

---

# Assessing Issues and Challenges Related to Implementation of the Willamette Restoration Initiative Restoration Strategy

---

**Prepared By:**

**RESOLVE, Inc.**

1255 23<sup>rd</sup> Street, NW, Suite 275  
Washington, DC 20037  
Phone: (202) 965.6201  
Fax: (202) 338.1264  
Email: pdemorgan@resolv.org

*and*

720 SW Washington Street, Suite 750  
Portland, OR 97205  
Phone: (503) 228-6111  
Fax: (503) 228-6207

**February 2001**

---

**Assessing Issues and Challenges Related to  
Implementation of the Willamette Restoration Initiative  
Restoration Strategy**

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| <b>I. Introduction.....</b>  | <b>1</b> |
| <b>II. Study Approach.....</b>   | <b>1</b> |
| <b>III. Lessons Learned/Principles from Other Efforts</b>                      |          |
| A. Introduction.....   | 2        |
| B. Ingredients for Success.....  | 3        |
| <b>IV. Common Themes .....</b>   | <b>5</b> |
| <b>V. Areas of Divergence.....</b>   | <b>9</b> |
| <b>VI. Further Analysis and Possible Implementation Approaches to Consider</b> |          |
| .....  | 10       |
| <br><b>Appendices</b>  |          |
| A. Resources for More Information.....   | 14       |
| B. List of Interviewees.....   | 15       |
| C. List of Interview Questions .....   | 16       |

# **Assessing Issues and Challenges Related to Implementation of the Willamette Restoration Initiative Restoration Strategy**

## **I. Introduction**

For decades, Oregonians have worked together to develop more coordinated and effective mechanisms to protect the Willamette River Basin. Over the last five years, these endeavors have intensified, in part due to statewide efforts to develop the Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds. In 1997, the Willamette River Basin Task Force, a citizen's group convened by the Governor, recommended the creation of an ongoing, basin wide entity. The entity would work to develop a vision and strategy for restoring the health of the Basin. In response, Governor Kitzhaber convened the Willamette Restoration Initiative (WRI) to develop an integrated conservation strategy to address water quality, fish and wildlife habitat issues, flooding and overall watershed health in the Willamette River Watershed.

A 26-member Board, chaired by Oregon State University President Dr. Paul Risser, oversees the WRI. Board members include representatives of business, local government, utilities, tribes, communication media, academia, watershed councils, soil and water conservation districts, agriculture, forestry, environmental groups, and state and federal government. The WRI Executive Director, Mr. Rick Bastasch, and others staffed the Board's efforts.

WRI is now at a pivotal juncture. Through a series of working groups, research and preparation of white papers, focus groups, and stakeholder feedback and comments, the WRI board prepared the Restoration Strategy for the Willamette River Basin (the Strategy). WRI will have accomplished its mandate when it presents the Strategy to the Governor and State Legislature in February 2001. However, development of a comprehensive strategy is just the first of many steps in the process of restoring a river basin. The next crucial step is to organize and carry out activities that implement a strategy. This report describes some of the issues and challenges related to implementing the Strategy. It also provides possible avenues to explore for effective implementation based on an analysis of other successful watershed partnerships as well as a series of interviews with individuals either involved in or aware of the WRI process.

## **II. Study Approach**

As part of their approach to planning for implementation, the WRI Executive Director and Executive Committee, with the Board's concurrence, asked RESOLVE to assess issues associated with implementation of the Strategy. They requested the report include principles for successful multi-stakeholder implementation efforts and possible options to consider in developing their implementation approach. RESOLVE, a neutral, private, non-profit group that assists people in addressing complex environmental and public policy issues, is headquartered in Washington, DC with offices in Portland, Oregon and Denver, Colorado.

RESOLVE proposed to draw lessons from multi-stakeholder efforts similar to the WRI and conduct stakeholder interviews in order to obtain an understanding of WRI's efforts thus far, including the issues and challenges WRI has faced, and ideas about Strategy implementation. RESOLVE has developed this report, based on a literature review and interviews, to assist the WRI Board in their efforts to develop recommendations for implementation of their proposed Strategy.

