

Final Report – OWEB Grant # 99-198
Long Tom Watershed Council
Watershed Council Support
January 2000 – June 2001

Report prepared in accordance with Exhibit B of the Coordinator Grant Agreement

1) General description of the work activities of the project, and the reports, studies and projects completed during the time of employment.

The Watershed Coordinator is responsible for overseeing both the ongoing and discrete tasks the watershed council set out to accomplish during the grant period. Although the council members, volunteers, and interns complete a substantial of the work, the Coordinator oversees the projects; communicates between groups; recruits, trains, organizes and oversees volunteers; keeps members motivated, focused and on time for tasks; and fills in gaps when volunteers are unavailable or unwilling.

The primary objectives the Council worked to accomplish during the grant period were:

- 1) Maintaining consistent activity and leveraging volunteer hours in the working committees (Steering, Council Development, Technical, Projects & Monitoring, Education/Outreach) and other ad-hoc committees (County Fair, Search for new Steering Members, Annual Celebration, etc.);
- 2) Keeping people from diverse perspectives communicating and working together toward watershed health at regular meetings, workshops, and forums;
- 3) Overseeing and integrating the many phases of the Watershed Action Plan, Water Quality Monitoring Program, Restoration Project Prioritization program, and others;
- 4) Identifying and filling in the work needed to carry restoration projects forward, especially on private lands;
- 5) Leveraging funds and in-kind service from private sectors of the watershed community as well as the public sector; and
- 6) Keeping the public-at-large informed and aware through the newsletter, speaking engagements, the list-serv and web page.

The Long Tom Watershed Council and its Coordinator have accomplished the substantive items proposed in the original grant application, (original grant application covered a two year period; funds were awarded for 1.5 years), and we have been able to address additional items as well. No distinction will be made in this report between what was originally proposed in the grant application and the extra activities. The following attachments outline the accomplishments:

- Appendix 1. Coordinator's Accomplishments
- Appendix 2. Council Meeting and Business topics
- Appendix 3. Watershed Action Plan

2) An evaluation of the effectiveness of the project and its value to the community

Meeting Attendance:

One measure of the value to the community is the 381 different people who have attended monthly meetings and workshops since we began. Our mailing list is 671 people who reside both in the watershed community and outside of it, with over 95% of that being people who specifically request to be on the list. 236 of those take their newsletter by email to save postage and paper costs.

Comment Cards:

We pass out comment cards at most meetings to make sure we are “on-track”. The following are responses to the question *“What is the one thing you like most about this watershed council?”*

- “Consensus decision making”
- “Informal but with focus”
- “Sharing of information”
- “The newsletter”
- “A forum of equality”
- “Good folks, good blend of commercial farmers and urban folks. Keep up the good work.”

We also ask “What is the one thing you like least?” but have only received two comments. One was on the background noise present in the room during one of our meeting venues so we arranged with the janitor to turn off the soda machines. The other was that “the Steering Committee seems to operate in a vacuum, not reporting its activities to the general Council”. The Steering Committee took immediate steps to rectify this by inviting the individual who made the comment to a few Steering meetings to discuss ideas of what we could do. They came up with two things: including Steering meeting notes in the newsletter and giving better oral reports at each meeting. We have implemented these and he is satisfied at the time of this report. The only limitation remains during summer when our meetings are outdoor tours, which are not conducive to conducting business.

We also ask people every few months to post sticky notes with their answers to the question: “How can your watershed council encourage new, more, better participation from you and others? The Steering Committee then takes time to review those comments and brainstorm things we can do better or different – or what people really like and we should keep. Our group advisor helps us highlight and address the most important issues.

We also keep an informal record of why people say the council is important to them, please see Appendix 4.

Donations:

Publicity: We have not had much luck with the Eugene-based Register Guard. They want to cover environmental conflict or big-ticket human-interest items. After re-assessing why we

would want press, we decided to work instead with the local rural papers and have succeeded in getting a regular monthly column for over a year now (examples attached).

Active Participation: An excellent way to judge the value to the community is to count how many people volunteer with the Council, and how much time they give.

