

Salem – May 31, 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?

- Baseline condition and uplift goal – monitor to achieve goal
- Improve watershed function – program and project effectiveness monitoring – frank about outcomes – how to get better if don't know if working
- Share lessons learned – make more accessible. Database of lessons learned
- Focus investments in key ecological areas (OCS, Will.map, WSC plans) –vs.- shotgun to enhance outcome – eco function, species diversity
- Specific strategy – habitats in Oregon cons. Strategy forest types. Outcome = metric numbers of acres of habitat
- Improve stewardship on public and private lands. Better OWEB relationship with agricultural community. AG controls a lot of land. AG and restoration work better together – result = more private habitat stewardship
- Plan for restoration maintenance
- Nor more weedy messes than we have now in 10 years
- Existing, quality habitat is at least as good in 10 years as is now
- ID problem – address – in 5 years show it has been achieved. Has it resolved/helped environment?
- Engaged citizenry – 10 years
- Strong connection to land and watershed in all demographics
- Engaged in activities = measure
- Create strong networks – more knowledgeable citizens and stewardships = shown by a variety of stakeholders (more involvement in Listening Sessions)
- Connected landscape level ecological restoration on lands predominately publically owned > long term security of OWEB scale results, basin level, area level results beyond project – longer term
- Restoration forever – invest in public land because private work doesn't last. Private is less permanent
- Private easements/community based, impacts ecological priority (but is it permanent?)
- Connectedness to nature – social attachments. Hard to measure. Higher level indicators. Data is expensive. Hard to have meaningful, measureable indicators in 10 years.
- Decades to get statistically significant trends.
- Indicator work – needs to be balanced with “reasonable surrogate” from experts. E.g. stream shading vs. monitoring all, everywhere
- Does OWEB need to do the data, are other partners collecting data? Be cautious in creating unique indicators for 10 years.
- Don't make application process too complex and only for professional grant writers but should be rigorous in granting large sums of money.

- Start with Oregon Conservation Strategy (50,000 ft.) -> Oregon Constitution -> statewide conservation strategy – progress toward OCS goals across diverse habitat, species and functions at landscape level.
- People should know their watershed so they take care of it. Measure by survey, poll and number of people engaged. “how many show up”?
- Shift in public perception and acceptance for habitat conservation on public and private lands. Some polarity now – ESA
- Outcome = land acquisition seem as a plus for services, open space, tec.
- Outcome = environmentalism is infrastructure/expensive. Cost of L.A ecosystem services
- Natural systems = high value
- Dollars to SWCDS improvements WSD (ODA)
- System doesn’t encourage fixing all functions in an area (vegetation, in-stream). Outcome = integration of programs to fix all – systems approach
- OWEB should clearly define watershed based conservation – Scale goals at watershed level. What is healthy watershed and how is it measured at watershed level. Need watershed scale effective monitoring
- #1 -stop the bleeding #2 - retrieve lost land. Acquisitions of wetlands and floodplains in 10 years. Floodplains are expensive to get back
- Upland habitats in crisis and also expensive
- People need to care
- Each of 3 mission areas are important. Ecosystem work force report important. Jobs – Oregon has more jobs in environment in 10 years. Would show strong grade. More companies locally to hire to do the work.
- Individual councils can’t control conditions in watershed but can control their own land – so indicators are good because of this.
 - How – through stories and demonstration of achievements. Community tool for communities. what investments are doing
 - Result – awareness, knowledge, understanding of dollars = more support, resources, expertise
- Measure = public opinion poll, 75% should show a basic understanding of watershed issues and neutral or positive knowledge of OWEB issues
- 50% of projects should show measurable and lasting ecological input through data collection (pre/post) this leads to public support. Need common approach to mon and OWEB analysis
- Team of folks trained on common monitoring platform (OWEB or contracted) training tools (Willamette partnership – example)
- Indicator = partnerships. More strategic partnerships leveraging resources on their own. Partnership incentives
- More projects tied to permanent projects. Needs a balance. Connect with private lands
- Outcome = community engagement and organizational capacity (# of volunteers) Capacity = do projects and maintain
- Must know and engage watershed citizens to prevent harm and restore
- Existing partners doing on the ground work need to be here – this is who L.O. want to work with (SWCDs and councils – L.O. contacts)

