

Report as of FY2006 for 2006OR75B: "Building Capacity to Manage Conflict and Change through Oregon's Water Governance Structures "

Publications

Project 2006OR75B has resulted in no reported publications as of FY2006.

Report Follows

Building Capacity to Manage Conflict and Change through Oregon's Water Governance Structures

Mini-Grant Final Report

Principal Investigators:

Denise Lach, Associate Professor, Oregon State University

Denise.lach@oregonstate.edu 541-737-5471

Aaron Wolf, Associate Professor, Oregon State University

Aaron.wolf@oregonstate.edu 541-737-2722

Project Manager:

Julia Doermann, Senior Water Policy Advisor, Oregon State University

Submitted to the Institute for Water and Watershed

June 15, 2007

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Competing interests and values in water management have created contentious situations that traditional water governance structures have increasingly found difficult to resolve. Oregon has been a leader in developing innovative, place-based structures to complement the agencies and institutions responsible for water resources management. Our project (1) teased out lessons about working with conflict from Oregon's local partnerships in managing and restoring water quality and watershed health; (2) created a curriculum that was taught Spring 2007 as the capstone course for the graduate certificate in water conflict management and transformation; (3) will use parts of the curriculum in a workshop for practitioners and stakeholders in New Mexico on conflict transformation later this summer; and (4) through the Water Governance Practicum (June 17-22) in northeastern Oregon and a site-visit to Rio Jemez in conjunction with the New Mexico workshop, will cycle back to watershed councils to discuss, cross-check, and deepen our understanding of the capacities and resources needed by local governance structures to develop stable solutions for local water problems.

Through these activities, we experienced new and more holistic ways that people were framing, understanding, and addressing their challenges and opportunities, and how these create a ripple of change from the individual to society. These open up collaborative and less confrontational approaches that build community rather than disrupt it.

The project overall contributes insights and practices for transformation from the individual to the societal level that appear to be contributing to a more sustainable future for Oregon's water resources and watersheds. This project also explores the transferability of these findings to other parts of the West.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Oregon has been a leader in water governance innovation. This arose from the recognition that agency-developed programs and regulations have reached their limits when it comes to nonpoint source pollution control, and endangered fish and watershed restoration. Oregon empowered diverse local groups to work collaboratively on water quality and watershed health restoration. Other state and federal resource management agencies also connect with and often do their work with these watershed councils.

We began our efforts to learn more about Oregon's water governance innovations by visiting five watershed councils across the state to conduct listening sessions. We visited the Walla Walla, a transboundary watershed between Oregon and Washington; the Grande Ronde Watershed Program, one of the oldest watershed councils in Oregon; Wallowa Resources, a non-profit group which has broadened its watershed focus to intentionally include its local economy and community needs; and the Coquille Watershed Council, and the Coos Watershed Council, two neighboring councils with dramatically different approaches, landowner patterns, and council structures. We chose councils representing diversity in annual precipitation, water and land uses/ownership, council membership and leadership, and geographic size and location. (See map in Appendix 1.) All were dealing with water quantity/water quality problems, urban growth, endangered species, habitat restoration, and economic and global market pressures that are changing local economies and land uses.

We probed with questions about what has worked; what hasn't; what was critical to positive change; what made a difference with diverse people working together; what were they able to accomplish; how did they work; what had they learned; what would they recommend; and what did they think belonged in a graduate level curriculum about Oregon's water governance innovations. Interviews were also conducted with participants in the Calapooia Watershed Council, the Sprague Watershed Working Group within the Klamath Basin, and The Deschutes River Conservancy, as well as state officials from multiple state agencies, the Governor's Office, several federal officials, academics who were studying and participating in councils, and non-profits such as The Nature Conservancy and National Fish and Wildlife Foundation. (See attached summary of the listening sessions – Appendix 2.)

Our scoping for our curriculum and gathering of lessons was furthered by attending the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board's biennial conference, both to attend scheduled presentations as well as to informally visit with representatives of state agencies from Oregon and Washington, federal agency officials, OWEB staff, and a broad array of stakeholders participating in watershed councils. Several of the individuals and the themes and recommendations are recorded in Appendix 3.

The input we got from our visits and interviews, coupled with our own experiences and literature about the forces and themes we were hearing about led to the creation of WPM 599: Water Governance and Conflict Management. This graduate course was taught

Spring 2007. (See attached syllabus under Appendix 4.) Thirteen students enrolled for a three credit course that was taught once a week for three hours.

Prof. Denise Lach, Prof. Aaron Wolf, and Julia Doermann co-taught the course. Five guest speakers participated as well, bringing a richness of perspective, history, insight, and inspiration to the class. The speakers were Geoff Huntington (former Director of OWEB and former Deputy Director of OWRD), Ken Bierly (Deputy Director of OWEB), Prof. Kathleen Dean Moore, James Honey (Sustainable Northwest), and Bruce Aylward (The Deschutes River Conservancy).

