

**BONNEVILLE ENVIRONMENTAL FOUNDATION**

FINDINGS REPORT

Prepared by:

**PYRAMID COMMUNICATIONS**  
239 NW 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Suite 215  
Portland, OR 97209

MARCH 21, 2012



## **OVERVIEW**

Watershed restoration efforts in the Entiat and Methow watersheds span more than a decade. Armed with sound science and a passion for the work, public and private partners have made significant contributions across the Upper Columbia with hard work and cooperative efforts. With the ongoing implementation of restoration projects on the horizon, a communications and outreach plan can strengthen existing relationships and help build new partnerships with local landowners.

From January to March 2012, Pyramid Communications conducted an array of research to inform effective communications planning and outreach in both watersheds. This research included a web scan of watershed restoration organizations, review of communication materials used in the Entiat and Methow watersheds and by the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board, interviews with key opinion leaders, and facilitated discussions with restoration partners in the Upper Columbia.

This report summarizes findings and implications for messaging and provides the foundation for communication strategy moving forward.

## **WEB SCAN METHODOLOGY AND FINDINGS**

A website is the key public-facing medium organizations use to communicate their market position, program priorities, and credibility with their audiences. Websites provide insight to how organizations see themselves and how they want target audiences to see them.

Pyramid conducted a web scan of watershed restoration organizations, documenting how each organization approaches and describes its work, defines goals, reports outcomes and engages with target audiences. A mix of both local and national organizations were selected, all active in watershed restoration in the West:

- Alaska Conservation Foundation (Alaska)
- North Fork John Day Watershed Council (Oregon)
- Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (Oregon)
- South Santiam Watershed Council (Oregon)
- Stewardship Partners (Washington)
- The Nature Conservancy (Alaska, California, Colorado, Montana, Oregon and Washington)
- Trout Unlimited (Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming)
- Whole Watershed Restoration Initiative (Idaho, Oregon, and Washington)

## **FINDINGS**

**Watershed restoration initiatives are predominantly partnership-driven.** Partnerships are the foundation of most of these efforts. Partners work together to increase the scope and scale of watershed restoration projects, deploy the varied skills of each partner, increase credibility and reduce duplication of effort to get better results.

**Partnerships are complicated and operate in a crowded landscape.** Partnerships cross public and private sectors to include tribes, local, state and federal governments, corporations, non-profits, schools and other educational institutions and other non-governmental community groups. The role of the partnership and the function of individual partners are not always clear. This can create confusion about coordination and collaboration.

**Many organizations communicate with audiences across multiple channels.** Not surprisingly, national organizations use more sophisticated and resourced communication strategies and tools. While varying in scale, most groups incorporate multiple channels, including face-to-face meetings, public meetings, Facebook, Twitter and e-newsletters. Organizations use each channel to support further communication and engagement with key audiences.

**Cultivating and educating young people is a priority.** Organizations across the board recognize that young people are critical to long-term support of watershed restoration. By offering internships, classroom instruction and hands-on experience, organizations invest in the next generation of conservation leaders. It is also likely that in many communities, schools are relatively easy partners to work with.

**There is an enormous amount of information with few clear calls to action.** Organizations convey a lot of information and data to a lot of audiences. The sheer volume of content is intimidating to the reader and creates unintended barriers. Key messages are lost in the complexity and mass of content. Much of the content is information reported out with few clear calls to action and few avenues for audiences to engage effectively with the work.

**There is little common, consistent language.** Organizations describe restoration projects in a variety of ways. Conflicting terminology can be confusing and create further barriers to communicating effectively. Descriptions of in-stream projects that put wood in rivers offer an illustration:

- Trout Unlimited describes this work as “large woody debris;”
- The Nature Conservancy calls it “wood restoration;”
- Stewardship Partners use the term “log structure;” and
- Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board describes these projects as “placing logs” or “placing large wood” in waterways.