To conduct the literature review, we analyzed several well respected "how to collaborate" field books and empirical research on watershed partnerships. In this literature review, we narrowed our analysis to those reports or publications based on either extensive stakeholder participation or empirical research (see Attachment A, Resources for More Information). For the stakeholder interviews component, RESOLVE identified a broad cross section of potential interviewees associated with the WRI process and/or expected to be involved as the Strategy is implemented, contacted them, and subsequently completed 15 interviews with individuals (see Attachment B for a list of the individuals interviewed and Attachment C for a list of the questions asked of the interviewees).

### **III. Lessons Learned/Principles from Other Efforts**

To organize this section we studied field books from the Amherst Wilder Foundation, the Bureau of Land Management, The Keystone Center, the Policy Consensus Initiative, the Society of Professionals in Dispute Resolution, and the Sonoran Institute. For the literature review we analyzed several in-progress empirical research projects (Beirerle 2000, Gray et al. 2000, Sabatier et al 2000.), analyses of surveys of large numbers of cases (Kenney et al. 2000, Stern, 2000, Wondolleck and Yaffee 2000, Yaffee et al 1996, and Mattessich 1992) and several in-depth case studies (Innes et al 1994, Porter et al 1995, Gray 1989).

#### **A. Introduction**

The Sonoran Institute distinguishes between place- or community-based collaborative initiatives and policy- or interest-based initiatives. Place or community-based initiatives "focus on a specific geographic locale... including public land and encompassing nearby human communities" (Cestero 1991). They further differentiate these place-based initiatives by the degree of formality, representation, and goals. The least formal of these initiatives are watershed groups, then dialogue groups, and finally, partnerships. Using the Sonoran Institute categories the WRI is a place-based partnership. Other place-based partnerships in a watershed context include: CALFED Bay-Delta Program, the Chesapeake Bay Program, and the South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Task Force.

Multi-stakeholder partnerships are an increasingly popular strategy for conducting collaborative planning and resolving local resource management conflicts, particularly in a watershed context. It is hard to know how many such partnerships exist, however, several current studies estimate that there are hundreds of watershed partnerships west of the Mississippi. Furthermore, there is increasing support from federal and state agencies and funding for such partnerships.

Notwithstanding the extensive growth, there has been very little empirical research on the favorable conditions, success, and implementation of watershed partnerships. The observations and possible approaches in this report are drawn from RESOLVE's extensive experience with convening and managing stakeholder groups, a review of the literature, and interviews of WRI participants.

## **B. Ingredients for Success**

From our experience and the literature review, we have identified ten ingredients common to successful watershed partnerships. These ten ingredients were mentioned (although sometimes defined slightly differently) in studies of watershed-based, large landscape-oriented projects where planning, conservation, and restoration efforts were implemented. We believe maximizing these ingredients substantially contributes to successful implementation of a comprehensive watershed strategy.

- 1) Inclusion of All Affected Stakeholders. Collaborative planning and watershed management efforts must include all parties with a stake in the results. These parties, the stakeholders, are any individuals, groups, organizations, or agencies who will be affected by watershed decisions, or who have decision making authority, or who can complicate or assist implementation of the strategy. Stakeholders are frequently individuals representing organizations. Watershed partnerships must include the leaders of local groups and organizations as well as reach out to national leaders. The appropriate agency personnel, either local or national, must also participate.
- 2) Incentives to Participate. Stakeholders must have sufficient and continuing incentives to participate. Timing and ripeness of the issues contribute significantly to incentives. Watershed partnerships may begin from a sense of political or economic crisis. Leaders may perceive that every approach to managing the resource has been tried and that policies and people are at impasse. This sense of crisis or impasse provides a powerful incentive and induces people to try a new approach. However, as the partnership continues stakeholders must continue to receive specific benefits and avoid losses to encourage them to stay in the partnership. If the participants can satisfy their interests outside of the partnership, it is unlikely they will stay with the group as it begins to prioritize projects and implement on-the-ground restoration efforts.
- 3) Representation and Accountability. The participants who represent groups or organizations must effectively speak for the interests they represent. They must be accountable to their constituency or agency. If they are representing an organization or agency, they must have their support and commitment. Furthermore, they must understand the importance of maintaining good relationships with their constituencies. Mechanisms, resources, and time for working with their constituencies must be included in the process. As the partnership begins to prioritize funding and sequencing of conservation and restoration projects, it is particularly important to ensure that all stakeholders are communicating with their constituencies and incorporating feedback they receive into the decision-making process.

