

**Oregon Solutions
StreamBank
2nd Project Team Meeting
4/4/08**

Portland State University

In attendance:

Jane Bacchieri, Governor's Office, Natural Resource Advisor
Ken Bailey, Oregon Solutions Convener
Ken Bierly, Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board, Deputy Director
Mark Brown, Bureau of Land Management
Brett Brownscombe, Oregon Trout, Conservation Director
Megan Callahan-Grant, NOAA Fisheries
Charlie Corrarino, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Fish Recovery
Pete Dalke, Oregon Solutions
Dennis Griffin, State Historic Preservation Office
Kevin Herkamp, Department of State Lands
Ryan Houston, Upper Deschutes Watershed Council, Network of Oregon Watershed Councils
Alan Horton, Oregon Trout
Dave Dishman, State engineer, USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service
Ray Jaindl, Oregon Department of Agriculture
Ray Jubitz, The Jubitz Foundation
Krista Koehl, Port of Portland
Judy Linton, US Army Corps of Engineers
Lois Loop, Farm Service Agency, Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program
Jeff Oveson, Grande Ronde Model Watershed, Network of Oregon Watershed Councils
Peter Paquet, NW Power and Conservation Council and Land Owner
David Primozych, Willamette Partnership, Executive Director
Doug McDaniel, Landowner from NE Oregon
Kevin Monyahan, Department of State Lands
Joe Sheahan, Oregon Dept. of Fish & Wildlife
Mike Teehan, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association - Fisheries
Jim Tuner, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association - Fisheries
Pam Wiley, Meyer Memorial Trust

Follow-up items from flip charts and discussion include:

Short Term:

2008 Pilot Project Objectives Work Group

Core members include DSL, Oregon Trout, OWB.

Purpose includes:

- Clarify the intent of the pilot projects.
- Identify objectives of the Oregon Solutions project that won't be met in 2008.

2008 Pilot project final selection

- Oregon Trout will articulate 2008 pilot project selection criteria that will be driven to a large extent by the priorities set with partners providing funding this year.
- The pilot projects and criteria will be shared with key partners including DSL, USACOE, OWEB, ODFW, FSA CREP program.

On-going:

Data Management Work Groups

Work groups discussed at the meeting are outlined below. The lead for each group and core work group members are suggested in ().

- Cultural Resource Reviews
 - Explore programmatical for cultural resource reviews. (DSL lead, US ACOE, ODFW, OSU INR, OWEB, FSA CREP, NOAA Fisheries, Oregon Trout, others?)
 - Consider discussion at the June meeting of the cultural resources cluster
 - Resource needs at SHPO – data set development and access, application processes.
- Electronic permit application (DSL lead, Oregon Trout, OWEB, ODFW, others?)
 - Development of a data dictionary.
 - Streamline project applications and reporting.
- StreamBank
 - Explore opportunity to streamline project funding processes using a similar approach as the Electronic permit application.
 - Alternative approaches for web tool to prioritize projects. (Oregon Trout lead, OWEB, NOAA Fisheries, ODFW, watershed councils)
- GIS needs to expedite restoration projects (ODFW, Oregon Trout, OWEB, DSL, NOAA Fisheries, OSU INR, others?)
 - Fish passage barrier data sets
 - ESA data

Barriers to Expediting Restoration Projects

Some specific barriers identified by the Oregon Solutions Project Team to date that may require statutory changes or government-led funding include:

- Oregon statutory limitations around notice-based permitting.
- Cultural resource reviews. Lack of adequate database development and related software tools at the Oregon State Historic Preservation Office.
- Fish passage barrier dataset integration and a completed GIS layer for the State.
- Development of additional GIS layers for use in identifying priority projects that are meaningful to each agency/funders priorities, and at a landscape scale for restoration.
- Staffing resource to address and coordinate expedited permitting efforts - at DSL beyond summer 2009, and at the Federal agencies when/where needed (e.g. USFWS in the short term).

DRAFT Meeting Notes:

I. Welcome and Introductions

Ken Bailey convened the meeting, reviewed the agenda. Pete Dalke asked if anyone has comments regarding the meeting notes, wanting to make sure the comments from the last meeting make sense and are clear. He also clarifies that the discussion is broader than just funding the projects. No comments were received regarding the notes from the first project team meeting notes on 2/22/08. Ken Bailey noted that comments or changes can also go after today to Pete.

