



## Draft Technical Memorandum

<b>Date:</b>	June 11, 2014
<b>To:</b>	Ron Shultz, WSCC; Alana Knaster, PSP
<b>Cc:</b>	Scott Boettcher
<b>From:</b>	Erika Britney, Project Manager ICF International 710 Second Avenue, Suite 550 Seattle, WA 98104
<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Effectiveness of Voluntary Incentive Programs in Washington and Potential Next Steps</b>

**Note: Please send comments on this draft to [Erika.Britney@icfi.com](mailto:Erika.Britney@icfi.com) and [Scott.Boettcher@icfi.com](mailto:Scott.Boettcher@icfi.com) on or before June 25, 2014.<sup>1</sup>**

### Part I. Introduction

This memo continues the work of ICF International and the Washington State Conservation Commission (WSCC), the Puget Sound Partnership (PSP), and a broader set of interested and affected stakeholders to evaluate the effectiveness of Voluntary Incentive Programs (VIPs) in Washington. The basis behind this evaluation is the 2012 Puget Sound Action Agenda and the following primary and secondary near-term actions (NTAs):

- **Primary: C3.1 NTA #2** – Effectiveness of Incentive Programs. By December 2013, the State Conservation Commission, in consultation with the Washington State Department of Ecology

---

<sup>1</sup> If you would like to receive this file as a word document, please email Erika Britney and Scott Boettcher.

(Ecology) and the Washington State Departments of Agriculture and Health, conservation districts, federal agencies, and tribes, will report to the governor and the legislature on the effectiveness of incentive programs to achieve resource objectives. The report will include a section from Ecology on compliance with water quality standards. [See page 209 -- [http://www.psp.wa.gov/downloads/AA2011/083012\\_final/Action%20Agenda%20Book%20Aug%2029%202012.pdf](http://www.psp.wa.gov/downloads/AA2011/083012_final/Action%20Agenda%20Book%20Aug%2029%202012.pdf)]

- **Secondary: C3.2 NTA #1** – Priority Areas for Voluntary Incentive and Regulatory Programs. The State Conservation Commission and the Washington State Departments of Agriculture, Ecology, and Health will identify priority areas to target and coordinate implementation of voluntary incentive and regulatory programs for rural landowners, small-acreage landowners, and working farms. [See page 209 -- [http://www.psp.wa.gov/downloads/AA2011/083012\\_final/Action%20Agenda%20Book%20Aug%2029%202012.pdf](http://www.psp.wa.gov/downloads/AA2011/083012_final/Action%20Agenda%20Book%20Aug%2029%202012.pdf)]

Activities and tasks completed to date include:

- October 28, 2013 – Participated in initial meeting with Puget Sound conservation districts.
- December 9–13, 2013, December 18, 2013 – Conducted initial interviews of select stakeholders to gain a broader sense and understanding of the scope and extent of programs, interests, and perspectives.
- December 20, 2013 – Submitted Task 2 memo regarding initial interview results.
- March 7, 2014 – Held Dialogue Group Meeting #1. Generated listing of potential high-level next steps.
- May 28, 2014 – Held meeting with Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission (NWIFC) to gain additional perspective/insight.
- June 10, 2014 – Submitted draft technical memo, identifying a range of concrete next steps that could be taken to advance and improve the use and effectiveness of VIPs.
- June 19, 2014 – Held Dialogue Group Meeting #2.

## Part II. Technical Memorandum Purpose and Overview

The purpose of this draft next-steps technical memo is to summarize existing perspectives on the effectiveness of VIPs and identify a range of concrete next steps that could be taken to advance and improve the use and effectiveness of VIPs.

This report is organized as follows:

- Part I. Introduction
- Part II. Technical Memorandum Purpose and Overview
- Part III. Perspectives on VIPs

- Part IV. Resources and Sources of Additional Information
- Part V. Potential Next Steps
- Attachment A. Dialogue Group Meeting #1 Participants
- Attachment B. NWIFC Meeting Participants and Notes

### **Part III. Perspectives on VIPs**

Perspectives on the effectiveness of VIPs for achieving resource objectives vary from those who believe they are useful, cost-effective tools to those who generally see limited value in incentive programs, and/or believe a more regulatory-oriented approach is needed. There was, however, agreement among the parties consulted that, under very specific circumstances, VIPs can, and have been, very effective for achieving resource objectives.

The following table (Table 1) reflects commonly held views expressed by meeting participants and interviewees regarding factors that contribute to the success or failure of VIPs.

**Table 1. Factors that Contribute to Success or Failure of VIPs**

<b>VIPs <u>succeed</u> at achieving resource objectives when . . .</b>	<b>VIPs are <u>less effective/successful</u> at achieving resource objectives when . . .</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Community-/watershed-driven; leaders from tribes, agricultural, and shellfish grower communities are collaborating.</li> <li>b. Mutual trust, respect among all entities involved in addressing the ecological issue.</li> <li>c. Clear, common goals/common interests are identified, defined, and achievable; geographically appropriate metrics for measuring progress/success are established and accepted.</li> <li>d. Good baseline data are available for checking progress toward resource objectives/metrics.</li> <li>e. Efforts are targeted, place-based (community-based).</li> <li>f. Compelling motivators. Money is not the only or most compelling incentive. Resource objectives and a regulatory backstop/incentive can also create motivation.</li> <li>g. Spark plug, “go-getter” to energize and rally the community.</li> <li>h. Clear, sensible, science-based rationale for objectives, metrics, and best management practices (BMPs).</li> <li>i. Flexible, performance-based approach.</li> <li>j. Clear rules that are equally applied with a well-defined regulator backstop and measure to ensure accountability.</li> <li>k. Progress is monitored and shared, and efforts are recognized.</li> <li>l. Coordination/support is available to navigate the various programs and changing requirements/thresholds and help overcome hurdles to engage farmers and communities.</li> <li>m. Incentive dollars are spent on the most cost-effective, beneficial projects.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Burdensome for property owners.</li> <li>b. BMPs are prescriptive, inflexible, binding.</li> <li>c. There is a lack of trust/ulterior motives.</li> <li>d. Requirements are not viable economically or operationally.</li> <li>e. Insufficient incentive (not just about money).</li> <li>f. Inequitable (sectors of the community feel unfairly targeted).</li> <li>g. Implemented without clear focus or understanding of resource objectives to be achieved or metrics for measuring progress/success.</li> <li>h. Measures implemented are not enough to address water quality issues or achieve resource objectives.</li> <li>i. Participating properties are geographically dispersed.</li> <li>j. Objectives and metrics are too narrow (e.g., they do not address salmon and shellfish).</li> <li>k. Success/progress is not measured on both the property- and watershed-scale.</li> <li>l. There are no regulatory backstops/incentives or other tools to foster accountability.</li> <li>m. There is no monitoring of results/progress toward resource objectives.</li> <li>n. Incentives are awarded to “use the money” or meet quotas because of a limited applicant pool.</li> </ul>