- 4) Learning and Capacity Building. In order to be successful, watershed partnerships must engage in active internal and external learning. The participants in a watershed partnership must learn and understand other stakeholders' perspectives and interests. This does not mean they have to agree with them, but without understanding others' interests and perceptions participants will not be able to engage in the give and take of negotiation and collaboration. Furthermore, the participants must begin to build long term trusting relationships. These trusting relationships will carry the partnership through the difficult iterative process of implementation. Finally, partnership participants and watershed citizens must begin to understand the complex relationship of biological, physical, economic, and social processes in the watershed. Without this understanding, it will be impossible for participants to implement the strategy once hard choices or strategy changes need to be made.
- 5) Clear Objectives and Projects. There should be clear objectives and these should include projects or plans that change the way things are done on the ground. Although many watershed partnerships produce improved understanding and empathy for diverse viewpoints, only actual improvements in watershed conditions or changes in the behavior of agencies, businesses, or individuals justify the time and expense of collaboration. Quickly instituting a meaningful restoration project, even if the effort is only a first step, can assist in building the foundation and public support for long term efforts.
- 6) Scope of the Partnership. Similarly, there must be agreement on the scope of the partnership. Scope includes the general description of the extent and scale of the partnership efforts as well as the intent. The scale of the project must make sense to the stakeholders. If the scope is too large, they may lose their sense of identification with the landscape. Further, many collaborative efforts fail when stakeholders implicitly disagree about whether the goal is to exchange information, produce recommendations, or make decisions.
- 7) Sufficient Resources. There must be sufficient resources, which includes time, staff, information, and money for the partnership to be successful. Collaboration takes time. If the partnership expects or promises unrealistic deadlines, members and the public will quickly become disheartened. The partnership will need to be staffed. Information will be collected and analyzed. Some participants may need support to attend frequent meetings. Collaborative processes can be expensive and time consuming; there must be enough support at the outset to allow a successful partnership to endure.
- 8) Ensure Full Participation and Communication. There must be a level playing field. Participants may vary in their style or ability to participate. They may also differ in their access to financial resources or their ability to take time off work. Finally, participants may differ in their access or understanding of scientific or technical information. The partnership must ensure equal opportunities to participate, to access relevant scientific and technical information, and to build skills for collaboration.
- 9) Manage the Process Carefully, Consistently, and Continually. The process must be carefully managed. The group must clearly define participant roles and responsibilities and establish clear groundrules and protocols. Most groups find that a respected and skillful convenor helps the process move forward and ensures implementation. Many groups find that they

need to hire an external facilitator if the participants do not have an established history of good working relationships. If the group does not hire an external facilitator then members should be trained in meeting facilitation and should rotate the facilitation role. All the participants should be trained in negotiation and collaborative leadership.

The partnership must learn about the legal requirements and laws that will affect any decision they can reach and who has what authority. The group should establish clear ground rules and decision rules that take account of the regulatory framework and established authorities.

Since so much time will be spent in meetings, they must be efficient. The partnership must set up realistic deadlines. The deadlines must establish clear and reasonable time lines to work for specific outcomes. Establishing milestones helps focus the process, marshal resources, and mark progress.

The partnership must establish informal and formal communication links with the public, the media, and other governmental agencies. It is important to have multiple layers of decisionmaking and active committees so that not every decision requires the full participation of every member. Finally, the partnership must anticipate change and design flexibility into the process. This is particularly salient in planning for inevitable turnovers in agency staff or other participation.

- 10) Connect Implementation to Planning. Beginning to address implementation issues during the planning process helps set the stage for successful implementation of an agreement. Early awareness of implementation issues affects decisions made by a group around representation, scope, and objectives, and assists in building trust among the parties. The longer a partnership waits to develop an implementation strategy, the more difficult it becomes to move forward on actions.

## **IV. Common Themes**

Based on the interviews with WRI Board members and others aware of the WRI process, a series of common themes as well as areas of divergence have emerged in relation to implementation of the Strategy. Each common theme is briefly introduced in this section and linkages to the ingredients for success are explored. Implication for how to build on these themes in planning for implementation are discussed in section VI.