Self-assessment: An OWEB grant to Pam Foltz and Alice Sperling resulting in their contacting the Council and offering training on volunteer management, consensus decision-making, and other related topics. We first had the Steering Committee complete a questionnaire. The reports were favorable, with a strong sense that the Council had come a long way in the last year. Items people felt comfortable with in their current state were: Effective meetings, facilitation, conflict management & resolution, decision-making. Two main items to work on were tied for first place: volunteer management and project development. We are scheduled to work on these during the next year and a half with Alice and Pam.

3) A list of the volunteers who participated in the project including the work accomplished and the total hours worked

The Coordinator’s time leveraged a minimum of 3,108 hours from interns, regular council members, and the general citizenry in volunteering for discrete or ongoing projects led by the Council. There are many informal efforts for which we don’t record hours spent.

Volunteer Hours

Here is a partial list that does not include the work done by individuals when outside of a team or committee.

Projects Team	180 hours
3 core members, 7 others help	
Search Committee:	90 hours
(for members of 2000-02 Steering Committees): 6 members, two months, meetings, presentations, interviews.	
Steering Committee:	1152 hours
(1/00-6/01): 11 members, 18 meetings + subcommittees on Projects & Monitoring, Education & Outreach, Council Development; outside work.	
Web Site Development & Maintenance	250 hours
(1/00-6/01), 1 creator, 2 technical, 1 maintenance	
Contract Review Committee for Coordinator:	30 hours
3 members volunteer, 4 meetings.	
Council Meeting Planning Team	132 hours
5 people creating, organizing, and leading council meetings, tours	
Annual Celebration Team	174 hours
12 people, plan, prep, post, flyers, cook, play music, speak, errands	
Small Cities Forums	40 hours
Quarterly meeting of City managers, public works directors of 6 cities in area to address water quality and habitat issues – volunteer time to coordinate meetings.	
News Columns in West Lane and Tri County rural newspapers	180 hours
Monthly columns: coordination, authorship, editing, printing	

Fair Outreach Program	199 hours
Volunteer project manager; build booth, displays, arrange, 36 volunteers staff booth – Lane County Fair. Oregon Country Fair – design, create, put up and take down drinking water signs.	
Internship:	95 hours
1 UO graduate student: self-assessments, project-review standards, library organization	
Internship:	106 hours
1 UO graduate student: watershed assessment forums, matrix of local groups’ contacts, library organization	
Internship:	130 hours
1 LCC student: Proper Functioning Riparian Condition Workshop, outreach to ag and ranching landowners	
Internship:	30 hours
1 UO undergraduate student: blackberry brochure	
Internship:	150 hours
1 UO graduate student: sub-basin maps, GIS organization, multiple map products (Winter 2001)	
Internship:	135 hours
1 UO graduate student: sub-basin maps, GIS organization, multiple map products (Spring 2001)	
Logo Development	35 hours
3 people including 2 artists (hours so far)	
Total Documented Volunteer Hours for Jan 2000 – June 2001	<u>3,108 hours</u>

Additionally, council members and the general citizenry attended monthly Council meetings to participate in the watershed council, educate themselves, and further the goals of local watershed improvement. Average attendance during this period is about 30, and fluctuates from 23 to 42 people (sign-up sheets available upon request). Note: Meeting agendas, minutes, and newsletter are not attached as they are sent to OWEB as regular monthly mailing.

The following list is of people who went beyond attending general council meetings to become actively involved during the grant period.

List of volunteers and affiliation

(Alphabetized by first name)

- Anita Ragan, Eugene resident
- Andy Poynter, Environmental Consultant
- Cara Benfield, UO environmental studies
- Collin Crocker, C&L Farms
- Court Smith, OSU anthropology
- Craig Shillinglaw, UO planning
- Dennis Todd, UO biology professor
- Doug Richards, Prudential Insurance
- Ed Alverson, The Nature Conservancy
- Gary Holm, Long Tom Industries
- Jason Barney, UO biology
- Jeff Yost, Willamette Industries
- Jennifer Gilden, OSU anthropology
- Jerry Marguth, Nixon Farms
- Jim Bruvold, rural resident, SWCD associate director
- John Bolte, OSU anthropology
- John Dillard, Monroe Telephone Co.
- Karen Barrows, UO graduate intern
- Kirk Stroda, Stroda Brothers Farm
- Lafona Jensen, rancher
- Laurie Bernstien, USFS fish biologist
- Lisa Messersmith, UO graduate intern
- Lita Furby, rural resident
- Mark Wilkening, BLM
- Michael James, urban resident, geologist
- Nancy Hafner, J.City resident
- Nancy Hunt, BLM