Draft Tech Memo: Effectiveness of Voluntary Incentive Programs in Washington and Potential Next Steps  
June 11, 2014

Based on the input gathered from interviewees and participants at the first dialogue group meeting and the NWIFC meeting, strengths, weaknesses, barriers, and opportunities are summarized in Table 2.

**Table 2. Analysis of Strengths, Weaknesses, Barriers, and Opportunities Associated with VIPs**

<p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Creates win/wins.</li> <li>b. Maintains viability of farming – keeps agricultural land in agriculture.</li> <li>c. Focuses on biggest bang for the buck.</li> <li>d. Builds trust between landowner and agency staff.</li> <li>e. Check-ins and follow-ups lead to additional improvements.</li> <li>f. Technical staff available to provide assistance.</li> <li>g. Provides funding and financial certainty.</li> <li>h. Appropriate conservation methods.</li> <li>i. Wide variety of programs; many funding options, with potential for aggregating funding.</li> <li>j. Can accommodate flexible approaches to solving resource issues.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Weaknesses:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Insufficient staffing/funding/lease payments.</li> <li>b. Rigid requirements stifle participation and innovation.</li> <li>c. Lack of focus on resource objectives.</li> <li>d. Motivators to participate not compelling.</li> <li>e. Must be a working farm or a farmer to get into program; as a result, other small landowners and hobby farmers are not included.</li> <li>f. Too geographically dispersed.</li> <li>g. Regulatory backstops/incentives lacking.</li> <li>h. No accountability.</li> <li>i. BMPs implemented do not necessarily address all resource/water quality issues associated with a parcel.</li> <li>j. Success based on awards made (dollar value), not on ecological outcomes.</li> <li>k. Low participation rates.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Barriers:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Difficulty achieving agreement on resource objectives and metrics.</li> <li>b. Rigid requirements create disincentives/reduce participation.</li> <li>c. VIPs “miss” several sectors (e.g., hobby farms, small-acreage farms). Different strategies are needed to reach these landowners.</li> <li>d. Farms need to be of sufficient size to make participation worthwhile.</li> <li>e. Forced entry through “Working Farm/Farmer” criteria.</li> <li>f. Constrains land uses.</li> <li>g. Too much paper work (application, permitting, and reporting requirements).</li> <li>h. Insufficient funding incentives or support services; difficult to get funding for coordinator/support and monitoring.</li> <li>i. Property owners do not trust inspectors and/or conservation staff.</li> <li>j. Overcoming perceptions about equity/inequity</li> </ul>	<p><b>Opportunities:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Placed-based/regional initiatives.</li> <li>b. Specialized staffing who are specifically focused on this type of VIP.</li> <li>c. Brokers, spark plugs, flag carriers (to help market to landowners and encourage participation on an ongoing basis).</li> <li>d. Word of mouth is a powerful way to reach landowners.</li> <li>e. Aggregating funding sources.</li> <li>f. Spatial and technical baseline and effectiveness analysis (to determine ecological baseline of existing lands and potential for ecological uplift).</li> <li>g. Monitor progress toward resource objectives can create motivation.</li> <li>h. Streamline process for individual participants though a targeted/watershed approach.</li> <li>i. “Treaty Rights at Risk” could provide a motivator/spark plug.</li> <li>j. Collaboration among tribes, agricultural community, and shellfish growers provides</li> </ul>

<p>can be an issue (“cutting off the nose in spite of the face”).</p> <p>k. Unclear route to reach potential participants; low level of awareness of VIPs.</p>	<p>opportunities to leverage multiple potential funding sources.</p> <p>k. Current focus of Puget Sound Partnership, various stakeholders, and decision-makers on VIPs and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) buffer guidelines, creating momentum around efforts to improve effectiveness of VIPs.</p>
--	---

In addition to the above-identified strengths, weaknesses, barriers, and opportunities, the conversations that occurred with both groups (dialogue group meeting; NWIFC meeting) generated ideas related to research, policy changes, and data collection that could help to advance the application of VIPs to increase ecological effectiveness.

1. Research successful programs in other states to identify tools and best practices to increase effectiveness of VIPs in Washington State.
2. Compile data on voluntary incentive implementation versus water quality data to create a baseline of how VIPs are implemented now (type, geographic distribution, proportion of watersheds/sub-basins) and determine whether there is a correlation between VIP implementation and water quality variables.
3. Research how to find and enroll hobby farms and other target groups.
4. Find non-land-based programs interested in funding/partnering.
5. Identify ways to fund/organize monitoring.
6. Research ecological impact of BMPs.
7. Develop a system for providing flexible funding scales to accommodate geographic context, property values, and level of priority.
8. Flexible or more locally defined selection criteria for awarding incentives to increase local control over how incentive dollars are spent.
9. Flexible application of BMPs: time, space, intensity, duration, etc.
10. Develop a model VIP program (i.e., what would it look like, how would it function, how would it be appropriately balanced with flexibility, monitoring, performance, inspection, enforcement, etc.). Consider the following as necessary attributes:
  - a. Clear, tangible, and measurable goals/objectives.
  - b. Place-based.
  - c. Delivers win-win solutions.
  - d. Clear rules and process for participating.
  - e. Scientifically based conservation measures.
  - f. Sustained, focused, flexible, measurable.
  - g. Performance-based/performance monitoring.