- No raiding OWEB dollars
- Invest strategically = important but need to do both. Outcomes in stronghold. Outcome = change/improve stewardship ethic. Measure = L.O. maintain restoration/culture of stewardship- they are part of it and do their part
- Join with IWRS and provide \$ place-based planning integrating uses and needs provide support to get off ground. How to do this?
- Increase riparian buffers – H2O temp will be reduced. Reduce sediment in streams. Fund monitoring to evaluate progress and conduct monitoring baseline support now and into the future.
- With mission statement in mind engage with others outside OWEB – students/ education in state – involve in res, ed. rest. monitoring etc.
- Expand community – success is demonstrated by future involvement with new groups/communities
- Work with Oregonians/communities to expand awareness/commitment to action to benefit ecological systems
- Establish baseline to evaluate project aggregate
- Maintaining those investments from past 12 years and allow for long term maintenance dollars for future investments
- Continued investment in SWCDs/WECs and assist WDCs in evolution and growth
- Demonstrate to public outcomes and successes for water quality, wetlands, etc. OWEB establish means to in fact measure outcomes
- Reporting standardization. Keep reporting requirements at project/activity.
- Larger landscape, collective effect, provide resources, database
- OWEB – design framework that roles apply to the large scale outcome focus, demonstrate success to public
- Provide resources to local entities to provide
- OWEB will have focused on addressing limited factors needed to restore and maintain habitat needs for Fish and Wildlife and Watershed
- OWEB actions within 10 years accommodate growth while monitoring watershed function. Remaining consistent with economic and population growth
- Ten years out desire to see communities have recognition of what is restored and a desire to maintain it.
- More contiguous restoration – less random acts of restoration – impacts at scale – everyone know what watershed is
- In ten years will have portfolio of protected areas open to all providing economic and biological benefits – be open to tools used – no constraints
- OWEB should be leading the nation with a model that shows and proves public investment in the environment can create and sustain jobs and healthy people. OUTCOME -> jobs in the environment through restoration, teaching, admin
- Participate in, and help the success of, the Integrated Water Resource Strategy
- Thriving watershed councils. Fishable, swimmable, drinkable water. Oregonians understand the ecological connections and are willing to take action, make sacrifices/pay dollars for their preservation
- Our watershed council (WC) is already fairly environmentally conscious and it is small. Biggest concern is more focus – education, projects – on upland portion of watershed

- Strong partnerships, successful projects with measureable and demonstrable outcomes, healthy waterways/wetlands
- Move towards de-listing of sensitive salmon species or at least create more stable populations across the landscape. Maintain functional local organization that are connected to the community and have the expertise/resources to tackle a broad spectrum of watershed issues
- Impact--- not just ecological changes at different sites. Includes cultural shift where communities/landowners recognize, pursue, maintain restored conditions. Social piece leads to connected projects and restoration at a scale where we are more likely to see/measure ecologic impact
- Follow the State Conservation Strategy identified as the guiding document in the Constitution. Measure progress against this frame and drive investments accordingly
- Water quality improved – improved from baseline amount 2012. Raise wetlands protected – increase in the number of wetlands. Salmon habitat improved – increase in salmon numbers. Increased riparian buffers and reduced sediment = water temperatures will be reduced and reduced amount of sediment in stream. Monitoring will provide data – landscape scale

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

- Sufficient operating funds and indirect cost specifically
- Signage, videography - support communication technical support – educational tools, schools, groups
- Building long term funding strategies and partnerships; rather than traditional grantee/grantor
- Strategic investment in geographic areas of most need
 - Baseline assessment
 - Measurable, obtainable objectives, community and economic as well as biological (often easier)
 - Provide monitoring framework for basins – also common databases
- OWEB assist in analysis
- Maintain land acquisition/restoration investments that we are doing today
- Professional development opportunity – OWEB funding for: (current conferences are good but add additional training for individual needs) Training/support to budding watershed councils. Get off to a good start
- Current focus on in-stream projects – need approaches to prevent toxins, nutrients etc., address behaviors upland
- Cost share – stream restoration irrigation, efficiencies, measurement devices
- Web-based – single budgeting web-based tool; that will allow WC to manage multiple projects
- Holistic approach to granting from planning to tech assistance, to operations assistance, more than current approach
- Finding for prevention of individual (plant and marine) species and monitoring
- Hub for outreach

