershed councils.

The findings from your "A Policy Analysis of the Role of Working Land Conservation Easements Using Dedicated Lottery Funds" are excellent. Rolling out working lands easements to a greater degree would be a great strategy for protecting watersheds.

Some level of "priority area" should be decided locally, and the funding based on that local prioritization is what makes OWEB unique and gets all stakeholders involved and inspired.

Maybe try and set more specific utilize existing plans and programs (e.g. OCS- Salmon and steel recovery programs, NA salmon stronghold program) to focus funding towards projects who meet more specific requirements but then have an additional category that helps the creative new style projects apply and receive funding. We agree with solicitation from large donors but it has to be able to be used for all operations not just specific goals based on the donor. Setting up a foundation to help supplement (NPS helped support a foundation for each park) to get help support from local funders.

At the last CONNECT conference I heard a lot of frustration from people about not being able to pursue grant opportunities because they couldn't make a strong tie to fish. The projects might improve water quality, but because there weren't fish involved, there wasn't any chance of getting funded.

I would focus on the ecological processes in rural areas instead of engineered restoration ideas. For example, reintroduce beaver and fire across the broad landscape of central and eastern Oregon. Think at the broad landscape level, but target those activities down to the local level. Set targets but adapt based on local conditions.

Figure out how much money it would take to restore all of Oregon and ask voters to fund that.

Also strongly encourage continued investment in education.

A change in strategy would be to focus on social benefits including public education and outreach, as a broader strategy to achieve ecological benefits. Without public support, understanding and participation we won't be effective in the long run.

Some level of "priority areas" needs to be defined locally. OWEB is the only entity that follows these local priorities to some extent, and that leads to the involvement and inspiration of all stakeholder types and ecological benefits on private landscapes that no one planning at regional levels knew existed.

Urban areas need help too!

Urban areas are the where the majority of Oregon's population lives - that doesn't mean rural areas are more or less important -- it means all of Oregon's lands provide "space and place" for people of all kinds and for all purposes. OWEB's investment strategies and financial portfolio needs to acknowledge urban AND rural areas.

OWEB should be careful with state and regional strategies that heavily-weigh Federal land ownership in their priorities (i.e., the WWRI). The original intent of the Oregon Plan was to encourage and incentivize private landowners to improve the conditions on their properties. That emphasis has been somewhat lost over the years, but needs to be re-emphasized in any Strategic Plan. Federal lands restoration should pay for themselves!

It really is a catch 22, if the habitat is poor and there are no fish, you need to restore it but you can't fund restoration because there are no fish

Similar to the SIP program, create a competitive process where a council, District, or other entity could apply for a large, long-term source of funding to implement a list of priority projects. This would reduce administrative costs, help retain quality staff (stability), and improve partnerships on the ground.

I would work with other likeminded funds in order to leverage money to have a greater impact. We are all trying to reach similar goals and should try and work collaboratively. Having a means to discuss funding goals with other funders could create more funds through different realms that are currently not defined. I also think that if we focus from an education realm, we can reach people at a younger age and show them how important watersheds and other aspects of the environment are.

I agree

We've been able to fund an intensive education program with only about 25% OWEB funding. Don't just limit yourself to OWEB for educational efforts. There's lots of funds out there for education. While education should be a component of a Strategic Plan, OWEB should not be the sole support for these efforts. Partnerships rule in education!

The emphasis should always be on working with local landowners. They are on the land every day and always will be. They are the best source we have for identifying problems, designing projects, and improving our watersheds over the long term.

Invest in protecting habitats that are currently healthy and high value.

I've seen state funding go towards restoration on federal lands, and it is really frustrating. Federal dollars should fund federal and state restoration.

Also look to ways to encourage multiple councils to work together, especially when reaching across urban areas.

Continue funding the urban watershed councils.

Focus on fish is a problem – especially ESA. The whole inspiration of Oregon Plan was to avoid species listings, be proactive - not focused on regulation. OWEB funding should not be used to meet regulatory mandates and we should be very careful of funding prioritized for ESA fish etc., as this keeps conservation defined around crisis. Oregon Plan approach has been a positive, proactive, “we can do it” approach. It’s unique in that way. Respond to the priorities, creativity and capability of the local conservation folks (watershed councils being in the lead whenever that capability exists).

Although I agree with your comment regarding partnerships, OWEB has funding to support both restoration and education and there should be a strategy to make these funds more effective. Additionally, lottery dollars also go to schools so making education a top-priority for OWEB might get more \$ in the OWEB pot, resulting in more money overall for restoration.

It would be great to see watershed councils and SWCD's working together on projects. For instance, councils completing the in-stream work and SWCD's completing the riparian and agriculture best management practices.

Host regular webinar/listening sessions.

We have discussed a 20% contingency fund (20% of the total project cost) that would last for 5-10 years. At that time, it could be returned. Especially for "heavy infrastructure" -- e.g. fish passage, urban restoration, etc.

Provide access to GIS and database development for smaller watershed councils. We are very fortunate to have this in-house, but I know this is a real problem for other councils.

OWEB could provide more in-kind support such as data-loggers, website hosting for councils, etc.

Make technical resource people available so that local restoration projects are scientifically based, with the latest best practices and data.

Keep merit-based and performance-based program elements for Council Support grant program or it will be quickly seen as "overhead" by legislators and others. It's already sliding that way which is a misunderstanding - the funding is fundamentally for capacity to involve all stakeholder types, do appropriate strategic planning, and approach the work in a holistic, community-oriented, prioritized way.

Use new/emerging ideas and technologies (MORE WEBINARS!). Fund projects that might be more experimental but could have good payoffs. In stream activities such as beaver dam support structures and engineered log jams are two examples of recent "emerging technologies" that could have a big impact on watershed restoration. Also, novel livestock management tools like new water developments, fencing techniques that may not be as tested as others but could be cheaper, easier, better, etc. in the future.

Look to programs that unite restoration and public education. Especially in urban areas support programs that engage local residents and students in restoration programs.

Tie funding to projects that are sustainable over the long term, maintained over decades. It's frustrating to see a huge effort into the first year or two of a project that then degrades over time.

Support opportunities to encourage/reward landowners doing good work. The challenge is that folks doing good work are often ineligible for upgrading or enhancing their current efforts. Funds are often limited to fixing problems only.

In 10 years there is a broader awareness of watershed issues by the general public in both urban and rural areas.

Introduce flexibility in Coordinator grants to allow Coordinators to use part of their funding to pay for technical guidance on an as-needed basis - especially as they are putting together grant applications. Sometimes all you need is a little bit of help (i.e., developing a monitoring protocol for a grant app, developing a planting plan for a grant app, getting database and/or GIS TA, etc.)

Maybe a have two separate project development tracks: one type of project targeted by OWEB staff and implemented either by OWEB staff or partners and the other projects being brought to OWEB by watershed councils and partners to be implemented in the grass roots style.

Remember that just because certain groups can afford to hire individuals to speak for them doesn't mean that what they have to say is more important than the little guys' point of view.

I would suggest thinking more broadly than fish. Health watersheds are about diverse habitats that support people, plants and wildlife.

Councils and SWCDs work together where possible - sometimes they offer a different approach locally. Don't incentivize/force relationships.

The best way for OWEB to get more money in the pot is to make sure that the schools don't teach the laws of probability!

If councils aren't using AmeriCorps members they're really missing an opportunity for very energetic and creative people at a very reasonable cost. We get a VISTA for \$5K/year that has made demonstrable improvements in developing our outreach and education program.