- h. Rolling implementation with adaptive development.
  - i. Compelling for landowner (financially or operationally).
  - j. Uses both incentives and accountability (carrot and stick).
  - k. Coordination and leadership.
  - l. Accountability, showcasing success/sharing failures.
  - m. Time and patience.
11. Use geospatial/technical analysis to focus needs by region/watershed.
  12. Community-based development of goals by watershed.
  13. Are there still projects available in the Puget Sound that are an “easy sell” because of the mutual benefits?

## **Part IV. Resources and Sources of Additional Information**

The following link provides access to documents produced and collected in conjunction with ICF’s evaluation of the effectiveness of  
VIPs: <https://www.dropbox.com/sh/9x10kp1rgp65jxk/P7QSdQN55a>

## **Part V. Potential Next Steps**

Potential next steps for increasing the effectiveness and addressing the weaknesses and barriers associated with VIPs have been developed for review and discussion with the dialogue group in mid-June 2014. Input from the dialogue group will be used to refine and prioritize the potential next steps for the WSCC report to the Puget Sound Leadership Council, governor, and the legislature on the effectiveness of incentive programs to achieve resource objectives and how effectiveness could be improved within Puget Sound. Potential next steps are identified by title below in Table 3 and then are described through the remaining pages to this Technical Memorandum.

**Table 3. Potential Next Steps to Increase VIP Effectiveness**

<b>Administrative</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Policy/Legislative</b>	<b>Page</b>
1. Knowledge Management System	10	5. Taxation Relief	19
2a. Funding Crosswalk (Matrix)	12	6. Regulatory Incentive	20
2b. Funding Coordination	14		
3a. "How To" – Model Program (Framework)	15		
3b. "How To" – Practitioner's Guide (Manual)	17		
4. Strategic Targeting	18		

1	<i>Administrative: Knowledge Management System</i>
<p><b>Description</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Knowledge management systems concentrate, coalesce knowledge.</li> <li>✓ VIP knowledge is highly distributed, often inaccessible, and not grounded in prescriptive policies and procedures.</li> <li>✓ Successful VIPs require engaging leaders and strong champions.</li> </ul>	<p>Unlike regulatory programs, VIPs lack an easily accessible, retrievable body of information that practitioners can consult and rely upon to support their implementation efforts. Regulatory programs typically house a deep body of information, “know how,” and prescription in the form of governing statutes, rules, policies, case law, manuals, guidance, etc. VIPs do not have this level of background information and supporting documentation. VIPs lack a robust body of implementation information/knowledge that practitioners can readily access and apply. Although VIP implementation information does exist, it is typically anecdotal, poorly organized, and haphazard, with partial descriptions and documentation that is not readily retrievable. In addition, VIP implementation occurs in a decentralized, ad hoc manner across differing geographies and sectors, making cross communication among peer practitioners difficult and practically infeasible. Regulatory programs, in contrast, have well-established communication channels to support the needs of frontline implementation.</p> <p>Knowledge management systems are methods for “capturing, developing, sharing, and effectively using organizational knowledge” (<a href="http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Knowledge_Management">http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Knowledge_Management</a>). Knowledge management is about creating a culture where information is given context through conversations, collaboration, discerning opinions, mediation, and categorization. Knowledge management repositions learning from classrooms to work-related practices and from ad hoc mentoring to continuously shared knowledge. Knowledge management systems are used for <u>information management</u>, <u>building topical knowledge</u>, and <u>capturing institutional knowledge</u>. Knowledge management systems can be useful for overcoming communication and information-sharing obstacles faced by organizations. Knowledge management systems additionally provide a living platform from which to “daylight” knowledge and “know how.”</p> <p>In the case of VIPs in Washington, implementing a knowledge management system could (1) improve the quality and efficiency of knowledge gained by providing tools for collaborating, integrating, and incorporating experiences on VIPs throughout Washington, (2) provide meaning and context to information, and (3) provide a means for individual VIP initiatives to evolve together with a common understanding of what is happening and what others are doing in their geographies.</p> <p>The content and knowledge to be shared could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Case examples</li> <li>• Standardized VIP reporting on the types of BMPs implemented, ecological issues addressed, the general location (protective of confidentiality agreements), implementation date, and implementation program used.</li> <li>• Funding sources and approach to aggregate funding</li> <li>• Fellow practitioner knowledge on select topics (e.g., “landowner motivators,” “performance metrics,” “programs constraints and allowances,” etc.)</li> <li>• Events, opportunities</li> <li>• Checklists, forms, applications, and other tools</li> <li>• Contacts</li> <li>• Several background links on knowledge management systems:</li> </ul>

<b>1</b>	<b>Administrative: Knowledge Management System</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <a href="http://www.forbes.com/sites/lisaquast/2012/08/20/why-knowledge-management-is-important-to-the-success-of-your-company/">http://www.forbes.com/sites/lisaquast/2012/08/20/why-knowledge-management-is-important-to-the-success-of-your-company/</a></li> <li>○ <a href="http://www.kmworld.com/Articles/Editorial/What-Is-.../What-is-KM-Knowledge-Management-Explained-82405.aspx">http://www.kmworld.com/Articles/Editorial/What-Is-.../What-is-KM-Knowledge-Management-Explained-82405.aspx</a></li> <li>○ <a href="http://www.mindtools.com/pages/article/newISS_87.htm">http://www.mindtools.com/pages/article/newISS_87.htm</a></li> </ul>
<b>Implementation Considerations</b>	<p>Knowledge management systems are information management systems and applications of topical knowledge.</p> <p><b>Information Management System</b> – Governor’s Office of Regulatory Assistance provides state agencies and local governments with a free content management tool called EZview (<a href="https://www.ezview.wa.gov">https://www.ezview.wa.gov</a>) that would be ideal for a VIP knowledge management system. EZview is easy to learn and immediately available.</p> <p><b>Application of Topical Knowledge</b> – The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Endangered Species Act (ESA) web tool (<a href="http://www.environment.fhwa.dot.gov/esawebtool/">http://www.environment.fhwa.dot.gov/esawebtool/</a>) provides one example of a successful knowledge management system that could be used to jump-start a learning process for how to structure and organize practitioner knowledge.</p>
<b>Cost/Time</b>	Medium to high; would require ongoing efforts but could be initiated through a pilot project, which could be expanded.
<b>Value/Relative Priority</b>	To be determined in consultation with dialogue group.