- Provide synergism for SWCDs and WC for collaborative opportunities
- Provide data/analysis on what has worked and what hasn't; website availability
- Technical assistance by natural resources professionals, project specific, one on one, with foresters, biologists, engineering
- Funding for "cove tokens" positions to steward existing public lands
- Local input is important. Balance of state wide input
- Incentives: to "do the right thing" e.g. cows in streams, etc. Maintain what has been done
- Operating/maintenance funding category
- Address OWEB program for "working lands" approaches
- Nurture/support (permanent start) successful watershed councils over long term. Keep successful groups working
- Programs and projects that touch all ages
- Watershed health for all ages
- Preferential funding of low impact development (storm water)
- Integrated planning that considers storm water – along with host of other values all eco system functions
- Financial support and noxious weed program (continuous)
- Support for development of plant for restoration; (nursery concept)
- Encourage WC, SWCD to be self-sustaining (provide incentives)
- Case studies – success/failures
- Link to index of different tools (metric, credit)
- Keep grass root groups from dying
- Use every tool possible – every watershed and community has different needs
- More flexible dollars – groups can apply dollars where most needed *****
- Encourage long-term funding partnerships to lower burden and piecemeal approach. Tough to capture info **
- Offer expertise (OWEB staff) to help get grant money, implement projects
- Provide shared tech resources that cross boundaries and tools to use – from OWEB and facilitate access – other agencies, etc. **
- Info stream of best practices that show proven results
- Funds to break barriers – OWEB toolbox can help break barriers that exist to meeting OCS – don't artificially constrain tools in this process **
- Actively promote partnerships among grantees to get restoration up to scale – impact is bigger in partnership
- Shared database, reporting, applications with built-in confidentiality – all the way through system – include research based component for best practices – OR as national model (include lessons learned)
- Provide opportunities for fledgling councils to develop, become more functional, use dollars effectively
- Support success – councils that bring stakeholders, completed projects
- Reward by streamlining process
- In sync with IWRS – bring OWEB dollars to table in that strategy

- Continue to recognize importance of working with people...bring them along with projects – restoration projects with educational component
- Raise monitoring to provide baseline and document results achieved
- Support local grants in cons. and rest. and CREP
- Outreach – get people out doing/experiencing their natural community
- Help and support watershed councils. Find/discover restoration projects up and down stream so that Watershed Councils can participate in SIPs. Online application submissions. Online tools and online friendly help to find data and more
- Support place-based planning within the IWRS
- Funding without over supervision. Sharing of quality projects and ideas. Materials translated into languages other than English. Training for councils and districts about OWEB rules and requirements. Support place-based education
- Whole water cycle approach i.e. groundwater, upland infiltration. Help with regulation. Stream side restoration is low hanging fruit
- Funding for projects implemented by SWCDs and Watershed Councils – also other expertise for accessing grants and implementing projects
- OWEB can provide more flexible funding that allows organization to target their efforts where they are most needed. OWEB can provide shared technical resources that promote understanding across watershed and the state
- Long term funding partnership instead of traditional piece meal grantee/grantor that requires more administrative burden for all parties. Promote partnerships to get beyond competitiveness among grantees, groups fragmented in silos misses opportunities to bring restoration and stewardship up the scale that gets impact
- Acquisition of lands and waters and funding to restore these lands. 9% historic investment in this tool is way, way too low, 75-85% should be target
- CREP continue to support local grants conservation/restoration, monitoring to provide baseline data to document results achieved

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

- Balance investment to raise investment in acquisitions (lasting/permanent investment)***
- OWEB fund outreach/education for ecological education outcomes – focus on people**
- Greater emphasis on urban environment – greater challenges (Oregon City – example)**
- Invest in rural, salmon-rich areas that are in good condition
- Fund based on merit – not just divvy up around the state *
- Align funding with strategic initiatives (OCS) and leverage partnerships *****
- Look at landscape scale – OWEB can fill the gap in a holistic approach – start at landscape scale
- Consider education as part of the landscape/holistic approach – look at all contributing factors to watershed health
- Allow proposals to be submitted online Streamline process for reviewer and applicant – OWEB’s process is comparably challenging *****
- Re-evaluate overhead (10% and fiscal admin only currently – change) True cost

- Diversify audience/OWEB users
- With permanent funding, don't be so politically fearful – Be bold, think out of the box.
- Need emergency fund (invasive species in Vernonia) for between grant cycles – be nimble
- Report (efficiently) on restoration economy outcomes
- SIP – stable funding is good but it doesn't feel streamlined**
- Improve grant decision-making process raise transparency and statewide consistency
- Evaluate past strategies and methods, build on good, learn from past investments
- Funding projects that change practices that led to degradation – preventative, water quality
- OWEB fund upland and other practices not being funded
 - Look at applications to ensure there is not bias against certain project types
 - Proposal stratification
 - Respond to limiting factors – know project impacts
- OWEB – act like funder, not program or vice versa
- Expand perspective – water quantity and quality
- Create grants to address triple bottom line for multiple years ***
- Take into account value of agriculture At landscape scale
- More focused over longer period on priority geographies – currently identified and newly identified
- Invest in citizen science
- Look at projects as a portfolio that needs to be maintained over time – an asset
- Revenue generation overtime – ecosystem SVC or production to maintain property over time
- Functions – based accounting of restoration benefits. Be clear about expected benefits
- Tell the story of OWEB's successes and programs to those outside the natural resources realm and learn from failures
- Prioritize funding based on health of system – get unhealthy areas improved and healthy systems maintained
- Utilize experience that exists in forestry and agriculture to learn how to build restoration
- Encourage conglomeration of local partnerships (shared staff, tec.) – look at successful models
- Raise public/private partnerships like SIP
- More understanding of how three categories fit together and interaction between them
- All OWEB investments are ecological projects – tie other benefits to those outcomes
- Utilize existing social and community structures
- Longer term, larger scale investments over time
- OWEB is doing a lot right – more tweaking
- Revisit what it means to work from grassroots – facilitate local groups to be able to define “what” meaningful restoration means in their area ***
- Watershed councils have coordinators for a short time (1-1 ½ years) – look at how OWEB invests in capacity to ensure we are not the limiting factor (funding cycles, contractor, build partnerships)** (also applies to SWCDs)