Organizations also often use highly technical terms and jargon that laypeople find confusing, if not alienating:

*“The South Santiam Watershed is deficient in large woody debris due to past timber management, stream cleaning practices and torrential flows that removed woody debris*

*in the 1970's and 1996. This deficiency limits the ability of the watershed to dissipate streamflow energy and prevent erosion, retain spawning gravel and nutrients, or to create and maintain instream habitat complexity. LWD is severely lacking in lower reaches of the basin, but even upper reaches have low habitat complexity and would benefit from increased LWD.” – South Santiam Watershed Council*

*“The existing culverts are undersized and perched, impeding juvenile salmonid passage under most conditions and often restricting adults. Replacing these structures with properly sized bottomless arch culverts will make 2½ miles of quality habitat accessible to all life-stages of steelhead and Chinook. Overall water quality will also be protected by removing the potential for culvert failure and resultant massive sediment loading to the stream.” – North Folk John Day Watershed Council*

*“Existing pools were excavated to increase rearing and refugia habitat and nearly 40 log structures were placed to improve habitat. Additional gravel was added to enhanced spawning areas and stream banks were pulled back at a 3 to 1 slope, widening the floodplain and decreasing erosion. This fall, spawning salmon were observed using the newly enhanced cover and spawning habitat. This project enhanced a total of 750 feet of stream channel.” – Stewardship Partners*

**Communication focuses on process and project descriptions—not impacts.**

While organizations provide great detail on the function, costs and other characteristics of restoration projects, they rarely highlight the impacts of their work. For example, Trout Unlimited describes over twenty-five projects involved in their Home Rivers Initiative. However, stories are not shared to illustrate the impact of their work on the economy, fish populations, water quality or other elements.

## **COMMUNICATION MATERIALS REVIEW METHODOLOGY AND FINDINGS**

To assess the strength, consistency and effectiveness of messages in both watersheds, Pyramid reviewed an array of communication materials. Please refer to Appendix A for a complete list of materials reviewed. In addition, in-depth interviews were held with key working group members to explore past communications and outreach efforts and identify unique attributes of each watershed.

### **FINDINGS**

**Both watershed groups have existing, successful track records with landowners.** There is a long history of landowner involvement. Successful partnerships have been developed and projects implemented on private lands in each watershed. This history is a critical prerequisite to developing relationships with new landowners.

**There is a lot of data available that measures things people care about.** Monitoring efforts in both watersheds are significant. In addition to assessing impacts of restoration activities on fish

populations and habitat conditions, the data also measures factors more people might care about, including water quality and river health.

**Volunteer activities in the Entiat promote citizen involvement and environmental stewardship.** Volunteer events are visible avenues for community outreach and opportunities for citizens to demonstrate support for restoration to the broader community.

**Watershed restoration groups in the Methow highlight their partnerships.** By raising the visibility of existing partnerships, the Methow elevates a breadth of community involvement among citizens, non-profit organizations and government.

**Landowner outreach includes public meetings, newsletters, one-on-one meetings, community forums and events.** Both groups use traditionally effective methods to communicate with landowners. Much of the outreach to date has focused on landowners directly affected by restoration projects.

**Partners in the Entiat communicate without defensiveness.** Interactions with the community are open and honest. This communication fosters trust and builds stronger relationships.

*“We all dropped the ball on public outreach. We could have done better.” – Mike Kaputa*

However, it can also have an unintended effect. There is a fine line between communicating without defensiveness and invoking concern by calling attention to unanswered questions about the work.

*“Millions of dollars are spent each year...questions remain regarding the individual and combined effectiveness of restoration efforts implemented thus far.” – Conservation Quarterly Winter 2010*

**Salmon recovery is the consistent primary message.** Benefits to fish are a focal point in both watersheds. Yet, restoration projects provide the Upper Columbia, and its communities, with additional benefits, which are not always elevated.

*Cascadia strives to restore in-stream habitat in the Wenatchee and Entiat watersheds to provide salmon, steelhead and bull trout with the necessary conditions to live and prosper.*  
– Conservation Quarterly Winter 2012

*This large-scale effort to monitor how fish use the river, both before and after M2 project construction, will help quantify the effects of habitat improvement work in the Middle Methow.* – Middle Methow News July 2011

**The information communicated is often technical and filled with data.** The data is not often accompanied by an explanation of what it means for the larger community. This makes it difficult for people not directly involved with restoration to understand its value to the community.

*“The projects will create high quality side channel rearing habitat, improve surface and groundwater connection to the floodplain, and enhance riparian vegetation. Both projects propose to supplement existing large wood with a variety of log structures and placements to provide more habitat complexity and pool depth in both the side channels and the mainstem of the river.” – Middle Methow News January 2012*

**The focus of restoration communications is on project characteristics and cost—sometimes at the expense of communicating results.** Restoration activities are described in great detail but project outcomes are not always emphasized. Success stories and positive impacts are a missing piece of communication.