2a	<b>Administrative: Funding Crosswalk (Matrix)</b>
<p><b>Description</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Many funding programs.</li> <li>✓ Ever-changing requirements.</li> <li>✓ Crosswalk (matrix) tool valuable to help match and align funding resources.</li> </ul>	<p>Funding programs (federal, state, local) are established to fund specific activities under specific circumstances. There are many funding programs (including relief programs, such as conservation easement and open space taxation) relevant to VIPs to address agricultural runoff. Funding program requirements are often dynamic from year to year. Reauthorization, recapitalization, program expansion, and program contraction can all have the effect of changing the scope, applicability, and requirements of individual funding programs. Developing working knowledge of when and under what circumstances various financial resources are available to support VIPs and which funding sources can be combined is a complicated process that often requires continual learning.</p> <p>To utilize available funding programs, a crosswalk (matrix) tool, identifying such important information by program, could be particularly helpful. It could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Name of program</li> <li>• Application requirements</li> <li>• Prerequisite requirements</li> <li>• Ceiling</li> <li>• Match/cost-share requirements</li> <li>• Types of eligible activities</li> <li>• Types of eligible organizations</li> <li>• Intended sector or geographic area;</li> <li>• Performance requirements</li> <li>• Compatibility with other funding sources</li> <li>• Applicability of program to shellfish <u>and</u> salmon recovery needs</li> </ul> <p>The WSCC Grant Calendar/Directory (<a href="http://scc.wa.gov/grant-calendar-and-directory/">http://scc.wa.gov/grant-calendar-and-directory/</a>) already provides most of this information. However, standardizing descriptions of eligible activities and organizations would enhance filtering and sorting functions, thereby enabling an applicant to search specific types of programs (e.g., programs available to private landowners and eligible for riparian planting and maintenance or programs that fund salmon or shellfish-friendly BMPs). Furthermore, the addition of information on which funding sources can be combined or aggregated to support a single or related efforts would help support geographically focused VIP efforts and could increase participation rates if a larger percentage of the cost to implement BMPs is funded.</p> <p>Note 1: Earlier tech memo provided a listing of common funding programs from the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), WSCC, and others.</p> <p>Note 2: This product (funding/funders crosswalk matrix) could ultimately be housed within the web-based knowledge management system described above to improve its accessibility and usability.</p>

Draft Tech Memo: Effectiveness of Voluntary Incentive Programs in Washington and Potential Next Steps  
June 11, 2014

<b>Implementation Considerations</b>	To be most effective, the crosswalk or matrix needs to be a “living” resource because invariably one program or another will be changing or considering a change. Keeping the information in the crosswalk (matrix) fresh and up to date will serve the VIP community best (conversely, if the information is old, out of date, or inaccurate, its utility as a helpful tool substantially diminishes).
<b>Cost/Time</b>	Low to medium; build on existing grant calendar/directory.
<b>Value/Relative Priority</b>	To be determined in consultation with dialogue group.

2b	<i>Administrative: Funding Coordination</i>
<p><b>Description</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ “Spot coordination” rallies funding for a specific VIP.</li> <li>✓ “Continuous coordination” applies funding to strategic priorities over time.</li> </ul>	<p>In the end, most VIPs need funding. Coordinating funding needs and funding opportunities between funding agencies, funding programs, and funding applicants can be an efficient means of getting more “bang for the buck” from monies spent and on a nearer term time scale. Funding coordination encompasses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spot coordination to bring multiple funding sources together for the benefit of a select VIP effort/initiative.</li> <li>• Continuous coordination to secure, manage, and apply funding dollars from multiple sources as they become available to priority VIP efforts/initiatives.</li> </ul> <p>Funding coordination can have the effect of making better use of incentive dollars to achieve measureable results on the ground (rather than reactively responding proposal by proposal). It could also be used to manage different streams of funding in light of annual deadlines for allocating funding and matching requirements.</p>
<p><b>Implementation Considerations</b></p>	<p>Implementation considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding coordination will require a convener, a dedicated coordination resource, and/or a commitment to a policy of multi-lateral coordination to be successful.</li> <li>• Funding coordination builds on and works with the “2a – Funding Crosswalk (Matrix)” and “4 – Strategic Targeting.”</li> <li>• Funding coordination, especially continuous coordination, will benefit from application and utilization of a web-based interface such as Google Maps or the Recreation and Conservation Office’s Habitat Work Schedule (<a href="http://hws.ekosystem.us/">http://hws.ekosystem.us/</a>).</li> </ul> <p>NWIFC and American Farmland Trust have developed methods to aggregate and manage funding from various sources, which could help inform development of tools and platforms for funding coordination.</p>
<p><b>Cost/Time</b></p>	<p>Low for spot coordination; medium for continuous coordination.</p>
<p><b>Value/Relative Priority</b></p>	<p>To be determined in consultation with dialogue group.</p>