- Think about enduring delivery capacity system that is best for Oregon -> financially sustainable, professional, enduring, delivers outcomes. Time is now – land trusts, councils, SWCDs, collaboratives, conservation orgs
 - Look at what’s working where and what’s not – keep in mind what drives process and what we don’t want to lose.
 - Designed by those embedded everyday – look at how we are leveraging funds at a local level
- Don’t be afraid to make hard choices – but they need to be made with local folks at the table – honor local knowledge
- Measure 76 puts Oregon in a unique spot in the nation to leverage federal dollars – keep an eye on federal ball – they are looking for match and leverage
 - Important for OWEB dollars to break barriers
 - Legislative support to apply for and receive federal dollars
 - There is a partisan split on federal dollars when used for lands going into public hands – consider lands in private ownership
 - Also consider transition of wealth between generations
- Market and promote success stories – help successes market themselves
- Learn from failures what best practices are – both for help with turnover and with other local groups
- Raise involvement with tribal and other under-represented groups/communities – go the them – they have good ideas
- Recognize impact of education to the entire community to get them involved
- Improve collaboration between currently competing organizations ***
 - Narrow the gap between councils and SWCDs
 - Look at funding mechanism – there ought to be an incentive to work collaboratively ex-councils engaging districts and vice versa
 - Collaborating organizations get points or larger grants for collaboration
- Make application and reimbursement process less complicated
 - Streamline process for those who have successfully been funded before (capacity and restoration – all \$).
 - Ensure mechanism is fair/equitable with regard to “who” is funded – streamlining is about process – first timers get opportunity to revise, mentor, help
- Include tribal communities and communities of color in concerned topics
- On ecological focus on enduring outcomes of conservation strategy the other two will follow
- Build strategy and corresponding program process that better target and record strategic restoration that results in ecological uplift, captures social impact/shift towards stewardship and documents economic benefits...might require looking at past to understand. Impact of (of lack of) previous funded work. Target dollars to ecological priorities, not trying to fund all things all places. Maybe fund temporarilyready to go projects/groups, phase out, new groups build up, tec. Also target social shift and economic benefits to build story that restoration make sense, is viable and a good investment
- OWEB needs to reconnect with the original intent of mobilizing communities for grass roots efforts.

- Re-evaluate funding allotments to partners – SWCDs and Watershed Councils. Leverage funds with other agencies – NRCS, TWC(The Wetlands Conservancy), etc. Time is NOW to really look at this
- Grass roots revival of original program
- Recognize importance of people to achieving healthy watersheds. Education and outdoor experiences
- Be flexible with your grants. Support appropriate operations
- Engage watershed councils and their coordinators more frequently/regularly by asking questions about “climate” or the community about the watershed council relationship. How much are the local working with councils: Coordinate with Oregon Business Development Dept. to get more businesses on the ground in rural Oregon that can support watershed council and environmental services work

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?

- Establish priorities for OWEB nest with in larger state-wide strategy
- Basin sidewalks for some fish not only for birds – not just basin will benefit
- Keeping program outcome based and other priorities – geographic/balance – basin scale priority
- Keep ear to grand throughout the year to understand needs
- Keep in touch with grantees asking about needs and strategies
- Avoid a shotgun approach – strive for balance to strategies in wetlands
- Stick to priorities but add Community Shed solution granting opportunities(new) – outcome based measure every 2-3 years
- Maintain funding opportunities for flexibility and new needs
- Long term project needs to achieve goals with-out becoming entitlement
- Monitoring fund for things like weeds – is this OWEB function?
- Idea incubation (set aside Friday)
- Act as a venture capitalist both strategic and responsive
- Connect expenditure decisions to larger goals and strategies directly (OCS e.g. USFWS, Rec plans and other (no need for OWEB to create)
- Oregon Environmental Literacy Plan -> investments in education
- OWEB strive to assist in establishing broad based(mixed age) support for conservation engagement – develop long term strategy including grant based opportunities for groups
- Objectives under Strategic Plan with more specific activities
- Encourage development of grassroots organizations
- Create access to common data – enhancing existing tools, ex. land use and natural resources
- Involve WSCs and SWCDs and other conservation groups in development of strategic and opp programs
- Demand efficiencies from grantees and progress toward cons.goals
- Retain SIP, streamlining, reduce incremental evaluation of some metrics