### **1. The Strategy serves as a valuable starting point from which to begin achieving the goals of restoring the Basin's water quality and diverse habitat types.**

Most of the interviewees considered the Strategy a useful beginning, born out of strenuous effort, which sets goals for the future and identifies actions necessary to initiate and subsequently enhance restoration efforts. Individuals indicated the effort to develop the Strategy was time-consuming, challenging, and even infuriating at times, but that the final product effectively frames the issues for the Basin's citizens. As indicated below, in section V. 1., the extent to which interviewees feel the Strategy will have an impact in the Basin and their comfort with the

level of specificity in the Strategy varies significantly. A shared ‘picture’ of what the Strategy could achieve for the Basin also emerged from the interviews, however the extent to which the Strategy actually illuminated this ‘picture’ was not clear.<sup>1</sup>

A shared sense of the Strategy’s value as a starting point indicates the group has reached agreement around the scope of restoration efforts, a key ingredient for success. This is critical for implementation because it allows parties to own the implementation phase.

## **2. In order to achieve restoration goals, all Basin citizens need to be engaged and involved in implementation of the Strategy.**

Development of a Strategy with goals and objectives is an essential stage in the restoration process. However, implementation is a new stage requiring a fresh look at who needs to be involved to ensure the greatest likelihood of successful implementation. While the WRI Board represents a broad cross-section of interests, a more comprehensive approach to involving citizens throughout the Basin is imperative to achieve restoration or conservation on the ground.

Everyone interviewed pointed out that more of the Basin’s citizens need to understand the problems in the Basin and why a restoration strategy is necessary to address these problems. They also need to understand how their actions impact the Basin resources, what changes (behavioral and specific) they could make to change their impact, and the results such changes may bring about. The problems facing the Basin are so complex and substantial that for efforts to restore the hydrological processes and habitat while maintaining a vibrant economy and addressing social concerns to be successful, everyone living in the Basin needs to be involved in the solution.

As discussed in the first ingredient for success, all parties with a stake in the results need to be involved for successful implementation. Engaging the Basin citizens, and getting their buy-in on the Strategy is an important step to ensuring their involvement. Further, the fourth ingredient for success discusses the need to learn and build capacity during a process. Building trust among partners is necessary to work through the inevitable difficult times associated with implementation. Engaging those who will be involved in implementation as soon as possible will help begin building trust.

## **3. Implementing the Strategy would be greatly assisted by State Legislature support.**

Implementation of the Strategy requires a range of activities at on-the-ground, local levels, State agency levels, and federal levels. Interviewees indicated that legislative support for the Strategy would go a long way to legitimizing subsequent implementation activities, particularly the formation of a coordinating body. In addition, interviewees noted that legislative involvement with any implementation mechanisms would assist in better defining for stakeholders where issues will be addressed in the Basin.

---

<sup>1</sup> The interviewees’ ‘shared picture’ of what the Strategy could achieve for the Basin included components such as increased habitat quality so endangered species are no longer listed, major strides toward removing ‘quality limited’ label from the water, and a better public understanding of the debate and increased involvement in the activities necessary to achieve the goals.

In addition, the Legislature is critical to a number of important implementation components, including, but not limited to: funding specific activities, supporting agency efforts, and creating incentives for citizens to change behaviors. Involvement of, and support from, the Legislature will go a long way to ensuring that ownership of the implementation activities is shared.

It is important to include all affected stakeholders, as discussed in the first ingredient for success, in efforts to implement a strategy. As such, involving legislators in planning for and, if appropriate, performing implementation activities makes sense. Further, involving the legislature can create an incentive for various interests to participate in implementation efforts, which is an important step in developing a long-lasting implementation strategy (as described in the second ingredient for success). Finally, obtaining sufficient resources for the range of implementation activities is vital, as noted in the seventh ingredient for success, and legislative support and/or involvement could assist in obtaining some of those resources.

#### **4. Implementation of the Strategy would be greatly assisted by existence of a multi-stakeholder coordinating body or forum.**

There was a general sense among the interviewees that bringing all interested stakeholders together in a forum would be useful as implementation efforts get underway. A number of functions for such a body were suggested as possibly useful. The functions are not necessarily mutually exclusive but they might suggest different organizational structures. One set of functions included practical task-oriented activities with clear milestones. A different function would be to create an opportunity for people to bring issues and problems to one another for discussion and solution.

