

HARNEY BASIN WETLANDS INITIATIVE MEETING: ALL PARTNERS
WEDNESDAY MARCH 18, 2020 1:00 PM - 3:30 PM
Zoom Meeting Information: Call-in #1-669-900-6833 Meeting ID: 481 582 2262

Meeting Objectives:

- Discuss and provide input on draft FIP II application elements
- Discuss and strive to confirm final draft application elements (SAP and results chain)

Attendees: Dominic Bachman, Ben Cate, Brenda Smith, Peter Harkema, Marla Polenz, Chris Colson, Casie Smith, Alexa Martinez, Tony Svejcar, Bob Sallinger, Karen Moon, Ed Contreras, Bruce Taylor, Zola Ryan, Gary Ivey, Robert Warren, Esther Lev, Carlton Strough, Jeff Mackay, Teresa Wicks, Patty Lyons, Chad Karges, James Pearson, Eric Hartstein, Becki Graham, Carter crouch, Marta Prat, Ken Bierly, Norman Clippinger, Rebecca Pickle.

Action Items:

- Send bulleted list of deadlines for SAP & Application out to the group.
- Suggestions for the Results Chain & application (update)
 - Add Climate change reference in Theory of Change narrative & Results Chain
 - Strengthen flood meadows portion with available science/data for dabbling ducks (pintail)
 - More clearly define 'short stature vegetation' in Theory of Change – community shift vs. hayed/grazed
 -

1:00 – 1:20 Welcome, Introductions, Meeting Objectives/Agenda

- Welcome, agenda review and introductions
- Any brief updates on FIP I project implementation

1:20 – 3:15 FIP II Application

- Provide a brief overview of application process, timeline, and key milestones
- Discuss and provide input into key elements of the FIP II application & SAP, including:
 - Theory of Change section of SAP & Application
 - Project list & associated budgets
- Review and strive to confirm draft application products, including:
 - Strategic Action Plan
 - Results Chain

3:15 - 3:30 Wrap Up and Next Steps

- Volunteers for editing SAP & Application

3:30 Adjourn

Draft Meeting Notes – by Dominic Bachman

**= Required action item

Brief zoom testing and announcement of who was on the call.

The meeting began with Fip 1 updates

- Nutrient project is moving forward this year first samples within the next few weeks Dominic and James gave an update.
- Eric gave an update on frozen funding situation with OWEB currently. They will let us know when they know more. Spending plan will be rebalanced when things open back up.
- Esther working on seasonal calendar and draft of state and transition model and landowner workshops
- Replace current outcome 2 (acre driven) to the green box (in results chain)

We had a discussion about upcoming deadlines.

Strategic action plan final draft done by May 15th

We have two weeks to edit. Marla is the deadline police.

May 8th – Comments from partners on SAP DUE

May 15th – SAP to designer

Early June there will be another round of edits / comments on the design for the SAP.

June 19th is the final draft due date for the application.

**** Ben send an email with bulleted list of the deadlines following up after this meeting.**

The next thing on the agenda was to describe the SAP, the application, and the work plan. HDP team described the differences for these documents.

There was discussion about Theory of Change section of the document – what it's role is.

Theory of change section discussion on the narrative logic and results chain graphic.

Ben gave an overview of these documents and how they got to the current version.

Concerns that were brought up (SAP & Application)

For strategy 5 and 6 Zola had some concerns how the chain narrative got to short stature vegetation and invasive species - not exactly correct – haying/grazing vs species composition shift.

Zola wondered about reduction of nutrient input from tributaries? Didn't see that included.

Ben – comment on riparian in Strategic Action Plan vs FIP Application: The FIP application itself does not request funding for riparian so it's not mentioned there. If it is funded in FIP it is not eligible for open solicitation funding (for the entire Harney Basin). If we include it in a FIP request it could limit funding for riparian work in the basin. We're proposing to include riparian description in the SAP but NOT in the application.

HDP would assist in finding alternative funding for riparian work from other sources as specific riparian projects are identified.