- Reduce directing between SID/other OWEB investment – establish regional priorities across grant programs – recognize they are dollar limiting
- Continue investments in local entities (WSCs, SWC, landlords) with strategy to build capacity of local groups to perform at larger scale
- Funding partnerships, e.g. BEF MMT
- OWEB work with other agencies (lead on issues) to establish needs – outcome based RFPs – EM
- OWEB role provide dollars to allow local entities to meet priorities
- Provide funding for both strategic statewide as well as opp. and creative local needs
- Process for establishing SIP
- Too many types of grants!!! Bundle existing. Staging hierarchy of grants regarding RQs increase perhaps
- Get dollars to the ground for high priority acting, high performing orgs.
- Applications: Online – Preliminary – Streamlining – Shorter
- Lumping grants and reduce reporting projects and not to individual grants
- Align grants with a holistic integrated approach
- Education is part of every project
- Offer long term grants to establish more certainty for staffing
- Develop separate dollars for new and innovative ideas and groups
- Use current exp. with grantees from past – 12 years to rely on dollar funding continually
- Set-up performance based way to evaluate organizations – establish criteria (e.g. have vision strategy track need) then block grant
- Goal – to allow more time for input
- Maintain controls and oversight – incremental accountability
- Mentorship granting opportunities for local groups to get participation to gain and mentor others
- Small grant and opp. funding – set aside dollars for opp. that such as: arise weeds , landowner domino effect grants
- Establish contingency funding opp. with-in grant
- Work with partner organizations and agencies to look at their priorities and look for opportunities to leverage dollars and where goals overlap – collaborate and partner
- OWEB act as linkage and collaborating force, catalyst, clearing house
- OWEB's bigger than restoration – don't limit tools
- Ensure education component and through partnership with educational institutions and schools etc. as component of grant requirement – include education to community
- New and creative – work with educational institutions/schools etc. to promote
- New grant opportunities to foster new and creative ideas marketing entrepreneurial tools
- Provide training opportunities mentorship to better the likelihood of successful project management, grant administration, project implementation, etc.
- OCD – Constitutional mandate should be our guide under Measure 76 – driven by measureable outcomes articulated in OCS
- Biological goals
- Local organizations have strategies and needs and OWEB board should incorporate these in its larger state wide strategy

- Recognize the unique nature of each local group and organization when established under statewide strategies and biological and ecological framework that are also unique throughout the state.
- OWEB invest in local groups to be able to bring the info and data to make this happen.
- Establish benchmark (magnitude of citizen involvement) for measuring local communities engagement in establishing healthy watershed
- Invest in systems as alternative to products (projects) determine capacity needs of individual organizations desire to reach larger impact/scale
- OWEB work with OPRD to meet park mandates and biological mandates as well – make a concerted effort specifically
- Work with partnering agencies to see what their focus is. Work with universities for new ideas. Half the state lives in metropolitan areas
- 95% investments in the conservation strategy goals – 5% to new innovations
- We want a restoration story that promotes an ethic that encourages communities/landowners to see, value, promote and maintain restoration. Need to figure out how to weave ecological strategies, strengths of diversity of organizations and captures results to tell a story. Current granting system (piece-mealed, spread dollars broadly makes this difficult. This requires a different funding relationship. Long term funding integrated with shorter term grants allow for adaptation while providing support that might reduce high turnover, keeping a good strategy moving to completion, completing large scale/high impact projects
- Need to make sure that local priorities feed up to regional and state prioritizations like the Oregon Conservation Strategy. Invest in capacity to get to restoration outcomes rather than investing just in restoration
- Leave in as much flexibility as possible
- Continue to support successful programs. Provide sufficient funds and time to plan stage, implement and monitor on the ground projects. Give Oregonians tools, ideas and activities to positively impact watershed and watershed health
- Reserve a portion of resources for creative ideas
- Have listening sessions. US the Network or Oregon Watershed Councils. Use water quality data as a driver

Salem – May 31, 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?

- Coordinated investment – leveraged funds. Protection of high priority “strategy” habitats, oak savannas, bottomland hardwood forests, aspen, late successional conifer,

ponderosa pine woodlands. Active management/restoration. Economic natural resource assets – use to generate dollars for restoration.