The practical activities suggested included taking the lead in monitoring implementation, coordinating actions, providing outreach and education, and managing technical information. The first two of these responsibilities, monitoring implementation and coordinating actions, were seen as tasks that would otherwise not be accomplished and their absence would likely result in lost opportunities. Interviewees indicated the other two responsibilities, providing outreach and education and managing technical information (e.g., generating, publicizing, and making information available), were tasks that will take place through other mechanisms but which would be particularly enhanced through coordinated implementation.

The ability to learn from experience and adapt accordingly is extremely valuable for those involved in implementation of a basin-wide strategy (as described in the fourth ingredient for success). Each of the responsibilities described above can assist in building an individuals' or groups' capacity to learn. A forum where all interested implementing parties can learn from one another as implementation efforts are undertaken goes a long way to ensuring an avenue for full participation and communication exists. If such a forum is in place, it must be managed carefully, consistently, and continually if these benefits are to be generated. In addition, even though the Strategy is in place, the capacity to connect planning to implementation can be strengthened through such a mechanism. These ideas are raised in the eighth, ninth, and tenth ingredients for success.

Interviewees also indicated having an on-going forum where the range of stakeholders can engage in basin-wide discussions or problem-solving efforts would be valuable for implementation efforts. They added that the breadth of interests in the Basin requires that different stakeholders have a forum for discussing basin-wide issues or solving problems. This type of forum, to be successful in the long term, needs to enable participants to address tough issues. As such, questions around decision-making mechanisms, membership, and accountability need to be addressed to give the forum legitimacy. As discussed in Section V. 2., the extent to which interviewees perceived the need for a ‘formal’ structure did vary.

While the Strategy is a useful starting point, interviewees noted that the WRI Board deferred many tough issues, including priority setting, in order to reach agreement around the broad Strategy. Given the goal of developing a Strategy, along with the reality of limited resources and the lack of incentive to strive for consensus on really challenging issues, deferring these decisions made sense. However, as implementation gets underway, a group of diverse stakeholders will need to set priorities, balance tradeoffs, and assist in distribution of resources.

While the previous practical activities dealt with coordination responsibilities, this one expands the role for such a forum to include, in essence, decision making. Representation and accountability are particularly important for a body with problem-solving/decision making capacity, as explained in the third ingredient for success, and would have to be addressed in planning for implementation.

## **5. Securing a stable source of funding is necessary for coordinated implementation.**

Implementation success will be directly correlated with the ability to secure appropriate funding for priority activities (both on-the-ground actions and oversight/coordination actions). Thus far, much of the funding and ‘in-kind’ support for the WRI Board came from federal agencies. However, the future level of support for an on-going body is currently unclear. Some variance existed in discussing the likelihood of receiving funding, at least from the State, in light of the breadth of perspectives on the priority and/or relative importance for restoration activities generally versus social priorities (e.g., education, crime, etc.). While many interviewees indicated the health of the Willamette Basin system is of paramount importance, it is likely that to the extent decisions are forced into “either/or” type situations, social priorities will offer stiff competition for funding. Other sources of funding (e.g., foundations, private corporations) are available and, if the stakeholders think a coordinating body is appropriate, exploring funding will be important for implementation.

As discussed in the seventh ingredient for success, sufficient resources necessary for success includes time, staff, information, and money. For full implementation of the Strategy, a variety of funding sources will likely be necessary. Obtaining as many resources as possible early in implementation efforts will help build confidence in the process. If adequate funding is not available up front, supporters will need to leverage what support there is as effectively and efficiently as possible.

## V. Areas of Divergence

### 1. The “value added” of the Strategy.

While interviewees agreed the Strategy serves as a good starting point for achieving restoration goals, there were an array of thoughts on the actual value the Strategy can add to efforts to address major issues in the Basin. In describing the WRI origins, almost everyone mentioned its relationship to development of the Oregon Plan. Some people characterized the Oregon Plan as an attempt to alleviate federal pressures, particularly as they relate to water quality requirements and species habitat needs, on the State and its citizens. As the Willamette Chapter of the Oregon Plan, some have indicated that, to be successful, the Strategy needs to more clearly address these pressures. For instance, if the Strategy resulted in an acceptable Species Recovery Plan (under the Endangered Species Act) or recognition that the Basin was adhering to the criteria necessary to receive a 4d rule exemption, then the Strategy would be ‘valuable.’ If neither of these is achieved through the Strategy directly, some felt it might be more appropriate to spend resources on other approaches. Others, while recognizing the links to the Oregon Plan, felt the Strategy in and of itself will be a valuable step on the way to addressing these challenges and others.

