

## **Grants Pass – June 4, 2012**

### **Face to Face Session – Chart Comments**

#### **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?**

- Define desired outcome in writing and set priorities within the outcome and set targets.  
E.g. = 10% of streams off 303d by 1x date'
- Temperature – example
- Riparian projects 15 years out – water quality. What actions are needed?
- Priority tribes in each watershed with priority actions (with metrics area of focus)
- Concern = how affect councils
- Historical focus on aquatic and riparian – need to work on uplands
- Concern – uplands/biofuels not included riparian corridors = “wicks”
- Must look at uplands(forests) and riparian- look at whole picture/holistic
- 10 years is way short. Recovery = lifetime. Assess pointed in right direction through periodic reviews, look at data. In watershed cash match is hard locally
- OWEB leverage 10 to 1 within 10 years – cash not in kind
  - OWEB x 10 = lots of work, partnerships
  - OWEB broker partnerships – more clout
  - Increase grant program
- Education/outreach – hard to measure learning/aware/involve but critical for the future – need social support and understanding – survey metrics before and after
- Foster better relationships with universities to do community surveys – work with high schools
- More strategic funding partnerships on regional basis – Rogue, Klamath, Willamette
- Experience – match or grant opportunities are difficult, small and limited
- Support monitoring infrastructure(make more important) to quantify success – monitor trends
  - OWEB level or watershed level
  - Standardized and supported financially
  - Currently “iffy” and has to go through grant cycle
- OWEB successes – additional information and training (online data training) about what has worked – and how to get additional dollars – understand costs and value and show success in 10 years
- Outcome: awareness and land manager awareness of how their action affects fish and water. Project value = l.o. knowledge e.g. l.o. and fish runs – aware/involved/excited. Train project managers about the importance of this.
- Outreach – get the word out
- Monitoring x results in 10 years
  - Benchmark
  - Where want to go – goals, numbers (set at state level by who was the data)
- Many projects – lacks pre and post monitoring. ODFW/other help support monitoring data – where is data, how to get it. Hard to find
- WSC and L.O. are happy! Happy O.O. = better response in community = more support.

- Outreach to community is important for “disinformation” problems
- Every L.O. unique to relationship with their land – personalize it. The project should not detract from this and should improve.
- Work toward more legalistic allocation of water, water rights -> public domain. Control of water used for irrigation
- Innovative ways to meet both needs of irrigators and restoration -> monitor quality of habitat and farms
- New technology
- Healthier water to address climate change. E.g. address flood irrigation
- Work with private timber on forest practices – to improve and follow FPA = limited riparian, protect watershed
  - Monitor results and compliance
  - Change FPA
- In 10 years: see more of OR know what OWEB is and what it does – education/outreach
- OWEB = critical work to improve
- Support for OWEB to continue the work (like hunters and fishers support , ODFW.....)
- All Oregonians benefit from OWEB
- E/O hard to quantify. Puts it at a disadvantage. Talk to experts about how and what to measure?
- In 10 years – all in Oregon know what is a watershed and watershed council – poll/survey
- Restoration economy = significant % of state and Rogue economy. More than random! Ecotrust pie – e.g. why small for Josephine and Jackson counties. Measure equality
- Local service providers design and all parts of the job. Created business
- Harvest measure = commercial and sport harvest increased for wild fish
- More outreach to community for issues and support. Result = more support for projects in dollars and ideas
- Measure = receptive to restoration work. This ties to restoration economy. It makes a difference to jobs, quality of life.....connects to more people
- Outcome = more stories. Information/statistics available to Watershed councils to tell story to community – dollars for signs, PR, websites. To leverage more support in the community to get the work done and to work more effectively

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

- Provide technical feedback including effectiveness that compares how other are doing. What are others doing – help connect statewide
- Enhance small grant program to include various professional services such as facilitation – a few hundred dollars could make a big difference
- Education for adult community. They are citizens
- Databases – e.g. expansion of Oregon Explorer, make available....ecological nodes/corridors “mines” data from agencies and others, put into an understandable/useable format that can be used as a basis to determine priorities
- A tool to let watershed councils better understand the community
  - Community evaluations/surveys addressing – knowledge and perceptions on ecology function