We are now about to embark on a journey back to where we began – northeastern Oregon. An intersession class of seven students and three instructors will return to the Grande Ronde Watershed and the Wallowas to take what we've learned back out to the field and deepen it, check it, and grow it further as we visit projects, players, and the landscape. (See Appendix 5 for class syllabus.)

We will also take some of the core ideas and practices we taught in the Spring term, and learn about their transferability to New Mexico. Working with the Utton Transboundary Resources Center at the University of New Mexico School of Law and two of its associates who work on intercultural relations and tribal issues, we will weave our ideas and experiential exercises together and test them with an audience of practitioners and stakeholders. We also plan a site visit to the Rio Jemez to learn about an innovative watershed agreement as part of an ongoing federal water adjudication.

FINDINGS

Though watershed councils are still relatively new and growing in their capacity, these place-based, networked structures offer an example of 21st Century governance structures that can operate and be a place to integrate many of the 20th Century laws and institutions. They are increasingly able to simultaneously hold multiple, often-competing elements of a community and its sense of place – its environment, economic interests, and social needs, and offer a community structure for making resource decisions that benefit the entire watershed and its inhabitants.

John Paul Lederach's Conflict Transformation helps us understand how unusual and visionary this is. He says that conflict transformation requires real change in our current ways of relating that includes and goes beyond the resolution of a specific problem towards a clear and important vision; and in the process, builds healthy relationships and communities, locally to globally. We discovered that this transformation transforms us, too. With as much evidence that our laws and institutions are running up against limits, Oregon's water governance structures offer a model, important lessons, inspiration and insights for the challenges we are facing in the 21st Century.

Appendix 2

Lessons from Listening Sessions with Oregon Watershed Councils

Background

Oregon is in its second decade of experimenting with a new kind of water governance. The primary motivation for innovation was the recognition that traditional government programs and regulations have significant limitations when it comes to addressing nonpoint source pollution control, and restoring endangered fish and watersheds involving private lands. Working at the watershed scale with landowners offers unique possibilities for progress on multiple resource management objectives simultaneously including water quantity issues.

Oregon now empowers diverse local groups to work collaboratively on water quality and watershed health restoration through 92 watershed councils and 45 Soil and Water Conservation Districts with funding for on-the-ground projects, monitoring, council support and technical assistance; common assessment and monitoring protocol and equipment; formal recognition; scientific review and advice from independent, multidisciplinary scientists about complex, systemic questions; and government participation in a watershed context. For example, state and federal resource management agencies connect with and often do their work through or coordinated with these councils. Though watershed councils are still relatively new, they offer a structure for making resource decisions that benefit the entire watershed and its inhabitants, and a place to try and learn from innovative restoration practices.

The structures are still evolving to nest across multiple scales of decision-making in order to harmonize activities -- from local to national. However, Oregon is demonstrating that this collaborative place-based approach can make incremental, adaptive progress in overall watershed health and species recovery while building community rather than disrupting it. It fosters sustained, long-term environmental stewardship connecting people with their environment and their communities, and connecting communities and more centralized institutions in productive ways.

Gathering Lessons

In an effort to capture some of the lessons learned by watershed councils, a team from Oregon State University (OSU) toured several watersheds with stakeholders and held listening sessions to learn about what works, what doesn't, and what should be part of a masters level curriculum. OSU team members visited the Walla Walla watershed -- a transboundary watershed between eastern Oregon and eastern Washington, the Grande Ronde Model Watershed and Wallowa Resources in Wallowa County, Oregon, and the Coquille and Coos Watershed Councils in western Oregon. All are dealing with water quantity water quality problems, urban growth, endangered species, habitat restoration, and economic and global market pressures that are changing local economies and land

uses. The presence of listed salmon under the ESA in all of these watersheds is a dominant driver and focus.

Stakeholders

Salmon are an iconic species and a great integrator across the landscape. Since they provide significant economic benefits to the region they are an unusual catalyst to think about the whole natural system and its socioeconomic relationships. Watershed councils, therefore, take a holistic look at a natural system -- ridge top to ridge top -- and the communities that live within them. Stakeholders include a broad array of community members, elected officials, landowners, non-governmental organizations, and local, state and federal government agencies. Many of the landowners represent farming, ranching, and forest interests. Urban interests as landowners are sometimes involved, but less commonly. Because of salmon listings, there are several federal agencies and non-governmental organizations involved.

The stakeholders' interests include what might generally be expected based on agency missions and economic activities that landowners are involved in. They also include a collective interest in the health of the community and watershed -- "the sweet-spot at the nexus of economics and the environment" as one landowner/watershed council coordinator put it. Watershed council members are articulate about the connection between the health of the watershed and resources to run their schools, and hospitals. They make sophisticated global economic connections to their interests and mission. For many, their interest is our common future.