In a similar vein, some interviewees indicated the current Strategy does not do enough to seriously address the changes necessary to achieve its stated goals. These varying perspectives indicate additional work may need to be done, during implementation, to obtain a clear vision of how the Strategy will add value to those doing work on the ground, and thereby serve as an incentive to participate in implementation efforts as described in the second ingredient for success.

### 2. The value of a formal, coordinated approach to implementing the Strategy.

As stated above, a common vision of what could be accomplished through implementation<sup>2</sup> of the Strategy emerged from the interviews (again, whether the Strategy illuminated this or not is unclear). However, interviewees expressed a range of opinions in discussing what would transpire if the Strategy was not implemented. Some felt that without a formal, concerted effort toward implementation of the Strategy, major synergistic opportunities would be missed. Others indicated actions will happen regardless and existing organizations will work together to achieve the goals of the Strategy. The variance of opinion on this issue raises questions about how implementation efforts could achieve several of the Ingredients for Success described above in Section III.




#### *Table 1. Perspectives on Strategy Content and the Implementation Process*

The following table is designed to address the potential for confusion between the previous two Areas of Divergence and the first Common Theme (i.e., the Strategy serves as a good starting point for efforts to achieve the goals of restoring water quality and diverse habitat types). As shown below, everyone felt the Strategy content was good, however, some felt the document was

---

<sup>2</sup> Note: a common definition of “formal implementation” was not agreed upon. However, generally speaking, interviewees agreed this implied efforts had some authority in the eyes of implementers, were coordinated, and a range of parties were involved in completing the restoration tasks laid out in the Strategy.

sufficient in level of detail as completed, while others indicated additional work was necessary. Further, while some felt the implementation process needs to be ‘formal’ in nature, others indicated an informal implementation approach is adequate. Note that the figures in the table sections are not intended to represent an actual ‘count,’ but rather a relative sense of views.

| STRATEGY<br>CONTENT<br><br>IMPLEMENTATION<br>PROCESS | GOOD/SUFFICIENT   | GOOD/NOT SUFFICIENT   |
|--|---|---|
| INFORMAL   |  |   |
| FORMAL   |  |  |

### 3. The type of mechanism/forum for coordination of Basin wide restoration efforts.

As mentioned in Section IV. 4., interviewees agreed that a coordinating body would assist efforts to implement the Strategy. However, a range of options or approaches were suggested, each with potential strengths and weaknesses. In particular, suggestions included:

- a) continue with a WRI style body (though possible changes were identified)<sup>3</sup>;
- b) create a much smaller “Executive Committee” type body;
- c) utilize the existing Watershed Council process; and
- d) ask State agencies to take the lead.

Each suggestion incorporated important criteria for the ‘appropriate’ model, if one is ultimately to be chosen, including:

- a) do not lose the knowledge and sense of ownership of the existing body;
- b) ensure the mechanism can quickly and efficiently move on implementation issues;
- c) implementation needs to take place at the local level and therefore locals need to be involved in coordination and oversight; and
- d) existing mechanisms are in place and valuable, do not spend resources unnecessarily.

Applying these criteria to any decision regarding the implementation mechanism/forum to be utilized will be important to ensuring the effort is supported by the full range of stakeholders.

## VI. Further Analysis and Possible Implementation Approaches to Consider

In developing the Strategy, the WRI Board and staff identified many of the ingredients for successful implementation and incorporated ideas and opportunities to deal with those ingredients in the future (e.g., developing an outreach plan). In addition, potential barriers to successful implementation were identified during the planning phase but efforts to address them

<sup>3</sup> Ideas included: rename the body, hire a facilitator, clarify decision-making process, reevaluate the membership.

were not always successful. For example, efforts were made to engage legislators and representatives of the Watershed Councils, but the incentives for them to stay engaged with one another were not strong enough. Now the Strategy and underlying goals are in place and there is general agreement that they are a good starting point, an opportunity exists to make progress toward achieving the goals. In essence, opportunities to develop an intimate link between planning and implementation were missed, however it is not too late to begin engaging the necessary players in the implementation phase.

