

State of the Willamette Day 2

Guiding Vision Discussion: Building off Stan's idea that the Guiding Vision for the Willamette should be a process and not a document (dynamic and not static) what would this process look like?

- Process needs to be iterative and adaptive
 - lead to high quality projects
 - Gatherings are a good first step -bring together science, practice & funding (reflection)
 - Broaden goals and stakeholders – think about who owns the lands
- Identify Goals & Priorities:
 - Look through process lens, not limited to specific geographies, identify & prioritize best projects for watershed health
 - ID specific areas for improvement
 - Set realistic & fundable goals
 - Look at what has worked well historically (lessons learned)
- Landowners and other stakeholders need to be part of the process
 - Varied interests reflected in the vision
 - Cities & Counties also
 - ID WHO needs to be involved
- Incorporate diversity, equity, and inclusion
 - look at communities (marginalized/previously excluded from conservation conversation)
 - Broader version of community & watershed health
 - Expand voices
- Outreach:
 - Unified message among community/regional outreach
- The need to fund a continuous process:
 - Need for targeted outreach and secured future funding
 - Identify long term funding
 - Need funding for dedicated people
 - Need a funding vision & plan
 - Appreciate the alignment that already exists, coordinate with funding
- Information Sharing & communication:
 - Need a central repository of data informing anchor habitats and tracking efforts (updated regularly)
 - More communication among groups to help move together
 - Improve communications
 - Be available to each other
 - Meetings to talk about science and share new information/findings
 - Facilitate Building Partnerships
 - Communication Networks – share knowledge and data
 - Newsletters with latest science/data/findings
 - Too many parallel processes and projects – communicate across projects

Small Group Discussions

Priorities group (Taylor)

What worked Well?

- Oregon Chub – Private lands
 - Great data set
 - Below dams
 - Focused, longterm research
 - Channel complexity work supported recovery
 - Basin-wide strategy & reintroduction
- WWMP
- Easy to understand priorities and implement them
 - Figured out how to do flood plain forest expansion really well
- Success working on smaller revetment projects (above ordinary high water)
- South Fork McKenzie and other large projects to address channel complexity
- CARP – Gravel Pit reconnection(s)

What were Blind Spots?

- Private Lands
- Perspectives outside the scientific community – not included in setting priorities
- Lack of coordination between CREP and other efforts
 - Can't work on hydrology
- Disturbance in Floodplain forests
- Project prioritization (among multiple priorities)
- Not our business (as practitioners) to be working on complexity => on smaller projects
- Future land use and how this might constrain future opportunity/ Development
- Population growth
- Power of Aggregate lobby
- Out of stream water use
- Agricultural trends (ie hazelnuts)
- Inability of landtrusts to compete on price
- Climate Change

What should the next 10 years look like?

- Leasing land for restoration
- Improving working relationship with CREP
- All restoration programs allow for dynamic channel
- Down stream passage
- More tributary work
- Prioritize the priorities
- Partners and goals continue to develop – keep them fresh & living
- Legislation to limit development in floodplain
- Promote restoration where future temperature will be cool enough

- Close gaps where there are limited land trusts
- Integrate gravel extraction methods with needed restoration (for channel complexity) & reclamation plans
- More wood in streams
- Fight it out (with the Corps) how to remove more revetments
- More work on private land – not enough public land
- Improved outreach in general
- Pilot floodplain easement program

Challenges, Bottlenecks & Opportunities (Richard)

Difficult Questions

- How do we know if we are being effective? – ecological & human communities
- How can we be adaptive when we define desired future condition?