II. Review of Project Objectives

The project objectives for 2008, and 2009 and beyond, were distributed with the agenda (2/2008 draft). Added to the objectives for clarifications is the need to “test the web tool with a diverse group of landowner coordinators and a suite of project types”. Pete Dalke reviewed the Oregon Solutions collaborative process. Ken Bailey asked the team to review the ground rules presented at the previous meeting. At the end of the process we want to get a Declaration of Cooperation with statements of what each organization can provide to make the project a success. Expertise, technical, financial resources to implement the pilot projects and then commitments for work needed further down the road to expedite restoration projects.

Ken Bierly asked if the objectives listed are the stated objectives for the project and are they realistic. Discussion followed. One intent is to clarify the objectives for the pilot projects in 2008, and to try to begin to capture as well as for the 2009 and beyond for things that aren’t being addressed this year. This is one purpose for convening the project team.

In the draft 2/2008 handout there appear to be 3 sets of objectives. Discussion continued to clarify how they are linked together. The relationships between these pieces and how they might be linked together in time was considered. Ken Bailey indicated we can re-asses how we move objectives into other years for a realistic approach. DSL felt the objectives were realistic for what they feel can be accomplished for expedited permitting for 2008.

Ken Bailey asked that a smaller group get together to reassess and specify objectives that are realistic for the 2008 pilot projects and can be “tested”. Oregon Trout, DSL and OWEB will pursue this review and bring back revised 2008 pilot project objectives for the team to consider.

Ken Bierly asked does that mean pilot project objectives include culvert removal. Oregon Trout and DSL re-emphasized the desire for pilot projects to include placing large wood and boulders using StreamBank and the new expedited permitting process by end of year. Both felt if we can get to “testing” culverts projects as well that would be an additional bonus.

Ken Bailey noted the number and pace for pilot projects may be slower than we all hope – and there is a benefit to consider extending this “pilot” process for another year into 2009 particularly given OWEB’s interest in partnering more on fish passage barrier removal projects. This meeting can further sort out what we are doing for this year and coming years. He suggested we may want

DRAFT for REVIEW

to review pilot project progress with another meeting before December 2008. We may have a better idea after today's meeting of what we are going to accomplish with the pilots.

Pete Dalke discussed the need for additional work groups that seem to be needed to address the details of expedited permitting and providing better web tools, not just StreamBank, for landowner coordinators. This will be framed up better by the discussion today. If we don't finish this discussion today, and you want to be included on a work group – like the pilot project objectives or another work group, or suggest the need for another working group - let him know.

III. E Permitting and Process Improvement

Pete Dalke introduced some of the data management issues around the permitting process. A group (DSL, ODFW, OSU INR) met with Dennis Griffin, the State Archeologist at the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). Pete also had the opportunity to meet with Dave Dishman and Sean Welch with USDA NRCS to discuss how their restoration programs are trying to interface. Kevin Herkamp suggested that the discussion turn to the cultural resource review issues to start the discussion.

Cultural Resource Reviews - Discussion

Kevin Herkamp addressed the plan to streamline the cultural review process for large wood and boulder placement and possible options to bring efficiency to cultural resources / SHPO consultation for projects in general. Currently – lot of delays in process. Looking at some technology fixes in the short-term, including a web-based forum that would provide a screening tool. Not achievable immediately as there needs to be a data management system adopted in order for us to build the technology. A web-based forum would allow DSL and the US ACOE to be able to get information to SHPO quicker, as well as to other relevant agencies in the permitting process, and to get a response faster.

Dennis Griffin noted it's the process of getting the document (complete permit application with appropriate USGS topo map) to the desk and getting back out is the slow process. The actual cultural resource compliance review of a specific project is very quick. SHPO tried to have their existing USGS quad maps showing cultural resource site and survey locations converted into a GIS database. There were a lot of errors in data entry. The database needs hand manipulation now. GIS layer is not functional. SHPO won't be there soon with error correction (it took one year to correct 5-10% of the errors, focusing on transportation corridors where there are many ODOT projects). Noted it would be a 10 year project at least to get the current maps into a functional GIS layer at the current rate. SHPO doesn't have the staff to do this work now, and are headed toward laying off staff that will make likelihood of progress even slower.