While the Strategy now has broad support of the Board, efforts to implement the Strategy may be thwarted if they are instituted too quickly. This is a tough issue to reconcile given the urgency, as indicated in the document and interviews, of water quality and habitat issues in the Basin. However, unless important stakeholder groups (e.g., the legislature and on-the-ground implementers) buy into the Strategy and take it for their own, implementation will be very difficult. Given that the Strategy has already been written, obtaining the buy-in will be a challenge, but it is not an insurmountable one.

Given the Ingredients for Success, Common Themes, and Areas of Divergence identified in this assessment, there are at least five possible implementation actions that may be useful for the WRI Board to consider, the first three could be taken over the next three months, the other two over a longer period of time. These steps are:

1. Confirm agreement among the WRI Board members on the role of a coordinating body;
2. Engage additional stakeholders to obtain support for further exploration of the coordinating body idea;
3. Convene a broad group of stakeholders to discuss the role and characteristics of a coordinating body;
4. More explicitly make the Strategy an ‘iterative’ document; and,
5. Ensure development of an aggressive and meaningful outreach and public involvement program.

1. *Confirm agreement among the WRI Board members on the role of a coordinating body.* Building on the rest of this Report, there seems to be general agreement that the coordinating body could play a role in monitoring implementation efforts, coordinating implementation efforts, and raising public visibility and accountability for implementation efforts. In addition, the body could serve as a venue for dealing with difficult issues such as priority setting among the many actions and objectives. Explicitly identifying the value of such a body to the respective stakeholders will also assist in obtaining support. Achieving support for an effort to collectively explore the idea of a coordinating body will require agreement about the role such a body could play.
2. *Engage additional stakeholders to obtain support for further exploration of the coordinating body idea.* Given the urgency of making decisions, in light of the current legislative session, WRI Board members and staff have already begun to reach out to some of the essential participants including legislators and Watershed Council members. In addition, the Governor’s office has proposed legislation related to an ongoing body, which will be important to include in the discussions. Organization of a meeting among the groups

mentioned, as quickly as possible, is imperative to obtain the necessary support for further exploration of the idea of a coordinating body. Such a meeting is necessary to get buy in on the role, invite others to participate, and explore possible funding sources.

3. *Convene a broader group of stakeholders to discuss the role and characteristics of a coordinating body.* Assuming those members of the legislature, governor's office, and watershed councils engaged in the previous step support further exploration of a coordinating body, the next step would be to convene a slightly broader group of stakeholders to discuss the proposed role and characteristics of a coordinating body.

Process questions for such a group to address could include, but not necessarily be limited to:

- What coordinating body models exist?
- Who would need to be involved in the coordination body?
- How many people would be included?
- How would the body be chosen?
- Where would resources come from?
- Where would the body be housed?
- What operating principles would assist in the success of such a body (e.g., groundrules, information exchange, rotating membership, etc.)?

Questions related to building ownership of the Strategy and implementation activities could include, but not necessarily be limited to:

- Is more clarity on the vision, goals, and objectives necessary?
- What is the relationship of the coordination body to the Legislature?
- How would this body most effectively interact with other organizations?
- To whom and how would the body be accountable?
- How would the body set priorities?
- How would the body monitor activities?

Clarifying and getting agreement on these questions will go a long way to making the case for the value of a coordinating mechanism to assist in implementation of the Strategy. In particular, ensuring all stakeholders understand the value a coordinated implementation approach adds to their work will assist in obtaining their support.

4. *More explicitly make the Strategy an 'iterative' document.* To get buy in from others not already part of the Strategy, one option would be to more explicitly make the Strategy an 'iterative' document. The idea of an 'living' document is already noted in the existing Strategy, but proposing the mechanism to meaningfully incorporate other ideas in the evolving Strategy would be helpful. As the second Common Theme indicated, all Basin citizens need to be engaged and involved in implementation of the Strategy.
5. *Ensure development of an aggressive and meaningful outreach and public involvement program.* The first step in creating an aware and engaged set of Basin citizens is through development of an outreach and education program related to the Strategy itself. For citizens

to buy in to the Strategy a clear picture of what the Basin looks like today and a vision of what the Basin could look like in the future (in a variety of scenarios) needs to be laid out. The citizens, building on such a vision, would likely be more inclined to work toward implementation of the actions necessary to restore the Basin. Obtaining buy in for the efforts also requires an understanding of the Strategy's goals, objectives, yardsticks to measure actions against, and the ramifications of either achieving or not completing the actions. Further, obtaining ongoing support from the citizens will also require meaningful opportunities for input into the 'iterative' Strategy.

