



Stream Management Planning Peer-Learning Video Call

10-11:30 a.m., Wednesday, April 1, 2020

TOPIC INTRODUCTION

The [selecting objectives and measurable results](#) planning phase is the bridge step from the [data assessment](#) to the [implementation plan](#). This step poses challenges in that it requires synthesis and understanding of highly technical data/concepts. This planning step can rely heavily on the solidity of the stakeholder process.

Today's call will center around the methods and approaches for setting objectives and measurable results which helps transform data into a usable format from which stakeholders can make decisions.

ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES

- Gain an understanding of approaches for selecting objectives and measurable results, from both a technical and stakeholder perspective.
- Build relationships among SMP leads so they can be a resource for and learn from each other.

AGENDA

10 – 10:20 a.m. Welcome, Agenda Overview and Video Call Logistics – Stacy Beaugh

Introductions

- Name / SMP/IWMP Location
 - Role on your SMP/IWMP
 - How far along in the process is your SMP/IWMP?
 - Current biggest challenge/obstacle
1. Mely Whiting, TU, Pagosa Springs: Upper San Juan, Grand County, San Miguel. Matching funds (particularly for stakeholder piece).
 2. Brian Murphy, Otak. Big Thompson. Technical team consultant. Building trust within a pretty new Advisory Committee for the river health assessment work.
 3. Jess Alexander, Denver Water. Grand County LBD.
 4. Buffy Lenth, Central Conservancy. Upper Ark SMP is just starting. Lots of rgs involved and a first goal is to get people out of their silos and working together and aligned.
 5. Callie Hendrickson. White River coordinator. Beginning stages.
 6. Camille Richard, Lake Fork Valley Conservancy, Upper Gunnison Basin Mgt Plan. How to create meaningful data to use with stakeholders to inform them of the process and help them give meaningful input.

7. Chris Sturm. Administer the grants that fund this effort. Managing over 150 grants in the river health space and find ways to innovate new ways of planning. We just hired a new person in our program.
8. Courtney Gutman. Big T Watershed Coalition. Early in the process, just pulling together our river assessment and stakeholder processes frameworks. Adv Committee has people who are not familiar with this process, so we need to community a vision for the outcomes, and looking for possible projects to give examples. Understand relationships and long-time trust/distrust/power dynamics between people and orgs.
9. Daniel Boyes. Rio Grande HW Restoration Project. Getting the technical and stakeholder teams on the same page with SMP goals and objectives.
10. Dan Omasta. CTU. Blue, Upper Gunnison, Upper Ark. How you take data and make it understandable and useful for stakeholder feedback.
11. Gary Swanson. Boulder Flycasters volunteer. S. Boulder Creek. Moving from creating our frameworks to collecting data.
12. Gretchen Rank. Mancos CD. April meetings were significant community kick off events and now are cancelled. Pulling back and retooling our timeline.
13. Heather Dutton. SLVWCD, Rio Grande. Final edits.
14. Natalie Allio. Upper Ark. Just getting started and working with Nicole on scope development. Not being able to meet in person is so hard.
15. Jake Hartter. WSCC. N. Fork Gunnison. Moving from a list of projects to prioritizing them and selecting objectives. Find good ways to meet remotely.
16. Jen Stephenson. Northern Water. Grand County LBD. Update plan?
17. Julie Knudson. Purgatoire River. Early stages, desire to be comprehensive.
18. Katherine Morris. Grand County, 10 years old plan and finding that the original objectives are different than what our LBD group is doing now. We want to get some ideas on how to revise and update our plan.
19. Kim Lennberg. Big T and Yampa. Field verification amidst current situation.
20. Linda Masters. Extension for Rio Blanco county, White River. We got a lot of public input and need to work on our scope.
21. Nicole Seltzer. Yampa. Diversion assessment participation.
22. Scott Schreiber. Finding someone to take over the South Platte SMP with Denver TU.
23. Stephen Brandt. Boulder Flycasters TU chapter. South Boulder Creek. Timelines and data collection pre-runoff.
24. Tristan. White River CD. Scope of work development.
25. Will Davis. Big T Coalition. Painting a picture of the project to keep stakeholders involved and navigating the relationships between people when their interests conflict.
26. Kelly Romero-Heaney, City of Steamboat Springs. Yampa SMP in SBS. Implementation is going well. City is furloughing all employees by 10% so finding time to do this.
27. Gigi Richard
28. Stacy Beaugh
29. Seth Mason
30. Julie Baxter
31. Heather Bergman

10:20 – 10:30 a.m. [Select Objectives and Measurable Results](#) Topic Introduction

Presenter: Seth Mason, Lotic Hydrological

- Where does “Set Objectives and Measurable Results” fit within the stream management planning cycle?
- Why is it important?
- What is the difference between goals and objectives?

IWMP/SMP efforts all have their own flavor/challenges. Social side is typically more of a challenge than technical component. IWMP framework document includes sequential/rational planning model as a diagram for planning process. Plans and actions based on clear goals and objectives are more likely to succeed in meeting communities’ needs. Recommendations and actions need buy-in and volunteer activity, and projects (IPPs) with a clear rationale are more likely to receive implementation funding.