- Focus groups
- Would like OWEB to do; or provide tools for us to use
- More input to review team for restoration projects; way to plug into them, before decisions are made
- Develop communication protocol that watershed councils can use to encourage collaboration
- Consider MOU from OWEB/Governor's office to encourage state and federal agencies to provide technical resources (personnel or other) e.g. DOGAMI-LIPAR, DDLM – data (going on in Medford)
- High priority – OWEB leverage at state level to get technical expertise from agencies - state and federal matching needs
- Tech needs: Total Station or OWEB help
  - May need survey crew
  - GIS for all watershed councils
- Provide workshops for technical feedback, education, outreach etc.
- Front end information (recommendations are published before grant cycle) from review teams, “what are you interested in”
- Administrative tools – contract templates, financial budgeting tool – coordinator – GIS
- Less bureaucratic process – simplicity
- Address watershed restoration from holistic standard, include addressing terrestrial issues – get ahead of the curve
- OWEB – watershed council appeal to local government; need OWEB support mechanism...
- Small grant, WRI, Reg grant program are all important – keep them going
- Education tools – who we are, what we do; watersheds can educate
- Mechanism that allows OWEB/watershed councils to provide input on policy for fish issues – to state/federal regulatory processes
- Training/guidance to review teams on priorities other than endangered fish
- Strengthen the organizations that are doing the best work
- Leverage agency / foundation dollars
- ODA dollars -> OWEB is important – noxious weeds
- OWEB dollars to help councils fill the role that others cannot
  - Cost sharing with cities
  - Professional services
  - Misc. needs that are important
  - Could be fee for service

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

- Recognize diversity in state re: how each area works on these issues
  - Raise flexibility in the types of models funded – SIPs don't work every where
  - Look at different multi -year, larger scale models \*\*
- Look for “bang for the buck” follow the best results
  - Set aside funds to reward most innovative ideas coming in
- Continue to get out and around the state – it is different to do projects in different areas

- Raise emphasis of social/economic representation on the board to meet 3x bottom line
- Ensure healthy combination of 3x bottom line
- Emphasize information needed (H2O metering, etc.) to meet outcomes
- Importance of collaboration across interest groups
- Raise alignment of OWEB and OWRD around water
- Look for raising partnerships with funders
  - OWEB can help build synergy with funders in watersheds with high ecological value (i.e. Rogue)
- Preserve and protect general grant program while supporting innovation and SIPs \*\*
- Fund monitoring – long term – make sure funds are actually achieving identified outcomes
- Self-assessment of review team process – can there be more input from proposers before final decision? \*\*
- More emphasis on maintenance of projects – either part of initial project or greater ability to get funding for standalone maintenance – tie to monitoring
- Raise financial commitment to outreach. Reach the right audiences enough to impact
- Raise funding commitment to project development \*\*
  - Support effective organizations to do this
  - Person with responsibility to answer TA questions – to help ID resources and pull strings to make it happen
  - Help to pool funding for engineering design
  - Simplify programs. Integrate acquisitions staff with other agencies
- Stronger support for uplands work \*\*
- Need clear vision available to watershed councils and others so they know what is of interest to the agency – a real business plan, regionally based with 3x bottom line
- Look at block grant program to basins ex – funds x to Rogue basin – let local groups prioritize investment \*\*
- Make outreach available and more like small grant program -> rapid response
  - Make outreach a high priority again
  - Important for getting partners and landowners
- Raise integration between restoration and association outreach
- OWEB use power to encourage partnerships with different entities – municipalities and others
- Encourage legislators to provide additional incentives (tax etc.)
- Incentive program to adjust management practices to address terrestrial management practices
  - Nexus with fire prevention funds and other fund sources
  - Noxious weeds
- Raise funding/leverage with other groups beyond PCSRF – diversity will bring raised flexibility
- Better define social/community – it varies by community – rec. – water to drink?  
Outreach into schools
- Small grant program – needs access to technical assistance
- Support for existing education programs