- Nancy Shafer, Eugene resident; Miracle on 33rd St Adopt a Stream Group
- Pat Johnston, Willamette Resources Education Network, BLM
- Paul Atkinson, Laughing Stock Farms
- Paul Reed, rural resident, SWCD Director
- Peter Ruffier, City of Eugene Wastewater Division Director
- Rick Allison, rancher and timber owner
- Roland Hoskins, City of Eugene
- Ryan Collay, rural resident & educator, OSU
- Sarah Shafer, UO Geography Dept.
- Susan Payne, UO Landscape Architecture
- Tom Hunton, SureCrop Farm Service

3) A list of other participants in the project

Main Partners

- Bureau of Land Management, Eugene District
- City of Eugene
- Long Tom Industries
- SureCrop Farm Service
- GreenScape Forest Systems
- Oregon Country Fair
- Willamette Industries
- City of Veneta
- Monroe Telephone Company
- Roseburg Resources Co.
- Swanson Superior Forest Products
- City of Junction City
- Stroda Brothers Farms
- Reerslev Farms, Inc.
- Eugene Water and Electric Board
- East Lane Soil and Water Conservation District

Other Partners and Groups involved (not as consistently as Main Partners)

Private Industry and Organizations: Lane County Farm Bureau, Monroe Telephone Company, Lane County Fair Board, Northwest Youth Corps, Looking Glass Youth Corps, McKenzie River Trust

Citizens' Groups: Fern Ridge Community Action Network, City of Eugene Neighborhood Leaders Council

Local and Regional Government: Lane Council of Governments, Cascade Pacific RC & D, Benton Soil and Water Conservation District, East Lane Soil and Water Conservation District, Eugene Water and Electric Board, Cities of Monroe, Junction City, Veneta, Eugene, Harrisburg, Coburg

Universities and Schools: Rachel Carson Center at Churchill High School, Willamette High School, UO InfoGraphics, Geography, Planning, Public Policy and Management, Biology, Landscape Architecture, Oregon State University Anthropology, Fish & Wildlife, Bioresource Engineering, Geography

State and Federal Government: Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Bureau of Land Management, Oregon Department of Forestry, Oregon Water Resources Department, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, Oregon Department of Health, United States Geological Survey, Oregon Association of Conservation Districts

Councils: Siuslaw Watershed Council, McKenzie Watershed Council, Mohawk Watershed Planning Group, Coast Fork Willamette Watershed Council, Mid Fork Willamette Watershed Council, South Santiam Watershed Council, Marys River Watershed Council, and fellow Coordinators: Upper Willamette Council Coordinators, Willamette Basin Council Coordinators

Technical Team

Our technical team is available on an ad-hoc basis. They meet for project reviews, water quality monitoring program development, and will convene for upcoming restoration decisions). Technical team members logged a total of 1,527 hours during the grant period.

(Alphabetized by first name).