The suggestions for streamlining the cultural review process include easy access into a tracking system to screen projects. Would involve immediate notification of permit applications, project location, and ability to view the application material, as well as electronic response. Griffin feels elimination of the paper shuffle would cut at least 3 or 4 days off the process that are now lost in transit time of documents between offices. He feels SHPO is working with DSL to get there.

DRAFT for REVIEW

Griffin feels the ideal fix would be to put data online with appropriate levels of security, similar to the cooperative venture the State of Washington has done the sovereign tribal nations. They put out polygons buffering sensitive sites, and the polygons determine whether a project may present a cultural resource problem or not. It would be good to have a functional database that would contain known sites and a list of exemptions.

Kevin Moynahan commented that SHPO has been great to work with in on new approaches to turning things around on a timely basis. Dennis Griffin again noted that the review process is easy – if we can integrate the process right into the system it would be a very fast process. Making polygon-type “buffered” data sets available to the public would likely reduce permit processing time even further and allow for flagging of permit applications in sensitive areas, and likely needing more review time, earlier in the process. But this likely won’t happen in the foreseeable future unless the tribal nations in Oregon are comfortable with the WA approach and GIS data is developed.

Judy Linton noted that right now some of the tribes review via e-mail notice. The US ACOE is working statewide with the 9 federally recognized tribes on this issue.

Dave Dishman asked if the level of review by each tribe is going to be pretty much the same or is it going to change because of the electronic system? Judy Linton responded that since this has never been done before – electronic – with flags where they have areas of interest. Dennis Griffin felt that the larger tribes that have larger, active staffs may be more receptive to more coordination and the concept of moving cultural reviews for projects that are restoration-based in a quicker fashion.

Peter Paquet – what do you do with recognized tribes that have an interest in ceded areas in Oregon (such as the Nez Perce and Yakima nations?) Both Dennis and Judy recognized this as another issue to consider.

Pete Dalke - Can we find a common interest with those Tribes that want and are participating in restoration projects – find a way to move cultural review and related project processes in a more expeditious manner that better melds their needs and interests with expedited restoration?

Lois Loop discussed her experience managing the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP) in Oregon. Federal money involved in a project creates the federal nexus that requires a review process when anything that needs to happen on the ground. CREP projects typically don’t do much earth moving or involve working in a stream. Typical projects involve putting in buffers, fencing out cattle, planting bare root trees. These are the activities that generally have no effect, but a consultation is required for any land disturbance - “anytime a fence post hole is involved”. Consultation takes a lot of time even with “no effect”, including much landowner’s time. Landowners often bail on restoration projects because they aren’t willing to wait through the process. They don’t have the technical assistance they need to do the job correctly. As a solution she is proposing a programmatic document defining which projects/activities can we proceed with a SHPO determination of little or no effect, and thus move quickly. Her office is still working through that process with SHPO. This is a first, and could set a tone for CREP work, and restoration activities needing cultural reviews, in other parts of the country – that’s what she is working for at the moment. The FSA national archeologist has visted Oregon twice, this office is closest of any to having a programmatic with a tribe. Lois noted they aren’t there yet. It has been an interesting conversation. Her agency holds the landowners hand and leads them through the process – the agency that is the funding source is complying. The landowner would be unaware of the cultural resource consultation work unless a

DRAFT for REVIEW

site is identified on their land where the project is being implemented. Then landowner would become aware and then become involved with modifying the project plan. Dennis Griffin noted that the extent of project modification is very dependent on the situation – modifications to project plans require a good deal of cooperation or can become very time consuming.

Opportunities identified:

- Share or tier off programmatic agreements that CREP, Bonneville Power and others may have developed. SHPO currently has programmatic agreements with BLM, USFS, ODOT.

Ken Bierly – the tribes are individual sovereign entities that interact with the state and federal government. He feels it is going to be difficult to develop solutions that bind all tribes. Dennis Griffin sees how agreements could be project-type dependent—and to consider trying that approach. Tribes support fish habitat restoration generally.

Megan Callahan-Grant pointed out that the cultural review processes are also big issues for NOAA Fisheries, and they don't have archaeological staff. Two specific questions:

- 1) Do you need to be a professional archaeologist to access the database of cultural sites?
Dennis – yes, you need to be a professional – not a landowner, neighbor or biologist. In order for us to expand our dataset – we have to have complete buy off to get the data so we have to have restrictions in order to have access to that data. Megan noted in Washington, they are able to make available password protected data.
- 2) Could there be list of activities exist for what will be approved quickly through SHPO consultation? Dennis noted there is a different list for each agency.