*The stream channel was lengthened to 220 linear feet by installing meanders and other fish habitat features in the stream, such as woody debris, placed to ensure unimpeded upstream fish passage. Weed removal and restoration of native vegetation occurred over an area of 0.35 acres along the Yaksum Creek streambank. The producer and his family were very satisfied with the result of the restoration. This project will serve as a demonstration site for water quality and fish and wildlife projects. – Conservation Quarterly Winter 2011*

*We carefully obtained onsite many of the necessary materials for construction, placing large boulders to form a low-flow notch and recycling fallen trees to create cover for fish when high water overtops the rock sill and flows into the side channel in the spring.*  
– [www.methowsalmon.org](http://www.methowsalmon.org)

## **STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEW METHODOLOGY AND FINDINGS**

Pyramid conducted confidential interviews with eight community leaders and landowners from each watershed. The interviews were designed to assess their awareness and perceptions of watershed restoration and fish recovery efforts in their communities. Working group members identified participants—all of whom are knowledgeable and have a stake in restoration efforts in their community. Participants were consistently candid and thoughtful with their comments. Interview participants are listed below:

### **Entiat Watershed:**

- John Craven, landowner
- Doug England, Chelan County Commissioner District 3
- Sharon Rose, landowner
- Keith Vradenburg, Mayor, City of Entiat

### **Methow Watershed**

- Hank Konrad, owner of Hank’s Market
- Bob Lloyd, Town of Twisp Council Member
- Sheela McLean, writer for Methow Valley Grist
- Vic Stokes, landowner

## FINDINGS

**Most participants see positive impacts of watershed restoration.** When asked to describe the impact of watershed restoration and fish recovery, interview participants note a range of positive results, including benefits to the economy, reducing erosion and improving water quality.

- The majority of participants, and community leaders in particular, see the positive impact watershed restoration has on their local economy.

*“It creates more recreation and is a mainstay of the Valley’s economy.”* (Methow)

*“Everybody wants to be able to fish again. And the fishing really helps the economy of our town.”* (Entiat)

- Participants see reducing erosion as another benefit of watershed restoration. Both groups value the land and see restoration as a means to protect it.

*“Past projects have been beneficial in preventing erosion.”* (Entiat)

*“It stabilizes banks that are highly erosive.”* (Methow)

- Participants from both groups value water quality. They recognize the positive impact watershed restoration has on improving the quality of water in their communities.

*“We all benefit from having a cleaner river.”* (Entiat)

*“It’s been successful in terms of improving water quality.”* (Methow)

It’s important to note that these interview participants do not mention changes in fisheries health as a positive impact of restoration. They may attach other positive impact as a benefit of healthier fisheries (as a Methow participant notes, “Improvement to the fisheries is a big deal. That pulls a lot of economic power into this area.”), but healthier fish populations do not emerge as an independent positive impact.

**Stakeholders recognize the collective effort.** The majority of participants can identify four or more groups involved in watershed restoration. Chelan County and Cascadia Conservation District are identified most frequently in the Entiat watershed while the Yakama Nation, Methow Conservancy and the Bureau of Reclamation are named in the Methow watershed.

Additional agencies and/or organizations mentioned by Entiat participants:

- Chamber of Commerce
- City of Wenatchee
- Entiat Watershed Planning Unit
- Forest Service
- Irrigation Districts
- Landowner Steering Committee
- State of Washington

- US Bureau of Reclamation
- Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board
- Yakama Nation

Additional agencies and/or organizations mentioned by Methow participants:

- Big Valley Ranch
- Bonneville Power Administration
- Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
- Fly Fishing Club
- Forest Service
- Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation
- Natural Resource Conservation Service
- Okanogan Public Utility District
- Trout Unlimited
- U.S. Geological Survey
- Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Washington Department of Natural Resources

Over half of the landowners feel there are additional groups or agencies involved, although they could not identify them by name.

*“There are lots of people behind the scenes.” (Methow)*

*“Probably more agencies involved than I know about.” (Entiat)*

**Some participants are unsure about the impact on the health of the fish.** When asked if fish populations are healthier today than they were ten years ago, responses are split. Half of participants feel the fish are healthier while the other half say they do not know or do not care.