- Retrieval and restoration of significant portions of urban watersheds, particularly with a reward to wetlands and floodplains.
- OWEB should consider refocusing on more inclusive funding strategies that account for full-scale projects, not just low Hanging fruit. Success could be identified through monitoring long term viability of each project, not short term “progress”.
- Strategic network of protected/restored waters, lands and functions that align with or conservation strategy, plan etc. Uplands, not just fish – raise representation of diverse habitats/species/functions. Ecological functions – e.g. water quality and habitat.
- Measured impacts and effects – ecological and cultural. Promote more SIP’s and whole watershed-type “initiatives”. Continue capacity dollars at a constant level to SWCD’s and councils that are meeting clearly defined benchmarks and demonstrative measureable impacts. Increase technical assistance/outreach funding as the most difficult, time consuming and meaningful stage of projects is the onset of strategizing/landowner recruitment/design. OWEB will see more strategic partnerships develop throughout the state if they achieve success in their investments.
- Measureable ecological uplift in priority watersheds. An engaged citizenry that understands their watershed and participates in protecting and enhancing its resources. Both kids and adults. We can measure some of this (restoration), but the social piece is more difficult.
- Connect every student to their home watershed. Engage them as current and future stewards. Invest in implementing the Oregon Environmental Literacy Plan (“No Oregon Child Left Inside”) – use this assessment to track progress.
- Begin – scale recovery of listed salmonids in priority watersheds. Metrics are base dependent but should quantify vs. limiting habitat factors and eventually in population numbers of wild fish.
- Healthy watersheds performing functions. Strong connection to land/watersheds among all demographics.
- Identify important issues that need to be addressed and prioritize the issues for funding.
- Work within scientifically identified geographic areas of importance. Measureable change within a landscape, water column, or recovery of a specific species? In some areas, economic may be very important.
- Define what “watershed based” conservation means and develop tools to implement and track progress toward meeting watershed level goals. Leverage financial and social capital in high priority areas to get more conservation on the ground, faster. Identify and measure how watersheds are “healthier” that they are now.
- There should be a significant, lasting and measureable ecological benefit on at least half of the project sites funded by OWEB. In a public opinion poll conducted throughout the state, 75% of respondents should be able to demonstrate basic awareness of watershed issues and a neutral or positive view of OWEB funded projects (generally).
- OWEB should be guided by the Oregon Conservation Strategy and other statewide conservation plans. Progress toward achieving the goals set for in those plans is success.
- Significant ecological gains in high priority – high potential salmon watersheds. Clear and significant ecological gains everywhere else, based on prioritized, regionalized river

basin plans (e.g. Willamette, Deschutes, Klamath, John Day etc.). Clear changes in stewardship activity by landowners (with support from councils and SWCDs)

- Lasting conservation benefits for native wildlife (including fish and plants). Landscapes with healthy functioning natural systems managed to ensure their long term conservation. Monitoring and evaluation show success of investments. Stewardship of conservation values is community priority.
- Substantial investment in environmental education reasoned by shifts in public attitude and surveys of school children before and after experiencing programs. Improvements in upland habitats measured by acres restored and at-risk plants and animals protected.
- Improve water quality in streams and rivers so that they are all safe for swimming and fishing.
- Meaningful restoration of naturally functioning ecosystems throughout Oregon – and demonstrating a path to do so for other entities. More dollars spent on maintenance and monitoring and holding grantees liable for project failures.
- Help create strong networks of watersheds, communities and stakeholders in Oregon. Help create more and healthier green spaces and clean waters in Oregon. Help create more knowledgeable citizens and students to help achieve a and b. You will know if you have achieved a – c because you will be able to hear from varied stakeholders and see the healthy lands and waters statewide

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

- One-on-one technical assistance by natural resource professionals (site, project, landowner specific). Funds to landowners to develop management plans (e.g. forest management plans)
- Ready access to critical data with/on which to base advocacy efforts. Encouragement of more urban research by tying funding to same. OWEB provide preferential funding related to LIP.
- Improve granting options for projects through ODA, in an effort to arrive at the same outcome and long term viable projects. Such projects must include inventory, contracting options, restoration – to include invasive species control and subsequent management – and monitoring; adaptive management must also play a strong role.
- Behavior change through community based social marketing (e.g. Doug McKenzie-Mohr). Ecosystem marketplace. More strategic, long term investments like Meyer/OWEB/BPA in Willamette
- We are receiving much of the support and tools we need now, actually – Willamette and Model SIP dollars, increased support for long range vegetation management, support of ecosystem marketplace alignment (Renee), good relations with RPR. If OWEB is serious about the storytelling and community awareness of measureable outcomes, then there must be more funding for signage/videography/project website management and other outreach efforts attached to specific projects, council support dollars are not at an adequate level to do all of these things – help us help you! Continue to support Network and OACD – they provide tools/professional development.