Megan suggested it would be useful for this group to stack those lists on top of each other (SHPO, RGP, GA's, SLOPES). How likely is it to come up with a list of restoration actions in known sites that would be approved? Dennis feels it is possible – under specific conditions and specific sites. Dalke suggested a break-out group to discuss this in a smaller setting and will work to set this up.

Kevin Herkamp discussed the focused work on application forms — for instance, capturing information where a survey has been done, has the applicant id'd any of these items, what equipment is being used and how much ground disturbance is involved. DSL is trying to approach the new application forms with the question in mind of how to best help SHPO review projects—get them answers to all questions they will need to review efficiently.

Mike Teehan - Tribes are conspicuously absent in this discussion. If we had them around the table we might reach general broader agreement. Try to pick someone with a lot of experience and get some to weigh in on some of these issues. Pete Dalke asked if we can approach the tribes with some of this information and see if they want to have a discussion.

Dennis Griffin noted the cultural cluster group coordinated through the Oregon [Commission on Indian Services](#). All nine tribes in Oregon participate – a great venue to present some of these ideas. Next one in June – and suggested we have a spokesperson to present to tribes.

Ken Bierly has worked closely with the cultural cluster group for years. They talked about this very issue – they are very concerned about protecting cultural issues and simultaneously concerned about restoration issues. Worthwhile to peruse these conversations, though it's a complicated maze.

DRAFT for REVIEW

Ryan Houston suggested the federal BiOP umbrella to get approval on the permitting process. Get federal agency to become a partner and you get coverage.

Brownscombe reiterated cultural resources are important and to address this issue will need staffing / funding support. He asked Dennis how common the situation is where SHPO gives two different responses on the same project (1 based on a notice from DSL, the other from a COE application notice). Dennis feels it's the way the project applications are presented. The more direction, the more information on what is going to happen on the project the easier is to review. 3,000 reports waiting to get into the SHPO data systems. They are backlogged and try to have one consistent reviewer. This suggests there would be benefit to having one joint application come to SHPO that standardizes the information related to cultural resources.

Pete Dalke thanked Dennis Griffin for joining the project team and all the comments that have made the discussion useful for outlining some next steps.

E permitting process update

Kevin Herkamp is ready to finalize the expedited General Authorization permit to enable turning around large wood / boulder placement permits in 15 days. He is trying to get it the permit process down to notice based: telling DSL that you qualify for this permit. DSL is looking at adjusting the application form that will tell if you qualify or not – hoping to have the application form complete by May 1st. The form is a precursor to improving all of the other DSL permit application forms. DSL's approach is to get expedited forms and permitting done for restoration actions first, then move into the non-restoration permit world. For every application you'll see all the same pieces - just formed in a different configuration. DSL is working to collaborate with the US ACOE so that they also can get these permit applications through the system as quickly as possible. Corps projects can get through in about 40 days.

Judy Linton noted the Corps is still wrapping up things on their end with the joint application for large wood and boulder placement projects. Some delay behind DSL because of the Corps additional legal obligations. Expect to get water quality specifications in the next few weeks from DEQ. Coastal Zone Management Act review from staff at the Department of Land Conservation and Development is also expected. Working with US Fish and Wildlife Service to cover consultation with them. She sees this consultation happening in a couple months.

Brett Brownscombe felt in an ideal world a restoration project proponent would notify the agency when they fit under the general criteria of a specific permit. If it exists in the mining context (general authorizations are available for small, recreational miners) why doesn't it exist in the restoration context? The proponent can declare that they will meet the permit terms, which will speed processing and work on the ground, and then allow DSL more time to audit for compliance, which really doesn't happen right now. If you don't audit your permits – it becomes a paper exercise. Why is that world impossible?

Kevin Herkamp explained DSL faces statutory restrictions in doing true notice-based permitting. Notice is required followed by approval from DSL. Past policy has also allowed the opportunity for public comment in most cases. DSL wants to get permits down to having enough safeguards in for protection but also allow the permits to approved in a timely manner.

DRAFT for REVIEW

Judy Linton - as long as we can identify the cultural resources restrictions the general permit approach may work for COE. In this scenario, what would happen is once a year the permittee would report on a single form, listing what actions were taken under the general permit.