*“It’s widely believed that the fish are healthier now.” (Entiat)*

*“I don’t know if the fish runs are healthier. If we left things alone, they’d continue to repopulate.” (Entiat)*

**Landowners are committed to protecting their property.** Landowner participants are most concerned about the integrity and health of their land. Landowners want to know how projects will improve their livelihoods.

*“My first concern is my riverbank.” (Entiat)*

*“Helps me, as a farmer, be more efficient in water use and other things...it has a positive economic impact for me.” (Methow)*

*“Landowners have been happy because there’s no or little cost. They see value in saving some of their property.” (Methow)*



**Liability concerns are widely shared.** Landowners and community leaders want to know if liability protections are in place in the event of personal injury or property damage caused by restoration projects on private land.

*“Landowners are wondering who is accountable if the woody debris comes loose and causes damage.”* (Entiat)

*“We have real concerns about liability—and it’s real hard for the agencies to get around that.”* (Methow)

*“What happens if a bridge is taken out?”* (Entiat)

**Inconsistent communication leads participants to draw their own conclusions.** There is general confusion about restoration projects, leading to skepticism about roles and responsibilities of groups engaged in restoration projects, as well as concerns about results and costs. Participants do not understand the end game and how success is defined.

*“They’re doing a better job talking among themselves, but honestly, I don’t know if they’re doing a reasonable job talking to others.”* (Methow)

*“The different people you talk to use different terms in different ways. Makes the discussion confusing.”* (Entiat)

*“Where are we going and how will we know it when we’re there?”* (Methow)

- Participants are unclear who is responsible for ongoing maintenance of restoration projects. They want reassurance that necessary repairs are made to projects in the river.

*“What’s the life of a log? Is there a plan for maintenance?”* (Entiat)

*“People need a way to report damages, like if a log breaks free, there’s a number to call to get the responsible agency to come pull it out.”* (Methow)

- Participants recognize that millions of dollars are spent on watershed restoration. They question whether projects yield enough benefits to make it a good use of public dollars.

*“Is this an efficient use of our dollars?”* (Methow)

*“Millions of dollars being are aimed this direction and nobody really knows if the fish are going to benefit enough to justify all the expense.”* (Entiat)

- Some participants are skeptical about the effectiveness of restoration projects. They are not sure these projects will deliver the desired outcome.

*“No one knows the benefits of larger projects. No one knows what will happen.”* (Entiat)

*“The people involved don’t know what the outcome is going to be and what the numbers are—how many fish are going to come back—it’s a study in progress.”* (Entiat)

**Stakeholders are confused about who is in charge.** Half of the participants in the Entiat watershed see Cascadia leading restoration efforts. Most participants in the Methow watershed do not know who is leading the efforts.

*“It’s a struggle to say who has a say on this and who has a say on that.”* (Methow)

*“Lots of different groups involved. Not sure how projects are selected/prioritized.”*  
(Methow)

**Concern about “outsiders” influence.** Stakeholders in the Entiat perceive some restoration partners as outsiders and question whether they have a real stake in the work. They see anyone who does not live in the watershed as an outsider. When asked to identify the outsiders involved in restoration work, participants name consultants, funders and board members. (This concern also came up in partner discussions with stakeholders in the Methow)

*“Some of the people involved don’t live here and don’t care about what happens down river.”* (Entiat)

*“Folks involved in this work don’t necessarily live in the Entiat.”* (Entiat)

## **PARTNER DISCUSSIONS METHODOLOGY AND FINDINGS**

Pyramid held five discussions with eight watershed restoration partners, representing six organizations/agencies in the Entiat and Methow. Four discussions were conducted in-person in Wenatchee and Winthrop and two discussions were by phone. Please refer to Appendix D for a complete list of partner discussion participants.

The discussions were fluid conversations ranging from 45 to 90 minutes, explored perceptions of partner collaboration and solicited insight about communication and outreach with both landowners and the broader community.

### **FINDINGS**

**Funding and timelines are driving a new sense of urgency.** The timelines of BPA funding (including the Accords with Yakama) create a timeline not necessarily consonant with the most effective restoration strategies. Partners do not have the luxury of moving at a different pace to reflect the unique dynamics of their own watershed and communities.