3a	<i>Administrative: "How To" - Model Program (Framework)</i>
<p><b>Description</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Model program (framework) to consistently and effectively implement geographically focused VIPs and accomplish specific ecological outcomes across Washington is needed.</li> <li>✓ Key elements include:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Imperative to Change;</li> <li>○ Initiator, Spark Plug;</li> <li>○ Outreach, Recruitment;</li> <li>○ Property Assessment, Landowner Agreements;</li> <li>○ Performance Monitoring; and</li> <li>○ Advertising Success.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Geographically focused, outcome-oriented VIP programs are exceptions and not the norm. Implementation of VIPs typically occurs on an ad hoc, geographically diffuse basis. When there are geographically focused programs established to accomplish ecological/watershed objectives, they are typically created as a reaction to a social/environmental/political crisis. Implementation of geographically focused, outcome-oriented VIPs in Washington lacks an operating model or framework to apply lessons learned from other efforts and consistently structure and implement to increase likelihood of success.</p> <p>As stated above under "Knowledge Management System," VIPs in general, and geographically focused, outcome-oriented VIPs specifically, are in their infancy compared with regulatory programs. As such, the cloth is still being cut for what successful VIPs look like, how they function, and what best practices for developing and implementing VIPs look like. The overall success of VIPs in Washington could be increased through development of a well-vetted model program (or framework) for geographically focused, outcome-oriented VIPs that on-the-ground practitioners and implementers of VIPs could use (as well as policy makers, agency partners, and other interested and affected stakeholders).</p> <p>Based on input from the dialogue group, key the elements of a model program (framework) for Washington include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Imperative to Change</b> – A defined ecological issue is necessary to create a sense of urgency and drive for action that is geographically focused. This will require:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Baseline environmental data to characterize the issue to be addressed;</li> <li>○ Clear, measurable ecological objectives that need to be accomplished to address the issue; and</li> <li>○ Well-articulated rationale that connects the ecological issue to the interests/wellbeing of the community <u>and</u> individual property owners, creating common ground and compelling action (e.g., flooding issues, potential for regulation, potential for enforcement, etc.).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Initiator, Spark Plug</b> – Successful VIPs require a clearly identified and a trusted person or entity within a watershed, community, sector, or geographic area that has the energy, skills, and relationships to advance and implement the VIP. The person/entity identified needs to be able to effectively navigate the interests and perspectives of the targeted area.</li> <li>• <b>Outreach, Recruitment</b> – In order to establish the foundation of participation necessary for a successful VIP, the following approaches should be considered:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Identify common priorities (based on reliable baseline information and scientifically based resource goals) to be achieved within a discrete (targeted) geographic scale;</li> <li>○ Provide intensive outreach to boost awareness and ensure high program participation rates;</li> <li>○ Leverage multiple funding sources to offset costs and elevate participation rates; and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Develop durable partnerships.</li> <li>● <b>Property Assessment, Landowner Agreements</b> – This stage is necessary to establish and implement the partnerships and agreements necessary to successfully implement landowner-specific designs and treatments/installations.</li> <li>● <b>Performance Monitoring</b> – This stage involves establishing milestones and performance measures to be achieved within the context of the VIP being set up to meet ecological objectives. Measures of performance can cover a range of topics (e.g., pollutants reduced, buffers established, landowners signed up, contiguous parcels treated, etc.) and should be capable of being monitored, tracked, and reported on over time in order to convincingly document results achieved (or not achieved).</li> <li>● <b>Advertising Success</b> – Celebrating and advertising milestones and outcomes achieved is as important as sharing information on issues or poor results. Doing so provides recognition and feedback and encourages others and serves to move the larger VIP effort along.</li> </ul> <p>Note 1: This product (model program) could ultimately be housed within the web-based knowledge management system described above to improve its accessibility and usability.</p>
<b>Implementation Considerations</b>	The above model program is not intended to replace the products of other significant efforts (e.g., voluntary stewardship). Rather, the intent is to provide a standout reference that draws from, coalesces, and complements lessons learned and proven approaches that have been developed (pioneered) in Washington in a single place.
<b>Cost/Time</b>	Medium.
<b>Value/Relative Priority</b>	To be determined in consultation with dialogue group.

3b	<i>Administrative: "How To" - Practitioner's Guide (Manual)</i>
<p><b>Description</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Complement to model program (framework).</li> <li>✓ Set of best practices and tips, offered by peers and colleagues, on what it takes to make VIPs work.</li> </ul>	<p>Although a model program (framework) can be a valuable descriptive resource for how to develop and structure a VIP, it is not necessarily a set of insights and instructions on how to implement a VIP. Merely knowing the ingredients does not make one a good cook. Knowing tips, techniques, and timing in conjunction with the necessary ingredients does. A practitioner's guide (manual) is conceived here as a complement to the model program (framework) discussed above and a set of best practices offered by peers and colleagues on what it takes to really make VIPs work (beyond their structural components). "How to" tips and techniques can be catalogued pursuant to each of the six stages identified above. In addition, the guide/manual could be updated on a regular basis as new tips, techniques, and best practices are identified (e.g., best practices regarding use of social media, use of remote sensing, care and maintenance of riparian planting, etc.). The intent with the guide/manual is to make it Washington specific to reflect the unique governance and demographic characteristics of the state.</p> <p>Note 1: This product ("how to" guide/manual) could ultimately be housed within the web-based knowledge management system described above to improve its accessibility and usability.</p>
<p><b>Implementation Considerations</b></p>	<p>The first version of the guide/manual is intended to be a rapid capturing and cataloguing of peer perspectives on what it takes to successfully implement VIPs. This can be done through a broad "Survey Monkey" effort, development of selected case studies, and then a focused discussion with the dialogue group. Future iterations could be web enabled and part of the knowledge management system described above.</p>
<p><b>Cost</b></p>	<p>Low to medium.</p>
<p><b>Value/Relative Priority</b></p>	<p>To be determined in consultation with dialogue group.</p>