Ray Jubitz asked if a landowner fills out the application that is connected to appropriate GIS platforms – could the electronic applications pop up a warning if the project is in a sensitive area for ESA species or cultural resources? Ken Bierly noted that it's possible but the backlog of data is the problem – with SHPO, at the current pace it's out ten years before that data would be available.

Pete Dalke asked for a reality check – as landowners are trying to put projects on the ground, are we making progress here – or are we still beating a horse here on the same regulatory processes that we are battling for years?

Doug McDaniel – I'm a land owner who is trying to work on a stream project. What I hear here sound goods to me and I appreciate people working on it – because you aren't going to get landowners to sign up if they have to work through these systems. Place boulders in stream – biologists say it would be great – but it was a full blown permitting process – to take an excavator up the river and place in river. What you are doing is very necessary because action by landowners could be stymied for lack of OK is ridiculous. You may even have to go one step further – an organization is going to have to walk the permit through because I don't think many landowners are going to do it on their own. He has seen improvement in efficiency from his 1st project to the 2nd, more recent one. He had to spend \$22K on just getting a permit to start work on the first, and he doesn't think that's right.

Ken Bailey agreed with Doug – a landowner can receive so many applications related to permitting and not really know what it is the agency wants. What kind of answer do the agencies want? He supports what DSL is pointing out – check boxes and fill in the blank options, have the ability to do this electronically with some help – will help landowners understand what the permit is requesting. A big part of getting landowners to become more enthused is to make the permit applications productive.

Jeff Oveson and the Grande Ronde Model Watershed are involved in both of Doug's projects. They've invested significant amounts of public funds in those projects and feels we are wasting a significant amount of public funds trying to jump through all the hoops. Landowners are frustrated because they don't have someone to coordinate all the individual actions for them. 85% of agencies are with us and the other 15% is costing public dollars, time and frustration. Often it's the personalities of field staff that are barriers. Dave Dishman agreed with the issue of inconsistencies that exist between upper level management and field staff on interpretation of regulations. Need to address this better.

Brownscombe explained how StreamBank links to permitting and the DSL / COE relationship. Ryan Houston mentioned scale is an issue. OT is trying to lead a revolution across the state. Then as he looks at his own Watershed Council projects in his local areas, it's clear we are getting through the hoops with individual relationships we have. They are able to solve some things with local agencies because of personalities, trust, personal relationships. The range of activities is narrower. The geology is different. Maybe we can look at addressing these issues on a "mid-scale" to get some agreements that help streamline some of these things. There is some fear of opening the flood gates and perhaps inadvertently damaging relationships. As an incremental approach to revolutions, perhaps it's best in this case to take a geographic focus that can connect to agency geographic areas of focus.

DRAFT for REVIEW

Brownscombe pointed out that is how StreamBank started out—local pilot basin approach. But Oregon Trout wants to have a statewide vision and impact, and to see efficiencies on that systemic level. One approach that's been suggested is for StreamBank to hold a general permit that worked for any project coming through StreamBank that meets xyz criteria. There is a desire to make permitting efficiencies work amongst all statewide local coordinators – not just on the subbasin level—so why can't we get there.

Ken Bierly reminded that we are starting here with a relatively small range of activities. StreamBank and expedited permitting won't address issues with stream remeanders at this point. Let's see if we can make it work on this range we've identified for the pilots and keep moving from here. DSL agreed and decided they have to build some credibility – put something together that works and then move to bigger things. Bierly feels showing improvements in permitting efficiency prevents the resistance to restoration. DSL is reducing the resistance to restoration. Another related issue is laws established to prevent against damage, versus to encourage restoration. Until there is some recognition legally to change the law that recognizes restoration actions are not damage oriented, we need to do what we can and clearly understand where those statutory boundaries are blocking further advances to expediting restoration. Kevin Moynahan noted that DSL is discussing a legislative agenda that may advance this discussion and address some of the needed changes. Moving the restoration “ball” forward, and incrementally, with StreamBank may also inform needed legislative actions in the future.

Brett Brownscombe discussed that through the web tool when someone comes in to design a project, the tool asks questions that correspond to the information fields required by DSL / COE permit forms. Through this, the tool promotes efficiency by requiring the project proponent is addressing every necessary regulatory info field, making sure they upload all attachments, and then automatically populating the permit form based on that data entry. It reduces duplication of writing the same info for grants, design work, and permit docs, and it ensures complete applications so DSL / COE don't have to cause delay by sending them back as incomplete. Time efficiency there. Deals with the issue of incomplete applications. These are two areas where Oregon Trout and DSL think we can gain efficiencies.

