



Wednesday, August 24th 2022 | 2:00pm-4:30pm

In Person: Harney County Community Center 484 North Broadway, Burns OR

Zoom Link:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84335468165?pwd=NXIBRXVqTjk2MWpZelhSSTJGMFJpUT09>

2:09pm Welcome and Introductions

Peter Harkema

Attendance: OWEB Sign-in sheet.

Teresa Wicks, Casie Smith, Tara Wertz, Bob Sallinger, Jason Dunham, Marla Polenz, Janelle Wicks, Aviv-Karasov-Olson, Matt Little, Jason Kesling, Dan Nichols, Jeff Mackay, Chad Karges, Ken Birely, Karen Moon, Melissa Petschauer, Travis Miller, Alexandria Scott, Becki Graham, Brenda Smith, Tony Svejcar, Ester Lev, Kristen Shelman, Peter Harkema, Chris Colson, Ed Contreras, Samuel Artaiz, Alexa Martinez

2:10 – 2:45 pm OWEB FIP

Melissa Petschauer, Brenda Smith, Ken Bierley

- OWEB FIP Results - Not funded, OWEB FIP Agenda for funding. OWEB funding was talked about for 3 hours. Key points- strongest collaborative in the state but too strong to continue to fund. Fans and support of collaborative and our application, but still not funded.
- Reflections on conversations with OWEB Board and Staff
 - Ken Bierley - Sat down with Lisa Charpiloz-Hanson of how FIP was developed 2007-present. New staff members, with little to no experience of the FIP process. Talked with Lisa a few days after, the staff report put the board in a bind to make a decision of using funding from another source to fund our application. It was framed with little decision space for this. The board was not presented with enough information to make a decision. There needs to be a way to help make decisions. There is no opportunity to answer questions raised by the reviewers. Should be able to talk through questions with application representatives with the board. This conversation hopefully helped Lisa understand what went on.
Ester- Was that the first meeting with Lisa going through that process?
They only talked about HBWC project for 3 hours, and didn't fund it.
Ester- Other FIP applicants were disappointed about a 3 hour discussion about our project and not why theirs was good. They were disappointed about the process of the meeting.
 - Bob Sallinger - The discussions were focused around us getting money....comments made about having support and seemed naive. Fundamentally different than other landscapes, generations transformations and other adversities to stay together. This was more than just a common interest of staying together. Keeping a group on a conflicted landscape through years was more of an accomplishment over the interest of the work.



Chad K. - Brenda's convo with Autumn Muir. - Other applications from the east side of OR. Autumn Muir led conversations, to offer OWEB more equitable across the application process. How can you not put applicants against each other on landscapes that are all important to OR. Hard to work together as competing apps.

What is the alternative to a competitive process- letter of interest, work in partnership, partner that is helping people be helpful. The app process was strenuous, lot of time put towards application to not be funded. Letter of interest to help determine if there is a chance of being funded. Strategic action plan was put together for the app, maybe not what.....

Ken- Different processes, funded other ways, not those same applicants are the same for the FIP.

Lisa questions: What is a partnership- clearly defined the funder as a clear partner, the staff is telling me that partnership is the people doing work, want to achieve ecological outcomes, have to be a partner in the party. Not sure where it will go

Ester- there was a lag time in the process, OWEB staff had more voice on this and that is what they are comfortable with.

Casie- OWEB thought that we should be done with the projects from the first FIP. How long it should take us to adaptively manage, monitor, change a system. Questions that came up is we need an end date for the completion of projects, but there is no end date at this time. Didn't think there was a person on the board that understood the aspect of how much time is needed for this.

The amount of technical assistance, and partnership in funding to support was the main takeaways.

Ken- OWEB board is made up of policy people. New staff that doesn't have much help, they rely on the process.

Brenda- HBWC and CCAA were the only ones asking for a second FIP. Had been getting the green light to go for another FIP, and were not funded.

Chad- input from the sources, will be taking a serious FIP process, what will be changed, and how fast will that happen for the next FIP application.

If they don't change the application process, the next FIP is Jan 2023 due July 2023 awarded 2024.

Peter- does the group feel there is a sufficient amount of feedback, another conversation with OWEB?

If the group wants to have additional outreach, do that collectively, decide what the messages are. Make sure they get the message stop, but make sure collectively there is a process

Ester- lack of enthusiastic comments made during the decision process, was not received well.

Ken- tried to stay towards process over emotions

Peter- group to get together to form a message

Brenda- don't want to badger them for an answer to a formal letter from Autumn.

Bob- There were a lot of hurdles jumped through to get the app put in. Changed the projects completely. Heard that it was thought that we were trying to double dip, and OWEB should have made a clear suggestion against applying twice. Expectations of stepping up for the state of OR. They are a partner



Brenda- first time in a long time there is not a rep from OWEB at this meeting.

Jeff- Make sure to provide feedback along with solutions, to be considered with other applications.

** Brenda - to share letter with group

Ken- Get OWEB to addresswhat do we need to do to change the applications to receive better or different applications.