Finally, many other steps will ultimately emerge as the purposes and structure of the mechanism becomes clearer through these proposed steps.

## Appendix A

### Resources for More Information

Arthur, Jim, Carlson, Chris and Lee Moore, A Practical Guide to Consensus, Santa Fe, NM and Bismarck, ND, Policy Consensus Initiative, 1999.

Bureau of Land Management and the Sonoran Institute, A Desktop Reference Guide to Collaborative Community-Based Planning, Washington, DC, U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management and Tucson, AZ, The Sonoran Institute, 2000.

Canadian Round Tables, Building Consensus for a Sustainable Future: Guiding Principles, Round Tables on the Environment and Economy, Ottawa, Canada, 1993

Cestero, Barb, Beyond the Hundredth Meeting: A Field Guide to Collaborative Conservation on the West's Public Lands, Tucson, AZ, The Sonoran Institute, 1999.

Gray, Barbara, Collaborating: Finding Common Ground for Multi-Party Problems, San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass, 1989.

Keystone Center, The Keystone National Policy Dialogue on Ecosystem Management, The Keystone Center, Keystone, CO, 1996.

Mattessich, Paul and Barbara Monsey, Collaboration: What Makes It Work: A Review of Research Literature on Factors Influencing Successful Collaboration, Saint Paul, MN, Amherst Wilder Foundation, 1992.

Porter, Douglas R. and David A. Salvesen, ed. Collaborative Planning for Wetlands and Wildlife: Issues and Examples, Washington, DC, Island Press, 1995.

Society of Professionals in Dispute Resolution, Best Practices for Government Agencies: Guidelines for Using Collaborative Agreement-Seeking Processes, Society of Professionals in Dispute Resolution, Washington, DC, 1997.

Stern, Alissa J. with Tim Hicks, The Process of Business/Environmental Collaborations: Partnering for Sustainability, Westport, CT, 2000.

Winer, Michael and Karen Ray, Collaboration Handbook: Creating, Sustaining and Enjoying the Journey, Saint Paul, MN, Amherst Wilder Foundation, 1994.

Wondolleck, Julia M. and Steven L. Yaffee, Making Collaboration Work: Lessons in Innovative Natural Resource Management, Washington, DC, Island Press, 2000.

## **Appendix B**

### **List of Interviewees**

1. Jeff Allen, Oregon Environmental Council
2. Helen Berg, City of Corvallis
3. Paula Burgess, U.S. Bureau of Land Management
4. Mike Burton, METRO
5. Jon Chandler, Oregon Building Industry
6. Mike Crouse, National Marine Fisheries Service
7. Sandra Convey, Mary's River Watershed Council
8. Bill Gaffi, United Sewerage Agency
9. Gary Lynch, Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries
10. Susan Morgan, Oregon House of Representatives
11. Tony Nigro, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
12. Matt Rea, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
13. Louise Solliday, Office of the Governor, Natural Resources
14. Erik Sten, City of Portland
15. Sara Vickerman, Defenders of Wildlife

## Appendix C

### List of Interview Questions

#### Questions:

1. Would you please tell me about your background and interest in the Willamette Basin?
2. What has been your involvement with the Willamette Restoration Initiative?
3. From your perspective, what are the key events leading up to development of the WRI Proposed Strategy?
4. What functions are essential to implementing the WRI Proposed Strategy? Which of those, if any, are unlikely to be fulfilled by existing organizations and/or institutions?
5. What are the challenges/barriers/obstacles to implementation?
6. What approaches or processes would be most useful in implementing the Strategy and why? What would not be useful or acceptable approaches and why?
7. Assuming limited resources, what 2-3 major issues associated with the Willamette Basin will need to be addressed over the next five years?
8. Assume it is 2020, what did implementation of the WRI Proposed Strategy accomplish for the Basin?
9. What might happen if we just continue with the “status quo” or if WRI does not continue in some form?
10. How has the WRI process worked thus far? What has WRI accomplished that otherwise would not have been accomplished?
11. What suggestions do you have for improving WRI efforts (e.g., substance, process, relationships)?
12. Anything else we should discuss, questions for me?