**Collaboration is seen as more important than ever.** Given the number of groups implementing projects throughout the Upper Columbia, collaboration is vital to align efforts and build the awareness and support of landowners and community leaders.

**Cascadia Conservation District is the clear leader in the Entiat.** Partners recognize that Cascadia is the communication hub in the Entiat. They are seen as the organization to call for questions or clarification.

**People are looking for more clarity in the Methow.** The structure of the partnership in the Methow makes it difficult to identify a clear leader. Some partners are looking to the Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation to serve as a more visible hub.

**There is desire on all sides to work better with the Yakama Nation.** For a variety of reasons, the visible collaboration with Yakama can be strengthened. There is clear consensus that this is both necessary and doable, and will deepen the impact of restoration efforts.

**There is ongoing concern about liability in the Entiat.** Partners are not sure how to address liability concerns that continue to arise in the community. They are looking for responses to address these concerns.

**Liability is an emerging issue in the Methow.** This presents an opportunity for partners to get ahead of the issue and tackle concerns head on.

**Relationship building with landowners needs to be ongoing.** Current landowner outreach is generally focused on a deal-by-deal approach. These transactions are generally viewed as successful. However, ongoing communication and relationship with landowners after the project is in place can be more visibly strengthened. Many participants also noted the need and opportunity to communicate with landowners up and down river from projects to create greater awareness, answer questions and forestall concerns.

## **MESSAGING IMPLICATIONS**

**Treat the multiple-personality disorder. Decide and agree whose voice is really in charge.** Landowners are perplexed when multiple people approach them to participate in different aspects of fish recovery. While many nod their heads in support at the onset of these conversations, they call their neighbors immediately afterwards to get the unvarnished truth. This has come about because the initial design for each watershed coalition was intentionally loose and largely decentralized. As the number of partners grew, communications with the public and with each other unraveled. That early spirit of democracy inadvertently created unintended consequences. “The buck stops here” needs to be clear and evident within each watershed, both in terms of messenger and messages.

**People already went through high school biology class. Don’t ask them to do it again.** Simplify the complexity of your work and what you do. Science, acronyms, engineering jargon, and species terminology alienate residents and landowners. Landowners and residents aren’t experts in fish recovery or water quality and they don’t want to feel dumb. Experience tells us that when people are confused, they don’t support the work. Prevent this by keeping the science in the textbooks.

**Cut through the clutter. Say it and say it like you mean it.** Explain your work so that a fourth-grader can understand it. Be clear, be convincing, show your excitement. Practice the elevator pitch with a kid. If s/he doesn't immediately understand what it's all about, you need to simplify your story. This isn't the same as dumbing down. It is why Mark Twain said, "If I'd had more time, I would've written a shorter letter."

**Prioritize your audiences. Pay as much attention to what they *don't* care about as what they do.** It's easy to fall into the trap of thinking you have to talk with everyone, all the time, about every aspect of what's happening in the watershed. The primary audiences identified in the Message Platform [*separate document*] are essential. Spend 80% of your time and energy educating and energizing these groups about the overarching goals and what it means for the economy and for property values. Reassure them about the steps you are taking to address liability; give them peace of mind so they are open and willing to hear about the economic and property value benefits. Spend 20% of your time on the secondary audiences.

**Just like Jerry Maguire, "*Help me help you.*" What's good for one is good for everyone.** The competition for environmental funding is fierce and philanthropy is no longer a reliable revenue stream for non-profits. It's no wonder that partners put out their elbows to take credit when the funding stakes are high. Given the number of groups working in each watershed—each with a different purpose for being there—it's essential to join together around unified programs and messages. Funders will be drawn to the big-picture results that come about from being part of integrated effort with positive impact for the entire watershed, not a 100-yard stretch of riverbank overseen by a single group.