4	<i>Administrative: Strategic Targeting</i>
<p><b>Description</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Random acts of conservation are too diffuse, dispersed to result in measurable ecological benefit.</li> <li>✓ Structured, targeted application of VIPs can achieve conservation, restoration objectives.</li> </ul>	<p>“Random acts of conservation” is a perspective some express to describe their view on how and where VIPs are typically implemented now. The sentiment is one reflecting a view that the implementation of restoration and conservation VIPs is currently undertaken on an ad hoc basis, without a unified, geographically explicit and clearly articulated game plan. This is not to imply there are deficiencies in site-specific projects; however, because individual VIPs are implemented on a “first come, first served” basis, the result of these conservation/restoration projects is perceived as being diluted across the landscape. This action would involve working with the larger community of interests to identify a method for planning and targeting the application of restoration and conservation VIP projects. In short, this action would provide information and tools to move from a reactive practice to a strategic practice.</p> <p>Applying a proactive, strategic approach to VIPs could be undertaken on different levels and different scales. For example, prioritization could be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Geographic (e.g., a watershed);</li> <li>• Sub-geographic (e.g., stream reach, sub-watershed, etc.); or</li> <li>• Targeted by sector, industry, or community.</li> </ul> <p>While identifying and prioritizing action areas for VIPs, initial conservation and restoration objectives as well as performance measures can also be developed and identified. Intuitively, the process of prioritizing specific targeted action areas for VIPs will inform development of conservation and restoration objectives and help to ensure that VIPs are aligned with watershed and Puget Sound recovery goals. Early articulation of conservation and restoration objectives and performance measures will also help to ensure that VIP implementation is targeted toward meeting the right conservation and restoration objectives and performance measures.</p> <p>As an analog, Ecology changed the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) wastewater discharge permitting program to a five-year watershed-based rotation schedule several years ago. With this change, permitting review, development, and issuing activities for all permittees occur within a watershed on a set timeframe. This moved Ecology from a reactive, permitting approach to a structured, geographically oriented permitting approach. This approach affords Ecology more time to work in each watershed and the ability to apply a watershed perspective to permit decisions.</p>
<p><b>Implementation Considerations</b></p>	<p>Key factors in establishing successful and effective prioritization approaches include (1) a strong foundation of science and empirical watershed information to underlie the prioritization effort, (2) a scale that is manageable and can deliver results in a near-term time frame, and (3) the funding priorities associated with different funding sources.</p> <p>Prioritization approaches would also be informed by data on voluntary incentive implementation completed to date and the effects (if any) observed within the watershed. Because word of mouth is a powerful tool for increasing participation rates, information on the types of practices that have been implemented through VIPs programs (e.g., manure management, buffers, etc.), spatial distribution and the proportion of the watersheds/sub-basins engaged in VIPs would be valuable for identifying watersheds to target.</p>
<p><b>Cost/Time</b></p>	<p>Low to medium.</p>
<p><b>Value/Relative Priority</b></p>	<p>To be determined in consultation with dialogue group.</p>

5	Policy/Legislative: Taxation Relief
<p><b>Description</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Increasing interest among conservation and salmon recovery communities for taxation relief as a tool.</li> <li>✓ Topic can be controversial and as such further reconnaissance of the issue, players, and effectiveness is warranted.</li> </ul>	<p>Using taxation relief as a tool/approach to incentivize behavior in favor of specific public policies is not new. What is new is the increasing interest among conservation and salmon recovery communities to look to taxation relief as a tool to further habitat conservation and restoration objectives for watershed restoration and salmon recovery purposes.</p> <p>For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The VIP dialogue group has recently engaged in an energizing string of emails regarding requiring farm plans as a condition for being considered for open space taxation relief under the state’s “Farm and Agricultural Use” classification (see <a href="http://dor.wa.gov/docs/pubs/prop_tax/openspace.pdf">http://dor.wa.gov/docs/pubs/prop_tax/openspace.pdf</a>). The farm plan requirement would be similar to the forest plan requirement for timberlands that receive “Timber Land Current Use Classification” tax benefits.</li> <li>• PSP’s ECB is evaluating the effectiveness and workability of a tax relief program to incentivize shoreline property owners toward more environmentally considerate shoreline-armoring solutions (see <a href="http://www.mypugetsound.net/index.php?option=com_docman&amp;task=doc_download&amp;gid=2349&amp;Itemid=238">http://www.mypugetsound.net/index.php?option=com_docman&amp;task=doc_download&amp;gid=2349&amp;Itemid=238</a>).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Implementation Considerations</b></p>	<p>This is potentially a very large and controversial topic (i.e., taxation relief). Implementation next steps should focus on reconnaissance of the stakeholders, issues, and relevance of the approach to the issues at hand. In other words, can the tool (approach) achieve gains of the type that are sought?</p>
<p><b>Cost/Time</b></p>	<p>Medium to high.</p>
<p><b>Value/Relative Priority</b></p>	<p>To be determined in consultation with dialogue group.</p>

6	<i>Policy/Legislative: Regulatory Incentive</i>
<p><b>Description</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Regulatory systems can be incentivized.</li> <li>✓ Exemptions and non-enforcement technical assistance are two examples.</li> </ul>	<p>In many instances VIPs are the method to address issues that are non-point in nature and not always directly the subject of regulation, permits, and governmental approvals. That being said, there may be value in looking at how and where the regulatory system can be incentivized to provide VIP participants an incentive or motivator. A couple examples from Washington of how regulatory programs can be incentivized include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Regulatory Exemptions</b> – Certain fish habitat enhancement projects are exempt from State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) requirements and local permits and fees if they meet select criteria (see <a href="http://www.epermitting.wa.gov/Portals/JarpaResourceCenter/images/default/JARPA_supplement_fish_enhancement%202012%20final(1).pdf">http://www.epermitting.wa.gov/Portals/JarpaResourceCenter/images/default/JARPA_supplement_fish_enhancement%202012%20final(1).pdf</a>).</li> <li>• <b>Non-enforcement Technical Assistance Visits</b> – See Ecology’s Cleaner Production Challenge Initiative at <a href="http://www.pprc.org/cpc/">http://www.pprc.org/cpc/</a>. Ecology has a long history of successfully using non-enforcement “technical assistance officers” to work with industries to reduce pollution and conserve resources (see <a href="http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/hwtr/TRAC/3-Charge%201%20and%202-Improving%20the%20effectiveness%20of%20P2%20and%20new%20strategies.pdf">http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/hwtr/TRAC/3-Charge%201%20and%202-Improving%20the%20effectiveness%20of%20P2%20and%20new%20strategies.pdf</a>).</li> </ul> <p>Although these are not the “be all and end all” of solutions for agriculture, they are examples of what can be done with the regulatory system to provide from an incentive standpoint.</p>
<p><b>Implementation Considerations</b></p>	<p>Next steps for implementation could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identifying what, if any, are effective, demonstrable regulatory backstops.</li> <li>• Consider meaningful incentives (e.g., exemption from a regulation if BMPs are implemented).</li> </ul> <p>The NMFS buffer recommendations, the “Treaty Rights at Risk,”<sup>2</sup> and implementation of critical area requirements under Growth Management Act (GMA), or the Voluntary Stewardship Program (VPS), are potential vehicles for creating regulatory incentives to propel enrolment in incentive programs.</p>
<p><b>Cost/Time</b></p>	<p>Medium to high.</p>
<p><b>Value/Relative Priority</b></p>	<p>To be determined in consultation with dialogue group.</p>