- Bill Castillo, ODFW Wildlife Biologist
- Cary Kerst, City of Eugene Water Quality, Industrial Sources
- Clarice, Monroe Telephone Company (web)
- Court Smith, OSU Anthropology
- Dennis Nelson, Oregon Dept of Health
- Dennis Todd, UO Freshwater Biologist
- Doug Huntingon, Public Affairs Officer, BLM
- Doug Sackinger, Benton County GIS
- Ed Alverson, The Nature Conservancy
- Frank Rinella, USGS
- Garry Hoppe, Landscape Planner, BLM
- Gary Arnold, DEQ
- Gary Galovich, ODFW
- Graham Armstrong, BLM
- Gary Holm, agricultural landowner
- Guy Giesbrecht, Ducer Enterprises (web)
- Ian Waite, USGS Biologist
- James Ollerenshaw, City of Eugene Wastewater
- Jared Rubin, DEQ
- Jeff Yost, Willamette Industries
- Jennifer Gilden, OSU Anthropology
- Jim Beal, Army Corps of Engineers
- John Bolte, OSU Bioresources Engineering
- Judy Li, Aquatic Ecologist, OSU
- Mark Mellbye, OSU Extension
- Mark Wilkening, BLM group process
- Mary Santelmann, Ecologist, OSU
- Michael Mattick, Lane County Watermaster
- Nancy Holzhauser, Wetlands biology, local consultant
- Paul Clements, ODF
- Peter Ruffier, City of Eugene Wastewater
- Rick Allison, local logger and rancher
- Rick Barney, NRCS

- Roland Hoskins, City of Eugene group process
- Ron Miner, OSU Bioresources Engineering
- Ross Penhallogon, OSU Extension
- Tim Black, City of Eugene

4) An accounting of the expenditures of Board and other moneys, in-kind services and donated materials from the original grant proposal.

Appendix 5 shows the accounting for the grant period. In addition to the original grant proposal (modified for the 18 months granted), we have secured \$1,890 in extra cash donations. We also recorded \$ 41,042 in in-kind services without counting technical team hours, \$85,727 including them. Please see donation and in-kind services logs in Appendices 6 and 7 for an accounting of these.

5) Other such information as would be helpful in evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of project methods, materials, or assumptions

The Long Tom Watershed Council has maintained an active schedule and a good reputation with even the most conservative area residents. The Council includes a diverse group of stakeholders from all over the Long Tom Watershed. We have stayed citizen-based because 92% of the lands within the Long Tom Watershed are privately owned and the success so far of the Council indicates it is filling a valuable niche in the community. Those landowners can be loosely grouped by landuse: 46% forestry, 31% agriculture, 9% rural residential, and 8% urban (another 8% is public land). We continue to have success including ranching, timber and agricultural landowners as active participants in our Council. This was initially hard to do, and will continue to be so, because the overall goals of watershed councils are still seen by many people as “environmental” in a way that not many private landowners on working landscapes feel an allegiance to.

One measure of our success can be the many donations, letters and thank-you notes we receive from landowners and agency personnel. We also are amazed to see the dedication to the group that landowners will voice in public, such as those speaking out in support of the watershed council in large public forums. This is something OWEB representatives have seen and heard. This is a testament to the inclusiveness of the Council and the fact that landowners and residents feel ownership of and responsibility toward the group.

The Council provides people with the feeling that they have a relatively safe place to discuss land and water issues that are otherwise contentious. We are particularly excited about our upcoming endeavor – problem solving at the sub-basin level. We have created problem profiles and maps for each of the 10 major sub-basins and have piloted our process with Steering Committee the last four months, and with the Lower Long Tom agricultural landowners. We explain the problems using data and maps, give people restoration options, and ask them what they are willing to do. They are showing excellent response and we hope to organize multiple landowner projects and create new partnerships in the next two years.

Probably the single greatest weakness of the watershed council is the instability and uncertain future of funding. The below-basic amounts granted to Willamette Councils is particularly disturbing since 80% of the state's population lives in the basin and the land use is complex and in very small parcels. One paid coordinator and basic infrastructure leverages large amounts of volunteer hours and donations from those able to give. A crucial element gained in having that key staff person is maintaining the trust and consistency with landowners such that they are motivated to improve their stewardship practices, volunteer with the council, and communicate honestly about the barriers they face in doing either one.

Overall, thank you OWEB Board members, staff members, review teams and supporters for all of your assistance in adding a strong local dimension to watershed stewardship. The people here are very active, and even the most recalcitrant see it frankly as the "best option" out there for addressing water quality and habitat problems in this watershed area.

List of Appendices

1. Coordinator's Contract Accomplishments for grant period
2. Council Education and Business topics at Monthly Meetings
3. Watershed Action Plan
4. Why the council is important to local people
5. Grant accounting spreadsheets
6. Additional cash donations beyond that pledged to local match
7. In-kind services log