Stream Management Planning
Peer-Learning Video Call
10-11:30 a.m., Thursday, December 10, 2020

TOPIC INTRODUCTION

Most SMPs will undertake a process to identify and prioritize potential actions to support the objectives stated in their SMP. This peer call will bring SMP leads together to discuss approaches to this aspect of planning from how to effectively design the discussion process, approaches for evaluating potential project impact and tips for ensuring success and examples of potential projects. You will learn from your peers that have successfully accomplished this planning step.

ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES

- Connection, learning, and problem-solving with your peers.
- Understanding of how to lead your SMP through the planning step: Identify, Evaluate and Prioritize Potential Actions, specifically:
  - How to design stakeholder discussions to maximize results and buy-in
  - Benefits and methods to evaluate potential project impacts
  - Approaches for prioritizing projects
- Continue to build a community of practice among SMP leaders, developing relationships and learning to collectively enhance work on SMP/IWMPs throughout the state.

AGENDA

10 – 10:05 a.m.   **Welcome, Agenda Overview and Zoom Logistics**
Mikhaela Mullins, River Network

10:05-10:15 a.m.   **Break Out Introductions - Mikhaela**
- Name
- Role on your SMP/IWMP
- Location of your SMP
- Your biggest challenge right now
- Your biggest celebration right now

10:15 – 10:25 a.m.   **Topic Overview: Identify, Evaluate and Prioritize Potential Actions**
Stacy Beaugh, Strategic By Nature

Kim Lennberg (Alba Watershed Consulting) provided a brief overview of the SMP Outcomes Tracking Tool, a tool that is being developed by the River Network team to help CWCB track the implementation outcomes of Stream Management Plans. The tool is an online form that

converts to a spreadsheet database, where SMP leads can provide information about recommendations that have come out of their plans. It compiles information about project type, multiple objectives or benefits, project location, project cost and funding sources, and project status. Using those data, the goal is to help CWCB generate summary information and statistics to help them understand the ultimate implementation outcomes of stream management planning across the State. Completion of the tool is not currently required but may be incorporated into the CWCB grant reporting process in the future. River Network will use outputs from the tool to create a summary of SMP progress over the last few years, and this report will be shared with the peer network in spring 2021.

10:25 – 10:50 a.m.   Panel Discussion: Lessons from the Field
- Panelist Presentations:
    - Seth Mason, Lotic Hydrological

Seth provided examples from three different SMPs that Lotic has worked on in the last few years to illustrate a range of approaches to identifying, evaluating, and prioritizing implementation actions. He stressed that while the impulse is often to move quickly through the SMP process to arrive at actions and projects, it is extremely important to do the pre-work to develop a rationale for completing implementation actions that address the most pressing needs and satisfy the greatest number of stakeholders.

Crystal River SMP example: The technical team applied the FACStream framework to perform a conditional assessment and used the results to identify ecosystem constraints and needs, quantify impacts, and evaluate management solutions. Then, they thought of what might be done to address the primary limiting factor in the system and approached stakeholders with a set of options. In this top-down approach, the prioritization framework was related to the recommendation developed by the technical team.

Yampa (Steamboat) SMP example: Following the conditional assessment based on FACStream, the technical team developed a matrix targeted to a technically-oriented advisory group to think about where specific issues may be most limiting to the system. This conversation yielded a comprehensive matrix of management targets specific to geography and river health indicators. To prioritize this long list of potential actions, the team went back to the community and distributed "Yampa bucks" to generate a relative ranking based on the community's perception of the issues.

Middle Colorado SMP example: This SMP covered a much larger area than the others and included a larger and more diverse set of stakeholders. They broke into focus groups concerned with specific topic areas, and each focus group reviewed the assessment results and went through a mental modeling exercise to understand some of the bidirectional feedback between the issues of concern. This exercise allowed them to distill controlling variables and extract them as issues that may require treatment through objectives and actions. They then created a matrix that showed how many objectives were addressed with

any given action, overlaid it with evaluation criteria (e.g., costs, political will, biological conflicts, community support), and used this information to rank projects.

o Sonja Chavez, Upper Gunnison Basin Watershed Management Plan

The Upper Gunnison initially split up work across their large basin into 3 phases (later modified to 2). Phase I assessed 3 sub-watersheds, and Phase II is assessing the remaining 4 sub-watersheds. For Phase I, they assigned basin coordinators. However, timelines were different across sub-watersheds and analyses lacked coordination, which resulted in inefficiencies and non-parallel efforts. This approach also led to heavy workloads, and lack of expertise in all subjects yielded differences in plan emphasis across the sub-watersheds. Phase II organized sub-watershed assessments by subject matter experts instead (agricultural, municipal, etc.). The plan for identifying, evaluating, and prioritizing actions in Phase II is that the technical team will preliminarily identify issues and take them to the public. Based on feedback, the technical team will then develop a set of action items.

10:50 – 11:10 a.m.   Peer Problem Solving Break Out Discussion - Stacy

11:10 – 11:25 a.m.   Report Out and Panel Q&A - Stacy
- Volunteers report back on what their group discussed?
- Additional questions for presenters?

11:25 - 11:30 a.m.   Wrap-Up/Adjourn – Mikhaela
- Evaluation
  - Please complete the poll
  - In your chat box write:
    - One thing you liked about this meeting
    - One thing you would change for the future
- 2021 Peer Learning Schedule
- Additional Resources (see below)

Additional Resources – Check them out!
- Recently Completed Assessment Reports
  - Upper Gunnison
  - New: St. Vrain and Left Hand Creek
  - New: South Boulder Creek
- New: Community and Learning Web Page
- New: Ask a Practitioner Video – Using Recreation Surveys to Understand Community Preferences
- River Network Rally Workshops Zoom Best Practices Video