## **APPENDIX A**

### **WORKING GROUP MEMBERS**

#### **Bonneville Environmental Foundation:**

- Robert Warren, Model Watershed Program Director

#### **Entiat Watershed:**

- Susan Dretke, Resource Specialist II, Cascadia Conservation District
- Mike Rickel, Program Manager, Cascadia Conservation District

#### **Methow Watershed:**

- John Crandall, Biologist, Wild Fish Conservancy
- Chris Johnson, Board President, Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation
- Jennifer Molesworth, Methow Subbasin Liaison, Bureau of Reclamation

#### **Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board:**

- Don McIvor, Natural Resources Coordinator
- Derek Van Marter, Associate Director

## **APPENDIX B**

### **COMMUNICATION AND OUTREACH MATERIALS REVIEWED**

#### **Entiat Watershed:**

- Cascadia Annual Report
- Community assessment survey April 2010
- Conservation Quarterly newsletters
- Entiat BEF work plan
- IMW implementation plan
- Entiat Watershed Planning Unit meeting minutes
- Script treatment for the Story of the Entiat video
- Wenatchee World articles
- [www.cascadiacd.org](http://www.cascadiacd.org)

#### **Methow Watershed:**

- Building a shared future talking points
- Methow BEF work plan
- Methow Grist articles
- Middle Methow newsletters
- Methow Restoration Council 2011 outreach and education communications plan
- Methow sub-basin monitoring assessment
- Methow sub-basin model watershed proposal
- Methow Valley News articles
- [www.methowsalmon.org](http://www.methowsalmon.org)

#### **Regional:**

- Reach assessments for Entiat and Methow sub-basins
- The Power of Partnership news release
- The Power of Partnership video
- Upper Columbia salmon habitat implementation schedule and projects
- Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board 2011 legislative brochure
- Upper Columbia Spring Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Recovery Plan
- [www.ucsr.com](http://www.ucsr.com)

## APPENDIX C

### STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEW GUIDE

#### INTRO TO ENTIAT GUIDE (2 minutes)

Thanks for taking the time to talk about fish recovery and watershed restoration in the Entiat River Watershed. I will be respectful of your time and get through everything in about 30 minutes. We can spend a bit more time at the end of our interview— if you've got it – covering issues you'd like to discuss in more depth.

Pyramid Communications is working with the Cascadia Conservation District and the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board to help strengthen communication around fish recovery and watershed restoration efforts in the watershed. To do that, we're talking with a handful of community leaders like you to better understand what's working and what needs improvement.

This interview is confidential. The findings that we report back will be about general themes. No specific comments will be attributed to you or other participants. We are looking for your honest, candid input.

#### INTRO TO METHOW GUIDE (2 minutes)

Thanks for taking the time to talk about fish recovery and watershed restoration in the Methow River Watershed. I will be respectful of your time and get through everything in about 30 minutes. We can spend a bit more time at the end of our interview— if you've got it – covering issues you'd like to discuss in more depth.

Pyramid Communications is working with a coalition of organizations in the Methow and the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board to help strengthen communication around fish recovery and watershed restoration efforts in the watershed. To do that, we're talking with a handful of community leaders like you to better understand what's working and what needs improvement.

This interview is confidential. The findings that we report back will be about general themes. No specific comments will be attributed to you or other participants. We are looking for your honest, candid input.

---

### AWARENESS

**Entiat:** For our conversation today, we are talking about fish recovery and watershed restoration in the Entiat River, specifically, on the upper reaches of the river, about 20 plus miles up the Entiat River Road from the mouth of the river. In two years, restoration projects will occur on the lower 7 miles of the river, from the fish hatchery to the mouth of the river.

**Methow:** For our conversation today, we are talking about fish recovery and watershed restoration in the Methow River, specifically, upstream of Carlton along the main stem of the

Methow River, the lower 12 miles of the Twisp River, the lower 9 miles of the Chewuch River and the lower 6 miles of Beaver Creek.

1) Can you describe for me what you know about watershed restoration efforts in the Entiat/Methow River? How would you describe them?

(Probes: specific projects, kinds of projects; note any distinctions made between restoration, conservation and preservation)

2) How would you describe the impacts of this work?

(Probes: general river health, water quality, impact on fish, community/economic benefits)

3) What organizations come to mind that are involved in these watershed restoration efforts?

(Probes: who's leading these efforts; responsible for ensuring the work is effective; championing)

### **PERCEPTION OF IMPACTS**

4) The listing of spring Chinook salmon as endangered – and bull trout and steelhead as threatened – really sparked these recovery and restoration efforts.

How would you describe the health of the salmon, bull trout and steelhead populations now? Do you think these populations are healthier today than 10 years ago?

(Probe: Is it important to have a healthy fish population here? What's the consequence of not having a healthy population?)

5) Are there other benefits of the fish recovery efforts to the river or the land or the community?

YES/NO

5A. If YES: How would you describe those benefits?