Bierly mentioned the need to also think about the percentage of design. You can get permits on a 30% design - make decisions on what's sufficient for the permitting process.

DSL feels with electronic tools applicants can review examples and better prepare a sufficient and complete application. Interagency collaboration tool is needed. Information sharing between agencies is the big piece that has been missed in the past and one of the pieces that was ID'd as a need. Agencies need a common forum where they can talk to each other while viewing the same project permit application, figure out what is going on, what compliance issues do / do not exist, and which regulatory reviews have been completed. Because agencies aren't sharing information you set people up to be non-compliant. Developing this inter-agency web forum and tying into funding and technical assistance processes is a goal.

Mike Teehan endorsed this conversation and feels it is going in the right direction from the NOAA Fisheries perspective. His agency agrees with the need to prioritize restoration issues particularly around recovery plans for ESA species. There is the opportunity to share information, including better utilization of local assessments – spring off of these and make sure they are getting used to the extent they address limiting factors and are a key component of recovery plans.

DRAFT for REVIEW

NOAA Fisheries has a number of programmatic consultations in place including: Bonneville, USFS (culverts), BLM, CREP and OWEB. Teehan sees the need to use and build off of these vs. starting new programmaticas.

Brett Brownscombe discussed that StreamBank can build with data layers that are geographically based – key eco regions and key management actions, known limiting factors, etc. Then the tool can prioritize based on whether and the degree to which a given project lines up with identified priorities. NOAA recovery plans can present known limiting factors and management plans. Oregon Trout wants to foster more cultural acceptance of restoration as a practice, and saying no to a good project while waiting for the perfect one is not going to incentivize landowner engagement and positivity towards the system of restoration. But we also need to be clear that there are limited dollars and wanting to get the most bang for the buck. Tiered priority levels are another option – and the tool will be designed so that money doesn't flow to projects that are below a certain priority threshold, but if a project meets that threshold, it will be funded quickly instead of waiting for a project that might meet a higher threshold.

Bierly noted the tool is informed by priorities that other people have already written. It is significant that we don't have the databases to inform the tool and make appropriate decision algorithms. The decision element is the part that we are struggling with as a funder, the contextual decision structure.

Brownscombe - It's very important and appreciated that DSL is willing to address these smaller action types, in stream wood and boulders, but there is a need to bring efficiency to permitting the remaining restoration action types as well. There is an economic issue – getting local dollars on the ground in the communities where people are hired to complete the projects.

Krista Kohl noted the Port of Portland is interested in the whole system of implementing restoration project. The Port doesn't want a restoration project to take two years. So, efficiency with restoration project permitting can lead to more time for regulatory reviewers to spend on non-restoration permits, and hopefully move them faster too. DSL sees the potential for a "resource win" on the development side because staff can focus more on development impacts as a result of expedited restoration project permitting. Charlie Corrarino concurred that if the streamlining proposed by DSL can be advanced then it's a win for ODFW and others as well.

IV. Pilot Project Proposals & Status

This second team meeting included discussion of the pilot project proposals OT has received for 2008. What resources are lined up, what is in the cue to make expedited permitting happen this year? How will be pilots be made operational using StreamBank? This will better allow the team to come back in May to determine the roles and responsibilities for implementing the pilot projects later this year.

Brett Brownscombe presented to the group an Excel spreadsheet containing a list of potential projects that could serve as the pilot projects to run through StreamBank. Brett noted that the purpose of these projects is primarily to test StreamBank and expose what it is to more people beyond those involved with the three 2007 pilot projects. He also noted the importance of the funding that is already secured and that this private money is looking to be leveraged by public money. Brett reminded the group that April 1st was the deadline to announce to the applicants which projects will be funded and run through SB. It's clear that April 1st has past but he noted that a decision must be given by April 11th. If only

DRAFT for REVIEW

private money is in with no public money we know what projects we'll be able to accomplish. We want to know what it would take from public and private funding sources and permitting agencies to make these projects a success.