**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?**

- Expand operating base on ground
- Small initiatives that can/should green
- Turf
- Bonus points for partnerships within grant evaluations
- Bringing more folks to table
- To foster creative ideas – maintain flexibility
- Fish focus can be limiting -> expand into other types of projects – e.g. wetlands, beaver, uplands
- Healthy watersheds. Don't lose sight of wetlands, beavers, uplands. Includes more than fish and streams
- Watershed assessment -> have not had other offerings to provide dollars for a while
- Scale to appropriate for local needs
- Both OWEB staff assistance and dollars
  - Organizational support for outreach to landowners
  - Training for organization
  - Education
  - Professional assistance for community outreach
- OWEB – be sensitive to perception that watershed councils could be viewed as government
- Keep core in mind with all new ideas. General grant program vs. STP etc. OWEB work with other agencies to assist with match issue/leverage dollars
- Increase education/outreach grants – release restrictions so more members of community understand and support watershed not addressed in reg grants restoration
- Statewide education campaign
- Set aside part pot of money to send watershed councils and others to other groups that have been successful. OWEB take a role in distributing information about successful projects, lessons learned
- Continue to support network and OACD staff capacity
- Education and support for Watershed councils and SWCD
- Watershed councils are in a unique role and can do lots of things currently not funded to do this ex. NPDES/TMDL. Watershed councils can fill many voids
- Great programs dedicated to assist local groups to capitalize on service delivery for program needs
- OWEB encourage fee for service model for watershed councils
- Promote peer learning and building model
- Increase funding for outreach
- Increase field staff to benefit local groups or support for field staff – conduct an assessment
- Focus innovation on web tools, community interaction (not necessarily restoration)
- Higher collaboration between OWEB and other organization especially NFWF, NOAA – funders such as these and private orgs
- More effective sustainable restoration

- Outcome better , better prioritization in areas of greatest need
- Focus on existing data for decisions and standardized format
- Make data available
- Make case for economic benefits to local communities/commissions/chambers of commerce
- Take show on the road with data, graphs about economic benefit
- Currently OWEB being driven by partner funding may not be representing all of communities – enable broader outreach to local communities to ask what their needs are
- Recognize and be sensitive to political influence that some have and find balance so smaller local based orgs have similar influence with same outcome – look out for the “little guy”
- Transparency about decision process
- Big brother or foundation ->board needs to decide
- LTIS focus on restoration and other GP offerings – de-emphasize SIPS and Acquisitions

---

## Grants Pass – June 4, 2012 Written Comments

### **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?**

- Our watershed is all about salmon habitat and water quality. Landownership is private. Improving land owners/manager’s awareness of how their actions affect both habitat and water quality will be reflected in improved salmon population and water quality.
- Improve/increase awareness of the value of and need for restoration – make stronger connection to the economy – increase % of local economy from restoration activities. Develop clear priorities for restoration, acquisition and education. Continue monitoring key projects and resources, with greater emphasis on biological merit.
- Well-educated communities regarding watershed issues. In 10 years, if we are well on the way to well-educated communities we should see strong support for ecological restoration and protection. Successful restoration projects: long term monitoring is essential to making sure initial investment is worthwhile. Look to SDL’s wetland mitigation monitoring as an example
- Revitalization of fisheries. Development of monitoring infrastructure to quantify results and monitor trends in fisheries
- A standardized monitoring protocol to track specific objectives
- Species population grown. Habitats restored? Providing income through and as a result those funded projects
- Thriving watershed councils to get on the ground work done. More complete watershed restoration uplands as well as aquatic and riparian. Lower water temperatures. Clean water. Increased water volume
- More and better habitat; counting things smolts, gravel, water temperature etc.

- Increase leveraging of funds/investments to a 10:1 ratio. Create long term partnerships – some combined funding to improve ecological – and some combined funding for grants (larger grant program) to do the same. Improve monitoring to measure accomplishments. Education of population about watershed – increase 10 fold in 10 years.
- Ore guidance and focus in grant programs. Focus areas to reflect “triple bottom line”. E.g. ecological – encourage and support tributary focus. Social/community – identify and support key education/outreach metrics. Economic – identify and support economic metrics.
- Should see results of assisting watershed councils and other groups (such as weed boards / CWMAs) to restore areas in need of restoration. This could include riparian work (planting & noxious weed eradication) and work in uplands. The assistance should be statewide where needed most and/or where there are dedicated people to do the projects.
- Community involvement. Build partnerships. Economic outcome (performance) from investments
- Investments in stream restoration projects need to continue. Monitoring on the ground or as feedback from local watershed board.
- More realistic allocation to user within the state. Investigate the WC model – keep the best; junk the rest
- OWEB should work towards supporting a knowledgeable public that is aware and involved in watershed enhancement. Also increased water quality, habitat restoration etc. Stream improvement can be useful in public interest in watershed issues
- Quantifiable improvements in habitat values. Quantifiable improvement in public’s understanding of habitat values

**Question 2: Picture your watershed: What tools and programs can OWEB provide in its toolbox to help you achieve your goals?**