<sup>2</sup> <http://treatyrightsatrisk.org/>  
<http://nwifc.org/w/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2011/08/whitepaper628finalpdf.pdf>

**Attachment A – Dialogue Group Meeting #1 Invitees** (need to add tribal invitees)

Dialogue Group Invitees		
Perspective	Name	Email
1. Farming (Dairy)	Jay Gordon	wsdf@msn.com
2. Farming (Livestock)	Jack Field	jfcattle@kvalley.com
3. Farming (Farm Bureau)	John Stuhlmiller	jstuhlmiller@wsfb.com
4. Shellfish	Bill Dewey	billd@taylorshellfish.com
5. Northwest Chinook Recovery	Jon Sayre	nwchinook@wavecable.com
6. The Nature Conservancy (Skagit)	Kevin Morse	kmorse@tnc.org
7. NRCS	Rick Noble	rick.noble@wa.usda.gov
8. WA State Conservation Commission	Ron Shultz	rshultz@scc.wa.gov
9. WA State Conservation Commission	Carol Smith	csmith@scc.wa.gov
10. WA State Conservation Commission	Debbie Becker	dbecker@scc.wa.gov
11. Puget Sound Conservation District	Monte Marti (Snohomish)	monte@snohomishcd.org
12. Puget Sound Conservation District	Joe Holtrop (Clallam)	joe.holtrop@clallamcd.org
13. WA State Department of Agriculture	Julie Morgan	jmorgan@agr.wa.gov
14. WA State Department of Ecology	Kelly Susewind	ksus461@ecy.wa.gov
15. WA State Department of Health	Jerrod Davis	jerrod.davis@doh.wa.gov
16. WA State Department of Health	Mary Knackstedt	Mary.Knackstedt@doh.wa.gov
17. WA State Department of Health	Andrea Hood	andrea.hood@doh.wa.gov
18. WA State Puget Sound Partnership	Alana Knaster	alana.knaster@psp.wa.gov
19. U.S. EPA	Rick Parkin	parkin.richard@epa.gov
20. Local Government	Linda Neunzig (Snohomish County Agriculture Coordinator)	linda.neunzig@snoco.org
21. Local Government	Gary R. Christensen (Skagit County Planning and Development Services)	garyc@co.skagit.wa.us
22. American Farm Land Trust	Christy Carr	CCarr@FARMLAND.ORG
23.	Erika Britney	Erika.Britney@icfi.com
24.	Charlene Andrade	Charlene.Andrade@icfi.com
25.	Scott Boettcher	scottb@sbgh-partners.com



## Attachment B – NWIFC Meeting Participants and Notes

### Meeting Notes

#### Tribal Perspectives on Voluntary Incentive Programs (VIPs)

##### A. Meeting Date, Time, Location

1. **Date** – Wednesday, May 28, 2014
2. **Time** – 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.
3. **Location** – NWIFC (6730 Martin Way E., Olympia, WA 98516, small conference room in main building).

##### B. Meeting Participants

1. **NWIFC** – Fran Wilshusen, Jim Peters, Todd Bolster, James Weber.
2. **PSP** – Alana Knaster, Jeanette Dorner.
3. **WSCC** – Ron Schultz.
4. **ICF** – Scott Boettcher, Erika Britney.

##### C. Process Comments

1. NWIFC commented on the lack of tribal involvement in the dialogue group and the initial interviews (Task 2). Group agreed that sending the invitation letter to the tribal chairs was appropriate but not sufficient and recommended also copying tribal natural resource staff and NWIFC to ensure timely response to the invitation. Also, when in doubt, call Fran and/or Jim for guidance.  
  
⇒ Apply guidance going forward; invite NWIFC to follow up on dialogue group meeting.
2. It was also noted that initial interviews provided a narrow perspective on VIPs and included only proponents/advocates for VIPs and that other perspectives were not included (e.g., Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO), Ecology Water Quality, tribal, and salmon recovery perspectives). As a result, findings generated from those interviews are largely weighted toward that perspective. Examples include:
  - Concerns associated with buffers from the perspective of landowners are included but not the benefits of buffers from the perspective of salmon recovery interests, tribal interests, etc.
  - Language describing riparian buffer requirements demonstrates bias.

WSCC noted that the language in the memo reflects wording/views expressed by interviewees, which can be informative of attitudes and perceptions (accurate or not). Group agreed goal should be a balanced presentation of multiple perspectives from multiple interests.

⇒ Make sure that materials clearly identify views/perspectives of interviewees/participants, pay close attention to wording, and incorporate input gathered from this meeting into final report.

3. NWIFC commented that this project as performing a subjective evaluation of limited stakeholder perceptions on the subject of the effectiveness of VIPs.
4. NWIFC noted that what is really needed (rather than a process of gathering opinions), is some basic objective fact finding: what data is available; what can we tell about what has been put on the ground thus far; what are the sizes, widths, composition, etc. of buffers and BMPs implemented. Without a factual analysis this report, and the broader discussion of the effectiveness of VIPs to achieve resource objectives, will continue “the existing rhetoric of incentive programs”

⇒ Identify the need for basic, objective fact finding in recommendations for next steps for discussion at next Dialogue Group meeting.

#### **D. Context of This Project with Other Efforts**

1. This effort is scoped to address C3.1 NTA 2 (pg. 209, [http://www.psp.wa.gov/downloads/AA2011/083012\\_final/Action%20Agenda%20Book%20Aug%2029%202012.pdf](http://www.psp.wa.gov/downloads/AA2011/083012_final/Action%20Agenda%20Book%20Aug%2029%202012.pdf)), titled *Effectiveness of Incentive Programs*. This NTA states:

*By December 2013, the State Conservation Commission, in consultation with Ecology and the Washington State Departments of Agriculture and Health, Conservation Districts, Federal agencies and Tribes, will report to the Governor and the Legislature on the effectiveness of incentive programs to achieve resource objectives. The report will include a section from Ecology on compliance with water quality standards.*

2. In contrast to recent discussion between NWIFC and WSCC related to evaluating the effectiveness of existing agricultural VIPs administered by WSCC in lieu of instituting riparian buffer width recommendations, the WSCC intent of this project is to take broader, higher-level evaluation on the subject of the effectiveness of VIPs. (Note: See NWIFC feedback D.3. above)

#### **E. Comments on Voluntary Incentive Programs**

1. Need to be clear about how “effectiveness” is defined. Do you mean effective at allocating funding? If it refers to a broader ecological context, then the specific goals/objectives need to be specified.