Ester- if there needs to be changes, January is coming up fast, as a group we are willing to support that.

Peter- we need a small group to figure out what that process is.

Ed- We got some feedback and heard concerns, confirm that with OWEB, want to reapply to address concerns

Chad- opportunity for a parallel path of reapplying as well as changes to the process

Jeff- nominate Dominic for application changes.

Ester - we need to have a message before application changes.

Peter- **feedback to OWEB - Brenda, Bob, Ken, Kristen Shelman,
Brenda will distribute letter**

Dom, Ed, Melissa, Teresa - revision/modifying application.

- Future Funding Opportunities

Bob- Additional funding - Don't want to be dependent on the state for survival. Additional funding and another FIP. Other sources of funding on the state level. Dialogue of state helping more complex collaboratives, bill in legislature to move a bill through process other than agency. Christmas tree bill - fund critically important projects support from Rep Owens

Federal delegations - funding through appropriations. One of the important projects and collaboratives for birds in the US. all these opportunities could have momentum in the next year. Modifications are going to be expensive.

Jason Kesling- **RCPD funding is getting \$5million** to get funding. application coming this fall.

Peter- forming a group that will bring up funding ideas and conversations to help - Chad, Travis,

Matt - Funding through the house of reps and senates.

Jason- BIL funding- discussed Peter - discussed in RCPD.

Peter- working on scheduling with Melissa

- Questions/Discussion

2:45–2:55 pm Waterfowl/Wetland Management Collaboration Study Aviv Karasov-Olson UC Davis

- Project Summary
- Grad student at UC Davis- looking at the scale of collaborative partnerships throughout the Pacific Flyway. Multistates, local, NGOs and how the process works.
Conversations with partners, learning about HDP, HBWC, implementing the 2nd part of the project.
Roles of partners and who they collaborate with and relationships.



Through research wanting to learn how and what you do. Establishment and sustainability of partnerships. What are some of the hiccups along the way.

Survey sent out to some partners already will send survey to others.

Peter- do we get to see results? Aviv- will share results from survey and research.

- Waterfowl/Wetland Management Collaboration Survey
[Survey Link](#)

2:55-3:30 pm MNWR Aquatic Planning

Dominic Bachman, Chris Colson

- Water Diversion
- Electric Barrier for Carp Management

Two things chose to focus efforts on to help find more funding.

Electronic barrier for Carp on the lake.

Exciting technology that has some potential to help manage carp during climating conditions. Goal with system - stop card, let native fish through. Cost and staff time hasn't been done yet. Renting gear to test it out.

Located a couple miles downstream from headquarters, carp are able to live in streams at low levels, only place this year, when water quality is poor, they aggregate and breed in this area. Lots of potential to block off a large section of breeding habitat. Downstream of location to boat launch would be easy to remove fish with electrofishing. Would like to test it out, prior to purchasing the whole set up

Needs - getting electricity to location, generator or solar may work short term but not long term. Solar could be a possibility. Want to test during spawning, migration.

Casie- how works with James Petersen carp model. Going after adults, always an endless process. Miss one adult, miss 1 million carp. Have to go after the Juveniles to make a difference. Dom- on low water years, several low years in a row, the health of the fish is low in the lake, closer to sodhouse fish are healthier, could reduce numbers during low water years. Don't know how to deal with the small fish and let native fish through. could be a cheap way to reduce adults and letting them breed during low water years.

Jason Dunham- take a look at James's recent paper, curious how this would work with James's work. It is complicated, take a look

Jeff- best management, what can we effectively do is in James's model for management.

Peter - water aversions from Dominic



Dom- two pool diversion concept- getting funding to divert water from Malheur lake into Mud lake during favorable hydro cycles.

Chris- how to keep the lake out of Malheur lake to help emergent vegetation.

Teresa - Redoing surveys in the areas, how will this idea take into account Beth's study and vegetation that is doing well according to Beth's study. How will this project take into account for that project and the conditions on the lake

Dom- IF you could manipulate the timing of the draw down, choose to send water in another direction would help model these conditions. high water year than this year, but not as high. Could manage the water to wipe out young vegetation, let water get deeper as vegetation moves out. Because of what is going on right now, that is the most exciting.

Jason- funding to come back to HB, would be helpful to get engage and think of alternatives to help understand how the system works. Know more about what is going on now compared to 2018 summit.

Ken- has there been convos with water resources department about moving water

Dom- no we are not even there yet.

Kristen- what would happen if we have record snow levels, what happens if the water levels do not go down.

Chris- whatever the Donnor-Blitzen and the lake is doing, would be to the management's discretion. Returning some vegetation, big water events will be an issue of the weather events.

Peter- a tool, not the tool.