******Strategy seven - water planning improvements watershed climate and resilience it is now missing.**

Outreach and participation in other water groups in the basin bring knowledge back to HBWI. Zola thinks this is missing in this iteration of the results chain.

***** throughout the document - the list the tributaries needs to add silver creek (not just Blitzen/Silvies)**

*** remove an Arrow from invasive plants reduced to acres of short stature vegetation. Haying and grazing stubble in fall for early spring habitat is important. Need to describe better in narrative. Plant association shift from reed canary dominant or specifically haying or grazing for short stature. What are the target birds? Short veg. - Ben has this.

Forage production - what is the red text in the results chain? anticipating that these are social outcomes not ecological. **HDP likes them integrated in the system. Is it possible to use coloring for social for those boxes for visually able to see the connection. Robert says it is controlled by color from software – not really a way to get those boxes the same color as the social outcomes – just with text.

Calla – community engagement - the tribe is forming an ad hoc water committee that could be added, another thing like the community water planning to track.

Chad suggests that we integrate CBWP effort

Bruce was interested in Alum being added to Malheur Lake – what is this?

Casey discussed how this may reduce phytoplankton in the water column – starting w/ small tests – the group would be engaged all along the way.

Bruce wanted to frame the proposal and SAP around climate change and resilient wetland basins. Strategically we need to frame things with climate change heavily part of the application.

**put something in with climate change in the theory of change narrative and add some connects in the results chart.

Calla Theory of change heading will this document change with updates in the future? Yes some of the items in here are going to have to be adaptive management. Needs more context in the descriptions. Concerns over our success metrics and upscaling those projects appropriately.

**In the narrative in the flood irrigated meadows there is some info on birds. Zola wants more emphasis on dabbling ducks and northern pintail – data about bird use. Teresa has concern about the sole focus being on dabbling ducks/pintail.

There is a lot science from Northern pintail SONEC fleskes.

**Ben thinks we can strengthen the science available for pintail in the SAP, but also leave room for other species too.

Calla – comment/question - what is a desirable nonnative species? How is that determined & is that the outcome you are looking for? Monoculture of nonnative is not ideal. Make sure holistic view of management for different species.

Discussion on RCG and meadow foxtail. Meadow foxtail doesn't tend to crowd out everything like RCG. The criteria would be - does this species dominate & exclude everything else? Changes in hydrology may or may not push towards native species.

**Zola - outcome 2 was very focused on private land acres – 'conserve @ least 10K acres' - What she wants is for us to take the language from green meadows goal box and put it in outcome 2 instead of acre specific.

We walked through the budget as a group.

Asked Eric about the 80/20 is now moving into restoration that's what we wanted to see.

Project funding lists

Lake restoration stuff Chris wants to see. How might you envision when we break this out. James to send out email about this. Eric suggested section 6 FIP application workplan gets into the details. *** We could put that in there. James take the lead on resolving into section 6.

Gary Ivey submitted a project. Wondered why it got removed. We are limiting the amount of TA that is funded. Ben explained this project didn't make cut due to our criteria.

*** Esther suggested make a list of things that didn't get chosen and how we can look for funding. Ben working on that list

*** Robert add a column what strategy does it relate to.

Emergent Vegetation project. Teresa has a concern about using emergent veg growing around the lake. Discussion w/ Teresa & Jeff. Teresa want to know about where the vegetation will come from. Jeff said it hasn't been decided where it will come from @ this point – but likely wouldn't come from the lake.

Brenda: this level of detail is something that will get worked out when we submit individual grant applications. Right now, we just need to be on board with the concept of the project.

Casey – reminder to everyone that frozen funding will hurt our ability to be ready to learn and test different pilot restoration ideas before FIP 2 (Mesocosms project being held up due to Covid response)

Peter asked if the group had any further discussion or concerns about the proposed budget and none were brought up. HDP to move forward with the proposal with group review of next draft.

** All edits or comments to be emailed to BEN.

** All our work deadlines and deadlines for when they need to get back to us by.