2. NWIFC suggests that metrics used to determine effectiveness should include habitat conditions for both salmon and shellfish.
3. Participants from NWIFC indicated that they are not opposed to VIPs. They are concerned that the programs as currently designed [or implemented], are narrowly focused in order to avoid addressing difficult issues, such as temperature and large woody debris. As a consequence, some programs focus exclusively on one treaty-reserved resource (shellfish), while ignoring another (salmon). Since good riparian management (often by the same landowners) is necessary to protect both salmon and shellfish, narrowly focusing on shellfish wastes outreach opportunities and scarce state and federal grant resources.
4. VIPs are not successful when there is selective/limited implementation of BMPS and, as a result, the measures implemented are not sufficient to fully address all of the water quality and habitat issues associated with that property.
  - ⇒ Effectiveness of VIPs needs to be measured at the property scale and at the reach and/or watershed scale.
5. “Site specific” is often code for establishing BMPs “depending on landowner willingness.” There is ample science to provide thresholds for minimum levels of protection needed to ensure all WQS and beneficial uses are protected. Site specific can and should be used to increase levels of protection to comply, say with a watershed TMDL or recovery plan, however, it should not be employed to undercut or decrease science because a watershed has a different political makeup.
6. There was agreement that setting clear, discrete objectives at a watershed scale is important for setting up a successful watershed-focused VIP. However, in the majority of circumstances, it can be difficult to get agreement on the objectives (ecological outcomes).
  - Given that we already have legally adopted water quality standards and salmon recovery plans, we are going to have to honestly explore why it is so difficult to reach agreement on the ecological outcomes.
7. Treaty Rights at Risk should provide a motivator/spark plug related to the legal obligations that VIPs are intended to meet.
8. The forest and fish program provides a great example of science-based law that addresses Washington's native fish and aquatic species and assure clean water compliance.
9. It helps to learn from past successes:
  - Timber Fish Wildlife (TFW) Process – There was significant legal uncertainty and threat of litigation as well as a strong commitment of leadership. This process included small landowners.
  - Forest and Fish Report (FFR) – Was ESA focused but also successful at incentivizing.

10. Successful watershed-focused VIPs require strong leadership commitment and clear results showing environmental gains due to specific BMPs.
11. The focus on getting voluntary landowner participations leads to definitions of success that focus on participation, independent of the actual ecological objectives of the program – clean water and good fish habitat
12. Tribes have supported VIPs as long as there is a regulatory backstop on water quality standards and salmon recovery. During the Ruckelshaus process, tribes were willing to commit to viable farms as long as agriculture community made a similar commitment to fish. Agriculture community made no similar commitment to fish and said no to regulatory backstops. As a result, the Tribes declined to continue participating in the Ruckelshaus process.
13. Accountability and results are necessary for having (and demonstrating) effective VIPs. But many programs may not even collect the data (e.g. buffer width, land use, location, etc.) necessary to determine effectiveness or disclosure requirements may preclude such an objective evaluation. This report needs to evaluate this critical issue.
14. Key issue is whether or not VIPs are working from the standpoint of resource recovery and environmental gains.

#### **F. Buffers**

1. Agencies have not given NMFS' buffer guidelines enough of a chance (e.g., it took a few years for Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP) to be accepted as a program but it has gradually gained momentum and is used). Moreover, we have yet to see any analysis indicating that buffer guidelines can't/won't work.
2. Can include an off-ramp for unwilling landowners so funding can go to willing landowners.
3. Can include an off-ramp from buffer guidelines if alternate, scientifically sound, equally ecologically protective BMPs/approaches are proposed.
4. There is science to back up/demonstrate the ecological benefit of buffers. Can data demonstrate that buffers have discouraged landowners from applying, or is there only anecdotal evidence?
5. Need to create threshold expectations; use the energy of the tribes to advance the issue of VIPs in general.

#### **G. Outreach on Shellfish Management and Salmon Recovery**

1. We are currently lacking an agreed-to approach for concurrent, coordinated shellfish management and salmon recovery.

2. There is no consistency in publically funded outreach to landowners, and as a result jurisdictions may be recommending different, competing, and potentially in-effective solutions to landowners. This is not good government.
3. A scientifically based outreach (education) approach is needed to help develop consistency across jurisdictions.
4. Why do we do outreach for shellfish and salmon separately? Public education is needed; it is important to get the science right and message it consistently. Cannot have different agencies with different messages or variations on a theme.
5. There has not been a scientifically supported counter proposal on minimum buffer guidelines.
6. Incentive programs operate as outreach programs, because they communicate what the “public” is willing to pay for to achieve environmental gains. Therefore, when we incentivize insufficient practices, or don’t have adequate guidance to prevent these abuses, agencies may be sending messages to landowners that conflict with other government efforts. Examples include WSCC funding inconsistent with TMDL requirements, or NEP and PSP funding inconsistent with Salmon Recovery, etc.

#### **H. Data**

1. This is still anecdotal information/data that rely on people’s opinions; we still need real data on where/how VIPs have been implemented so it can be correlated with ecological data in the watershed.
  - a. What data are out there? We may find there are a lot of opinions and very little data.
  - b. Would analysis of data yield useful information? Need to see CREP data.
  - c. Post meeting note: CREP projects are implemented under terms of a confidentiality agreement so that information on individual properties is not disclosed such that the data can be connected to individual properties.
2. Need to understand what data are/are not collected and what this means for being able to assess the efficacy of voluntary BMPs, programs, and adaptive management.

#### **I. Funding**

1. A concern is that if money is not spent, then the same dollars will not be allocated again the following budget year. This incentivizes poor decision-making on spending. We need to encourage spending decisions that are made on the basis of well-designed proposals – not the fear of losing funding.
2. NWIFC has developed some innovative approaches to managing different streams of funding and is willing and interested in sharing ideas.
3. Can we do a better job of investing in conservation?