Links to paper

- [Modeling control of Common Carp \(*Cyprinus carpio*\) in a shallow lake-wetland system](#)
- [Carp, Climate, and Water Quality: Applying Systems Modeling to Ecosystem Recovery in Malheur Lake](#)
- [Effects of common carp on water quality and submerged vegetation: results from a short-term mesocosm experiment in an artificial wetland](#)

3:30 – 3:45 pm USGS Saline Lakes Group Integrated Water Availability Assessment

Casie Smith

Saline Lakes Integrated Water Availability Assessment

USGS has been told from congress to monitor, manage and save lakes in the Great Basin. Integrated water availability assessment (IWASS)



Saline Lakes USGS team - literary review currently. help ID data gaps. Working on stakeholder outreach.

First stakeholder engagements will be in October, day and half meeting. Determining state and local data and assessment activities. Will have follow up engagement

Outcomes: determining state and local activities an assessments

identify and prioritize data and assessment gaps

build lasting relationships,

Partnering with USFWS, for birds to help save and conserve the saline lakes.

Not sure if OR will have a priority lake to work with.

Looking for ways to update people on the saline lakes.

Peter- when the workshops and listening sessions come available it will be good to hear about that.

Bob- What defines saline lakes. Abert always comes to mind.

3:45 – 4:20pm Presentation from IWJV

Ed Contreras

Where we have been in the wetland conservation community, shaded areas are of wetland loss. Wetland is being drained or built over.

Functional loss is not being tracked, long term trends that have been lost. large amount of surface water loss in the west, 47% decline in surface water area. Loss of wetland footprint because of climate change, low precipitation, how does this affect birds.

forecast for water vs. temps. going to be few and far between, need to be planning for a drier future, large water events will be farther between.

Two areas of the study - SONEC and Central Valley, CA

two parts to the study, eBird, get relative abundance of birds when they are using a landscape. Will this test with what is seen on the ground? Water piece, where water is on the landscape. Wetland evaluation tool over 30 years of data.



Trying to figure out what the bottlenecks and difficulties of what birds need and how they are adapting. How do these effects impact bird populations.

Have a fact sheet IWJV website.

Ken- remote sensing, water rights/policy issue in Klamath, going to be different for different areas, based on water allocation and climate conditions.

Changes were the baseline of the timeline. LANDSAT started in 1984, some studies did not start that soon

Supplemental material is in the paper.

What can we track and where can investments be made. What do birds get here that they cannot get anywhere else.

- [Functional Wetland Loss Drives Emerging Risks to Waterbird Migration Networks](#)
- [Intermountain Insights](#)

4:20 – 4:30 pm Closing remarks

Peter Harkema

Ester, Travis, Tony-

Esther- Oregon Agricultural protection act, looking into the timeframe, to get money, do private landowner thing, could help with conversation with OWEB. Application due in October 2022

Travis- looking at invasives- Reed canarygrass, cattail, perennial pepperweed. Using open range consulting to achieve this. Develop STM's for wetland meadows. Invasive spp, water management, and bird pops. Broke into three categories on a management scale and communications, following the threat base model in sagebrush steppe. Dry, mesic and wet meadow. how they are changing and being lost over time. What does that mean for the refuge and management applications.

Esther- start testing management throughout the basin on private lands as they have more flexibility than refuge.

Ken- could be in conjunction with EcoDIVA group

Peter- reflection - started with disappointing FIP application news. Still a lot of good work that is happening. There is still a lot of important work that is going on, great to transition from disappointment into work that is getting done. May need another meeting this year. CCP meeting in the fall, coordinating committee helped with agenda formation, planning agenda for next meeting and will try to have everyone help with agenda topics. New year will discuss the coordinating committee.



From Zoom Chat

14:59:08 From Jason Dunham, USGS to Everyone:

I could not hear - did anyone mention BIL?

15:03:57 From Jason Dunham, USGS to Everyone:

Just making sure you have this Aviv -
https://kellybiedenweg.weebly.com/uploads/9/4/0/6/94065145/understanding_stakeholder_perspectives_for_malheur_wildlife_refuge_2019.pdf

15:05:04 From Aviv Karasov-Olson to Everyone:

Thanks, Jason!

15:08:00 From Casie Smith to Everyone:

Teresa for the win!

15:23:59 From Jason Dunham, USGS to Everyone:

Open access - look at the scenarios to see how an electric barrier and removal might work - depends on what you want! <https://esajournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdfdirect/10.1002/ecs2.3985>

15:30:46 From Jason Dunham, USGS to Everyone:

If we do get that big chunk of funding I think revisiting the 2018 workshop (files are at HDP) would be useful - we've learned a lot since then and a lot of the alternatives I'm hearing about today were discussed in detail there - quite a bit of changeover of people here and some of that history might be useful?

16:01:53 From Jason Dunham, USGS to Everyone:

I could barely hear the words, but this is super helpful information for linking downstream hydrologic conditions to ecological responses and for putting Malheur in context of their regional dynamics - thanks Ed

16:06:41 From Jason Dunham, USGS to Everyone:

<https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fevo.2022.844278/full>



Facilitator

Peter Harkema

Director, Oregon Consensus

pharkema@pdx.edu