- Technical assistance – have a person that can help identify state/federal people that can help with project design – with some power to help make this happen. Better – more diverse training for RRT
- Develop a robust, sustainable program to improve restoration processes in the Rogue through better use of available information – better databases, like expanded Oregon Explorer
- Our part of the state is not in line with Portland, and doesn’t want to be. Education is a major hurdle to making progress
- Begin to address terrestrial management practices and assist in supporting industrial timberland management changes
- Tools are there for restoration work. OWEB should support capacity building
- Education at elementary level. Fish population increased due to program funding
- Continued council support (Base Level). Support for upland restoration. Support for use of fire as a management tool for ecological restoration (after initial restoration) Technical support

- Technical feedback on how projects of ours compare to other groups doing similar work. More direct contact/tours, meetings, etc. with regional rep.
- Provide technical resource pool. Technical assistance related to admin, contract templates, etc.
- Increased access to technical assistance
- Noxious weed eradication especially on non-federal lands would be very helpful. Some kind of program for matching funds for private landowners for noxious weed eradication is needed.
- Administrative operating capacity. Training. Quick response to requests
- Continued support of partnership
- Strengthen the organization doing the best work. Help leverage the foundation and agency dollars flowing into the state
- I would like to be more connected to other OWEB grant recipients given more assistance with grant admin. Support and funding for watershed programs
- More acceptance by OWEB of value of improving public understanding of ecological, social, and economic values of restoration

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

- Recognize the diversity of state ecologically, socially and economically. What works in one place may not work in another and OWEB might be surprised at the local solutions developed. This approach will require keeping some small/regional council modes strong, instead of trying to make them conform to the models developed by outsiders
- Fund more outreach and education programs that reach students and public
- Place the emphasis on best bang for the buck
- Continue with streamlined financial reporting assistance in regional and statewide networking. Consider a newsletter describing successful on the ground project development and management
- Consider projects in the uplands more that affect the quality of the watershed. Watershed is more than water and riparian
- Share lessons learned -> staff needs to do this through, possibly WSC staff, but not researchers
- Improve efficiency of administering watershed programs at the watershed level. Consider having watershed councils only at 4<sup>th</sup> HUC or larger – maybe basin wide
- Upland restoration support. Support watershed councils that have capacity (capacity building). More education and outreach. Easier process for reporting, billing and bookkeeping. Simplify!
- Find additional funding. Focus more on actions that truly protect and restore watersheds. Fuels projects are not a good use of funds
- Commit funding for managing public forest lands to improve water quality and restoration ecology
- Target high value watersheds, e.g., the Rogue, with greater % of OWEB resources and collaborate/communicate more with other funders – public (NOAA, transportation dollars), private (Meyer, Bullitt, etc.) and quasi (NFWF, BEF)

- Recognize that the needs of each watershed are different. Each has a different need for outreach/education; technical assistance; funding/match funding. Try to match assistance with the specific needs of the watershed
- The ability or assistance in social/community outreach is the first step to a successful watershed rehabilitation plan. Without the support and understanding of the local, regional and state communities there is very little hope of effectively communicating the watershed needs and even less hope in receiving economic support for the efforts

**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?**

- Reward successful grants with continued funding and leave opportunities for new funds
- Set aside a “pot of gold” to award the most creative restoration work. Foster strategies to further communication around the state where it could do the most good
- Different levels/sizes of grants. Long and short term grants. Feedback processes. Meetings around the state.
- Spread investments as fairly as possible. Consider bonus points for innovative ideas and concepts.
- Simplify Acquisitions. Why does OWEB do acquisitions? ODFW has dollars for this. Transfer knowledge/people and eliminate. Improve grant programs and guidance. Increase staff, develop priorities open grant cycle, share lessons learned with grantees!
- How could we make these meeting more fun: Less staff (although the ones here were informative), circle seating, candy bars, soda?
- Less emphasis on SIP. More block grants to regional projects, locations i.e. Rogue Basin. OWEB act as broker for additional funders and partners. Foster technical support with our state and federal partners. Recognize regional (ecological) differences. Support and broker collaboration and partnership
- Fee for service education
- Critically define restoration outcomes and prioritize them. OWEB should build partnerships and incentives for the purpose of leveraging funds to make available to watershed councils.
- Keep the emphasis on aquatic habitat restoration and add additional support for small community based organizations.
- Restoration economy – help promote. Increase partnerships between OWEB and other funders. Both combined funding, but first, increased collaboration and prioritization.
- Look at what is being done with the small grant fund. This may shed some light on what is not being fully addressed by the regular grant program
- I would focus on a larger landscape scale support of watershed councils promoting rehabilitation projects that effect larger communities from the top to the watersheds to the basins