Challenges and Bottlenecks

- Long Term balance between habitat, agriculture, and aggregate
 - Better relationships with and understanding of economic interests
 - How do we work with and involve the larger community
- Lack of funding for long term maintenance and monitoring/research
 - Not enough capacity
 - Most flexible funding fosters creativity and effectiveness
 - Administrative burdens
- Greater clarity & consistency with funder reviews & changing priorities
- Systems are designed to reduce flooding – so how do we provide historic high and low flows?
- Changes to NEPA & wetlands
- Coast Fork Willamette: important tributary but often problems caused by development, funding and temperature

Opportunities

- Stream migration banks
- Willamette valley EIS
- Revetments: challenge or opportunity? Water control districts?
- Building climate resilience
- Can we expedite permitting?
- Collaborative efforts & coalitions
- Outreach around wider efforts that matter to communities
- Opportunities to use the science are increasing exponentially

Effective Communication Between Science, Practitioners & Communities (Laura)

Restoration=> Science

- Answering bottom up questions
 - What is relevant and practical
- Ariel imagery
- Citizen Science
 - Bird & amphibian monitoring (indicator species)
- Simplistic, site-level monitoring
 - Built into restoration funding

Science=>Restoration

- Clear answers to questions
 - Site visits/workshops for better planning
 - Early feedback
- Tell us where to focus
 - Priority areas/locations/project goals – with relevant info
- Track how projects are progressing
 - Develop simple metrics
- Planning workshops
- Emeritus Squad
- Dolphin Tank

Top Down- Bottom Up Funding priorities vs. Realities

- Time for building relationships
- Keeping landowners/participants engaged throughout
- Competing objectives & goals (multiple funders/viewpoints)
- What is the money telling us to do?
 - Is that based on science?
 - Improved communication/cohesion between science & funding priorities
- Ability to re-adjust priorities over time

Effective Communications across Willamette Stakeholders

Project & data updates for stakeholders

- Data repository for sharing & access
- Coordinating efforts
- Living & authoritative

For the general public

- Data sensitivity issues
- Organization websites

- Community talks
- Value public input – stakeholders share values, what appeals to them in restoration
- Work on private land may limit the ability to showcase projects
- Take advantage of existing websites/means of communication
- How do we reach the people who are not paying attention?

How do we frame restoration to appeal to multiple stakeholders/partners/people?

- Public access
 - How well do we tell the story of public access and restoration?
- Story maps – visuals have appeal/easy to understand
- Make connections with communities
 - Habitat, community health, local economy
 - Website for partners to highlight restoration projects (across partners)
- How we communicate is important
 - Appropriate scale & understanding at each level
 - Communication for science, public, and practitioner communities is different

Monitoring (Stuart)

Data needs of Restoration Practitioners

- Presence/absence of key species
 - Present and historical
 - Key to getting funding
- What data are available?
 - Types? Locations of storage? Access?
 - Both data & interpretations (use the data)
 - Aquatic inventories
- What are important site processes?
 - Present and historical functions (and losses)
 - Threats to such processes
 - Cold water refuges?
- Ability to tie functions/processes/species to proposed activities and funding

How do you measure Success?

- Presence and status of plants
- Presence/status/abundance of key species
 - Monitor the response of indicator species such as birds
 - Requires strong tie between ecological function and key species
- What is the appropriate timeline for post-restoration monitoring?
- Restoration of a previously lost function
 - Requires some commonly accepted methods or metrics
 - Share successful/useful methods – communication
- Currently funders only ask for whether the funded actions were completed, not whether they to the intended results

- Improve Impact monitoring (not just activity level)

Most Important Information Gaps

- How can we know what data are available?
- Data often not fully utilized
 - Lack of time, expertise, funding to analyze and use
 - Data interpretation and integration into planning/evaluation
- Prioritization
 - Where do we get the most return for dollars/time spent
 - Key data
 - Efficiency/cost
 - Benefit to user/funder
 - How do we decide what data to collect?
 - Incorporate data gaps, societal needs, equity
 - What are the trade-offs?
 - By funding this monitoring, what is not being funded?
 - How can we use data to inform priorities
 - To identify the most important locations and actions for restoration
- Collection of baseline, pre-restoration data
- Many activities are not prioritized in a larger context
 - opportunistic

What to monitor?

- How do we demonstrate the value of monitoring?
 - Difficult to sell
 - Sometimes the data are valuable but there is no research question
 - Data can be valuable for future, long term record
- Some data sets are a 'snapshot' in time – greater value when done frequently, over time
 - Need to choose 'sentinel' locations
- Need an accessible data repository

Good ways to share results

- Social media, videos
- Opportunities to talk about and show results of activities
- Need for detailed conversations among peers to share and discuss details
- Compile and share email lists
- Embrace failure and understand why