The projects will be chosen to best test the web tool. Even if there are a variety of landowners (project spans more than one property) on a single project, we are looking at the project as only one unit in StreamBank. Oregon Trout is also looking at diversity of project type. Next step – have set of plans in design phase. Brett commented that the project application from Willamette Riverkeepers could be of benefit to testing the software because it would be NGO operated. Megan Callahan-Grant noted that herbicide use is a tricky issue for permitting and for some funders as well. Brett explained another project involves bank sculpting and notes that the web tool is not yet equipped to run such a project. The projects have gone through an initial level of review internally at Oregon Trout. Brett asked for feedback from everyone in the room which projects they see as being "a win".

Pam Wiley announced that Meyer Memorial Trust is willing to provide \$150K worth of funds towards the pilot projects; however, they are not willing to put forth the money unless they see it is being supported by public agency dollars.

Ken Bierly notes that no prioritization screen has been implemented here. He asks if anyone has looked at the projects in the economic investment light. Brett responded that the funders have established their priorities and what limitations they have on their funding if they are going to "be in". This is what we're looking for public funders to do as well. This conversation about priorities is going to be driven by which public agencies are willing to present funding. He suggests linkages for transparency issues as well.

Brett commented that for long term if public funders get on board that's clearly the direction Oregon Trout wants to go. For the 2008 pilots, though, they are assessing on a different framework entirely.

Objectives for the 2008 pilot projects were discussed at some length. Alan Horton pointed out the need to flush out the errors and problems that exist within the software. The pilots are intended to test function with the large motor skills of the program – later refining the fine motor skills will come. Alan noted that the group will look at these projects in more specificity, but first have to come to agreement on the number, type and location of projects based on the projects submitted, available resources and the criteria of those funding the pilot projects. Ken Bierly felt clear explicit goals for the pilot should be outlined so we know what we are testing and what we are getting out of it. A variety of different complexities exist. Ryan Houston noted that Ken is asking the question SHOULD we do the project and Oregon Trout is asking CAN we do the project. Megan Callahan-Grant emphasized the importance of not spending all the private dollars on a project that isn't quite ready yet just for the sake of running a project through the software. Meyer Memorial Trust hasn't established priority areas for which they want to direct funding, but that doesn't mean they wouldn't be willing to fund testing this software. Alan suggested that Oregon Trout articulate test objectives – and present to the group a filter with which we can view these project choices. Ken Bierly agreed saying its importation to know objective and framework. A work group was set up to provide the group with a draft one pager with more specific objectives for the pilot projects by next week.

There is a difference of opinion within the team about the objectives for the pilot project vs. the larger objectives for StreamBank. For instance, does StreamBank ask the appropriate questions when sorting through the projects to know how to prioritize within the software? Charlie Corrarino felt that

DRAFT for REVIEW

that is an entirely separate conversation that is going to have to happen in a break-out session with more detailed attention than the group can focus on at present.

Pete Dalke requests an action item to get additional feedback back to Brett and Alan on the project test objectives screening criteria by next week. Also, need to know what public agencies are looking to fund these pilot projects by next week. There will be longer term and ongoing conversations regarding project selection and priorities. At this point, Oregon Trout needs to get decisions back to landowner coordinators that submitted proposals for pilot projects so they can start looking for other sources of funding if we do not select their project.

Ray Jubitz requested a list of other contributors – both private and public – that are willing to match project funding using StreamBank.

Megan asks if she can offer nitty gritty feedback on programmatic of projects.

Peter Paquet suggests avoiding projects that entail prior gold mining on land as toxics screening may be required, delaying project implementation.

V. New Business

Alan Horton – StreamBank is based on certain assumptions and Oregon Trout has been considering market research to confirm such assumptions. Both in qualitative terms by formally interviewing landowners and having their frustrations and concerns articulated and recorded. As well as quantitative surveys amongst landowner coordinators (Watershed Councils, Soil and Water Conservation Districts in particular).

Oregon Trout is also interested to collect data to that better quantifies the economic stimulus and development opportunities from restoration projects if others feel that information is needed. One purpose of the StreamBank web tool is to stimulate more local economic opportunities for businesses involved with restoration.

David Primozich comments that this research would be enormously informative. He mentioned that the Long Tom River Watershed Council has done some similar survey work that may be of interest.

Brett noted that it would also include compiling information and other data that already exists out there and requested that anyone with information or studies please get them to him.

Meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Meeting minutes recorded by Andrea Woodworth, Oregon Trout Development Coordinator.