5B. If NO: Why not?

**Entiat:** 6) The restoration projects involve the installation of what's called woody debris,



essentially, placing large logs in the river to provide shelter and areas of rest for fish. Is this project different from others you've seen in the past? If so, how?

**Method:** 6) Where appropriate, the restoration projects involve things like creating logjams, removing levees, placing large wood structures in the river, replanting riparian areas and reestablishing wetlands. Are these projects different from others you've seen in the past? If so, how?

7) How would you describe the impacts of these kinds of woody debris projects?

(Probes: benefits, negative impacts)

8) Given these concerns, what do you think the partners in this effort need to do to address them?

(Probes: aesthetics, liability, access, communication, involvement)

9) Let's step back and think about landowners, particularly those directly involved with or affected by these restoration projects that we just talked about. What are you hearing from landowners and their feelings about it? Do you think they see the value in the work?

(Probes: barriers, stumbling blocks, positive attributes)

10) What's one thing partners working on the ground can do-- that they aren't already doing-- to help build support from landowners and others?

(Probes: specific concerns, communication or outreach, messengers)

11) Thinking about everything we've talked about today, what's the hardest thing to explain about this work to people who aren't involved?

(Probe: Where are people getting hung up? How should this work be talked about?)

12) We've talked about a lot today. Is there anything I should know that hasn't come up yet?

## **APPENDIX D**

### **PARTNER DISCUSSION PARTICIPANTS**

#### **Entiat Watershed:**

- Jason Hatch—Trout Unlimited, Project Manager
- Mike Kaputa—Chelan County, Director, Natural Resources
- Robes Parrish —US Fish & Wildlife Service, Hydrologist

#### **Methow Watershed:**

- Tom McCoy— Methow Wildlife Area of Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Manager
- Jason Paulsen— Methow Conservancy, Executive Director
- John Sunderland— Methow Conservancy, Land Program Manager

#### **Yakama Nation:**

- Lee Carlson— Yakama Nation, Habitat Coordinator
- Brandon Rogers—Yakama Nation, Upper Columbia Watershed Restoration Specialist

## **APPENDIX E**

### **PARTNER DISCUSSION GUIDE**

#### **INTRODUCTION**

- Thanks for participating.
- We are working with Bonneville Environmental Foundation and a coalition of organizations in the Methow and the Entiat– including Cascadia Conservation District, Salmon Recovery Foundation, Wild Fish Conservancy, Bureau of Reclamation and the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board – to help strengthen communication around fish recovery and watershed restoration efforts with landowners and the broader community.
- You have been selected to participate in this discussion because we see you as a leader in this field who has a good perspective on what's working and what might need more attention.
- This interview is confidential, used to sharpen and help align communications with landowners and community members.

#### **QUESTIONS**

##### **CONTEXT**

- 1 There are a lot of players contributing to watershed restoration efforts in the Upper Columbia and the Entiat/Methow watershed more specifically. How do you see yourself fitting in? What's the most critical problem you are trying to solve? What the most critical piece of your work that everything hangs off of?

(Probe: Shared goal around fish recovery; vision of success)

##### **AWARENESS**

- 2 Thinking about fish recovery efforts in the Entiat/Methow watershed, who are your allies? Who do you work with the best? Why?

(Probe: Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board)

- 3 Who are you not working with as much that maybe in the back of your head you think you should?

- 4 Who is getting in the way of recovery efforts?

(Probe: landowners)

##### **PERCEPTION**

- 5 To be really clear, our job is not to change how you all are doing fish recovery and watershed restoration. The projects don't change. Our job is to take better advantage of all the great work being done and communicate more effectively to landowners to make

your jobs easier. We want to make sure landowners understand what you are doing, see the need and connect the dots so that they support the work.

With this in mind, how can we improve coordination among all the groups working on fish recovery so that information falls to landowners in a cohesive way?

### **COMMUNICATIONS AND OUTREACH TO THE COMMUNITY**

- 6 Thinking specifically about landowners, tell me what you are hearing from them. What are you asking them to do? Have you had any problems getting their support? What are you saying to them? How are you dealing with any issues that have come up? Any missteps? What would you like to be doing?
  
- 7 How are you reaching landowners? What's worked well? What hasn't worked?
  
- 8 What's one specific thing you want landowners to know about the work in order to support it?