Important to have solid/clear previous step (assess conditions/identify risks), otherwise process will face increased communication challenges in the subsequent steps. In assess conditions step, outputs need to be useful to stakeholder group – don’t provide results in format for technical audience – use visuals/intuitive presentation (e.g., color-coded ranking representation of data, mapping, graphical/tabular representations when necessary should be approachable with significant labeling and transparencies to draw attention). There is a lot of value in results synthesis. COSHAF semi-quantitative matrix/results ranking is useful for this. This step gets us to goals/objectives setting. GOAL: higher level visioning statement. OBJECTIVE: specific, measurable, quantifiable, often w/timeline. Prioritize objectives to promote focused consideration – this sets the stage for actions/implementation projects/planning recommendations.

10:30 – 11:25 **Panel Discussion: Transforming Data Into Decision Making Tools**

Please email questions in advance to stacy@beststrategicbynature.com and plan to bring your own questions and expertise to add to the discussion.

Panelists: *Seth Mason, Lotic Hydrological*
 Heather Bergman, Peak Facilitation
 Julie Baxter, City of Steamboat Springs

- Introductions/Opening presentation (20 minutes – about 7 minutes each)
- Discussion Questions (20 minutes)
- Open Discussion with Participants (15 min)

Seth:

Example – Middle Colorado. AC has 30 ppl, meets infrequently. Subset focus groups have 10-12 ppl, meet frequently (consumptive use, riparian/WQ, aquatic biota, recreation). Technical

assessment work initially presented to focus groups so they could develop goals/objectives. Used collaborative mental mapping exercise showing how concepts relate to each other to synthesize technical info displayed in ranking metrics. Used maps to discover “pinch points,” e.g., limited river knowledge is decreasing boating days, investigate reasons why, mental mapping helps think through how to structure objectives. Focus and advisory groups pass/share/refine information back and forth to construct rationale for final set of objectives and evaluation criteria, building community buy-in along the way.

Heather:

Example – St Vrain and Left Hand. Process was designed to actively (aggressively?) engage the agricultural community. Process centered around consultants assimilating and interpreting data, with groups funneling information to them. Groups: public, ag community, core ag advisors, full group of stakeholders, core stakeholder advisors. This step was mixed with conditions assessment, priority identification (w/dots) was done at farmer’s market, also did a community survey. Ag community had one-on-one engagement and CAWA workshop. Full group did a map-based identification of concerns and survey of values/priorities. These were used to develop draft objectives (consultants brought to stakeholders) and a final set of objectives after stakeholder review.

Question to ask at the beginning of the process: how do we rank/represent areas – defer to consultants/experts, stakeholders, or broader community? Need to clarify roles – who creates original content for others to react to and who reacts? No one way is the “right” way, but you need to pick one and then be prepared to adjust as you go.

Julie:

Example – Yampa through Steamboat. Spun wheels when we got to setting objectives phase. AC had a liaison from each stakeholder group provide input, responses were summarized into themes that became the plan goals. Management objectives became measurable outcomes helping to achieve plan goals (based on river health assessment (RHA) and stakeholder values). Needed to nail down what they learned from the RHA that really matters. COSHAF was a good tool for us, emphasized **summaries** of what they learned into everyday language – priority health issues, what is causing problems for each reach (stressors). Summarized that into 9 key findings (areas that are good and need to be protected, areas that need improvement, and opportunities) that became the link to developing objectives/actions. Then took the findings to key stakeholder groups for additional community values input and targets for future conditions. Questions:

Stacy – How did you specifically design meetings?

Heather: mostly everyone together except for mapping exercise and engaging the ag community.

Seth: large group setting is more difficult to manage if you want interaction. We started with broad objectives, then had breakout groups (5-6 ppl) with focused dialogue, followed by a share-back.

Buffy – Any experiences with beaver conflict management?

Seth: Lots of potential conflict, not simple to resolve

Mely – How many folks have gone from planning/assessment phase to developing on-the-ground projects?

Grand County, Steamboat, Crystal, some other responses in chat box

Gary Swanson – How do we work with CPW and other stakeholders to get fish counts done if we have background fish counts and plan on implementing projects like flow augmentation and barrier removal that would increase counts?

Seth: I suspect this has more to do with the aquatic biologist in your zone and how they would respond to your request, rather than a broader agency decision. Larger question is if trout biomass is an objective in your plan, you want the ability to measure its success (quantitative), but if you know you're not going to have that, you might try a different (qualitative) objective as a surrogate.

Camille – Comment about implementing low-hanging fruit or demonstration projects to meet immediate needs of stakeholders.

Katherine Morris – Response to Buffy's beaver question. They had a situation where a beaver deceiver would not have been successful, so instead of trying to move the beaver they moved the gauge to a property with a landowner who was more open.

11:25 – 11:30 a.m. Peer-Learning Schedule/Future Topics - Stacy

11:30 a.m. Wrap-Up/Adjourn - Stacy
Evaluation <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/7B89KVQ>