- More T.A. opportunities or some way to design/consult in-stream projects. A better facilitated action plan.
- Stream Webs - Student/interns restoration & monitoring. Support collaborative networks/partnerships -> collective impact i.e. invest in the Portland Metro's Intertwine Conservation Education Leadership Council to implement outreach strategies across the region.
- Long term programmatic funding (candidate for SIP or equivalent); contribution to reach scale projects, some > current competitive dollar limits; capacity funding; multi -year investment > bi-annually.
- Financial help/assistance with flexibility to achieve local and state wide goals.
- Maybe coordinate efforts of nearby groups to provide a synergistic effect. Let the council know what priorities that E(O)WEB will most likely fund.
- Strategic implementation. Evaluate past implementation strategies and methods. Build on success; stop funding those that don't work. Dollars for implementation in areas of importance.
- Support development of specific tools to address high priority conservation issues (e.g. floodplain reconnection). Continue funding of SIPs that help to leverage outside investment dollars in high priority areas.
- Simpler budget processes. For example, to reduce time spent understanding/managing budgets OWEB should create a web-based single master budget for each recipient (read/write access by recipient/OWEB staff and read only access to public).
- OWEB should spend more dollars on acquisition to ensure permanent protection of natural resources and habitat. Restoration is a vital and important part of managing acquired and other critical land, but can be fleeting. Strong education and outreach programs are also important to build support for conservation.
- Sufficient operating support to function strategically and with strong collaborations with landowners and other partners. Coordinated, meaningful, river basin strategies we can choose to opt in to, with adequate funding support. Regionalized priorities, rather than equal funding by region, based on river basin prioritized plans.
- Funding for land conservation to sustain conservation value and funding for restoration and enhancement to address conservation priorities and limiting factors. Funding for monitoring and evaluation. Funding to ensure long term stewardship in support of OWEB investments.
- Funding for educational programs, workshops and field tours. Funding for upland and wetland habitat restoration. Support for non-profit organization development beyond watershed councils.
- Incentives for farmers and landowners to create natural buffers along waterways.
- Capacity building grants to build more structure and rigor into local groups will aid effectiveness. Buying outcomes rather than inputs (or actions) is a good example to set. DATA on past projects – make available!
- Strong programs (both capital and non-capital) and grant partners of all ages to help keep more positive activities than negative effecting our watershed.

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

- More understanding of how the three categories fit together and how we need a balanced funding strategy within all three categories in order to create the results desired. For example, outreach affects broad communities of many ages, and without a strong social/community funding strategy, OWEB will fall behind in its long term goals for healthy watersheds with thriving economic communities
- Better defined expectations of quantifiable ecological outcomes. Verifying (or using a third party verifier like the Willamette Partnership) that projects exist long after implementation
- Make it financially attractive to do the right thing in riparian areas so that water quality is maintained or improved. For instance, offer incentives for landowners to provide natural buffers – not just pro grant writers.
- Relax and streamline financial reporting requirement. Current process is notoriously difficult. Create on-line proposal submission process (join the new century). Emphasize relationships/partnerships with government agencies.
- More strategic investment. Less political fear – Measure 76 protects: be bolder
- Provide adequate indirect costs/operating funds to allow councils to flourish. Provide CS dollars to ensure participation from a broad spectrum of stakeholders. Adopt common proposal review (TRT) process across the state.
- More acquisition.
- Streamline grant application/budgeting processes.
- Carefully examine existing gaps in conservation and focus energy there. Treat funds as economic development funds.
- Same as question 2 answer. Further define and limit where and how funds will be used.
- See question 1 above. Find more funding sources.
- Perhaps funding more assistance to help landowners
- Prioritize anchor habitats for recovery plans; invest in read-scale projects and/or phased projects. Consider scale – larger rivers can be more capital intensive to restore
- Educate people? Cultivate them to care: take care of our watersheds
- Tighten its focus to watersheds with high ecological benefits while remaining present in all areas of Oregon
- Project dollars easier to come by, especially in ESA baring streams in Oregon, so focus on the outreach/education, which will boost the overall stewardship in the landscape, as well as allow for project development. “If the state thought the best mechanism for restoration were watershed councils, then they would be funding their capacity to develop partnership and outreach at a higher level than they are now.” Begin to require stats on jobs created/materials sourcing/operators to emphasize the importance on the local economy – many groups are already doing this, so requesting this info with the monitoring reports will begin to paint the picture and tell the story on the socio-economic change happening. On that note, less of a cumbersome process, from beginning to end – if the program is changed and is more strategic with priority actions (like SIP), then they shouldn’t have to go through tremendous rigmarole to get funded – there could be REGIONAL priorities and action, where groups plug into that long term basin-wide

investment rather than the quick short term fixes –

Rogue/Klamath/Sandy/Deschutes/Willamette – attract partnering foundations – then the timing and allocation of funding could be prioritized more internally then by OWEB as a top-down agency. Maybe requirement is a strong word, but at a minimum promote strategic partnerships throughout the state, whether it be council-council, council-land trust, or with local government – there are a ton of councils, and not all are partnering at the level they should be by now. More monitoring, with OWEB support to develop effective monitoring programs and tracking? Most support for Greg?

- Integration with other funding sources and partners (more). Be for strategic. Integrate with land use planning – more acquisition
- See question 2
- Raise priorities for urban work. Raise acquisitions. Raise outreach (information development)
- More inclusive of inter-agency coordination. For example, don't ask the Dept. of Forestry for its expertise – then go back to your corner. Instead – collaborate with the Dept. of Forestry as your resource on forestry matter. Example – use our assessments priority landscape data to set priorities – if incomplete – tell us what is missing – so our data fits your needs.

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 create a category for 'creative community shed solutions' and fund it at a large enough pool and consistently (at least 10 years) to see and measure results. I would create outcomes for this category and measure them every five years
- Pilot project dollars for new ideas, but larger sums for verifiable strategic outcomes
- Avoid money pits and endless projects. Set aside an "emergency pot" for biological emergencies that can't wait to the next grant cycle. The Emergency Board doesn't work for this purpose anymore.
- Build in flexibility rather than strict roles. Remunerate high-priority project areas and clearly describe them. Fund projects that address regional places like the Oregon Conservation Strategy and USFWS Recovery Plans & Oregon Environmental Literacy Plan.
- Establish statewide (and geographically explicit) conservation priorities that allow vesting of priorities at regional and local scales.
- Bottoms up prioritized basin scale plans, rather like the SIPs.
- Demand more efficiency from watershed councils and drive them toward self-sustainability. The 6 million dollars spent on WCs every biennium could be much more focused. Demand program toward conservation goals.
- SIP. Restoration grants (and TA). Small grants (and TA). Reduce types of grants to three (small, med, large) to allow entry to diverse groups and to reduce complexity
- Funding allocations. Competitive process
- Focus on priorities developed for 5-10 year work effort regardless of watershed. Evaluate project in each watershed to find "uniqueness" for that watershed that supports the priorities.

- Outcome based looking at priority areas. Local input, science based
- Allocate a percentage (majority?) to priority investment; reserve minority portion for opportunistic efforts/ start-up, e.g. 80% priority investment; 20% opportunistic, innovative, flexible. Tough but necessary to interrelated challenges. Concentrate in priority ecological areas/basins. Energize statewide engagement & accomplishments to build/monitor community support to equity. Don't spread too thin to move needles on meaningful time and scales.
- Create targeted objectives under each of the 5 goals – allow for flexibility in specific activities.
- Just as watershed councils are expected to partner, so should land trusts, SWCD's and OWEB for that matter (with other funders to leverage more dollars for specific basins). Continue base-level funding for SWCD and councils to allow for capacity to get creative and be responsive/nimble to issues in our basins. Support Networks/OACD, but what about COLT? I guess they have the Gray Family foundation. Fiscal should remain at 10% minimum, respecting that many indirect rates are showing upwards of 20%. Use innovative products and programs coming out of the Willamette and Deschutes and somehow share them throughout the state a relevant, like the database – what else? Maybe the FTF – council partnership model in the Willamette – maybe the Network should be doing this instead of OWEB, but there still should be more dissemination of these great programs/products/partnerships. What if there were proposals from start to finish – assessment/recruitment/design/implementation/monitoring and as long as the council and its partners has a high priority basin or reach in mind, there should be approval from OWEB without hoops to jump through at every state – like the model watershed program – instead there would be annual monitoring/benchmarks reported.
- Assign a % of funding for strategic investments at landscape scale – species/locations/habitats/functions/scale at risk (aligned with goals) >>> 50%. Smaller % of funding for opportunistic investments. Separate % for clever, creative ways to meet goals – small
- Combine multiple pieces of the pie chart to ensure a holistic approach to all projects. Strongly encourage partnered and/or collaborative projects. Act, in part, as a clearing house for information with regard to projects occurring within a certain radius of proposed projects – with the intent of building/supporting collaborative efforts.
- Be more targeted with criteria related to research and outreach possibly reduce emphasis on direct support of restoration except in areas on 303D list.
- Use a priority landscape approach. But keep a bullet in reserve to throw at opportunities as they arise. Similar to the small grant approach.