Plans and Leadership

There were no formal plans developed in Oregon for conflict management. The process, however has been described as "participatory democracy" and "adaptive governance." When opportunities present themselves for changing land management practices, water right uses, or doing a watershed restoration project to improve watershed health, there may be a watershed council vote or call for consensus. Projects tend to be pursued for the benefits they provide, the learning experience offered, and the example to other landowners and water right holders of what the process and results look like and how they work. Further prioritization occurs at the state level through funding decisions on competitive statewide grants administered by Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB) (and to some extent by Bonneville Power Administration (BPA)). Most projects have a monitoring component so that lessons can be learned.

Several types of leaders and leadership were referenced on the tours and in listening sessions. Council members referred to two Governors who built the statewide capacity for watershed councils -- Governor Roberts and Governor Kitzhaber. Some referenced leaders in the Legislature that were pivotal during the early days as well. Several gave credit to federal and state agency staff with a tenacious commitment to some part of the collective vision and who have supported councils with efforts to get permanent funding, technical assistance, and on-the-ground work done.

Council members sang praises of large casts of characters -- both in positions of power as well as those with only the power to show up and try to help. It was very hard to identify any central individual or organization that was making it all happen. People emphasized that it was much more driven by relationships, trust, and a common commitment to a vision.

[Terms in the literature to describe the range of leadership include “servant leadership,” “catalytic leadership,” “leadership with authority,” and “leadership without authority.”]

Institutional Arrangements

The listening sessions and visits to date have been with watershed councils with long track records and many successes. Their approach has been opportunistic, incremental, adaptive, and sociologically and psychologically strategic throughout their histories. There is still plenty of work to be done and many skeptics about whether the watershed council approach can do enough to restore salmon and watershed health. There are also watershed councils in the state that do not have the cohesiveness and results of the four that were visited.

One participant in a listening session responded to this concern with several of his favorite quotes by Wendall Berry. One quote in particular speaks to this point:

“I have no large solution to offer. There is, as maybe we all have noticed, a conspicuous shortage of large-scale corrections for problems that have large-scale causes. Our damages to watersheds and ecosystems will have to be corrected one farm, one forest, one acre at a time.”

In addition to the institutional structures and funding in place to support watershed councils' work (e.g. OWEB, Soil and Water Conservation Districts, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Bonneville Power Authority, Department of Environmental Quality, Oregon Department of Transportation and several other state and federal agencies), many cited certain behaviors by institutional representatives as productive. They emphasized the importance of participants in general being able to:

- apply policy and science on a site-specific basis,
- work within a watershed scale,
- work as a community member, not as a “specialist,”
- have good communication skills,
- partner well,
- be respectful of local culture and the issues that natural resource workers face,
- integrate local knowledge,
- understand how to work with complete systems -- not just individual pieces,
- be sensitive to values of the community,
- volunteer, and
- network.

One said, “Condescendence is lethal.”

Tools, Techniques, and Training

Desirable tools, techniques and training can be summarized to include: listening skills, understanding organizational and institutional change; leadership training; collaborative learning; cultural proficiency; self-awareness; participatory and Jeffersonian democracy; and supporting skills for “conflict transformation.”

Appendix 3

OWEB Conference themes and recommendations

- think broadly to include connecting restoration with communities and the economy -- more options and more opportunity for finding common ground/vision
- working at the landscape scale seems necessary to meet restoration needs, yet this is still not done much and is more of an art than a science
- “act locally” -- know something about the local community; learn who they are and why they are the way they are before you try to change them
- conflict “resolution”/conflict “tolerance” - discuss different applications -- are you trying to adopt a new set of rules or are you trying to live together?
- importance of trust-building and how that happens
- what does it take to effectively partner?
- species by species/issue by issue vs. landscape vs. ecosystem recovery and productivity
- tipping points
- where does change come from?
- What are the big engines and how do we think about and prepare for these? (demographic changes, global warming, drought, trends in food systems, development, tourism, etc.)
- Be alert to trigger words.
- Mosaic thinking rather than scale -- there'll be niche marketing and commodity groups need to think about how to enter at all levels.
- what level of risk-taking is supported given circumstances
- how do we move away from our conflict over differences and support opportunities and collective hopes and aspirations -- construct institutions tying into desires and core interest of humans.
- understand value systems
- develop courage
- trust
- gain comfort with difficult discussions
- recognize the deep commitment that precedes you and that you may never have seen/heard about anything like what you experience.
- importance of place-based efforts that have local commitment following scientific assessment.

Drawn from presentations and conversations with Jeff Oveson, Coby Minton, Diane Snyder, Tom Byler, Ken Bierly, Tom Shafer, Lori Warner, Jackie Dingfelder, John Runyon, Besty Parry, Donna Silverberg, Nan Evans, Jane O'Keefe, Roger Wood, James Honey, Joe Witworth, Extension folks.

Appendix 4

WPM 599: Water Governance and Conflict Management Spring 2007: Course Description and Schedule

Instructors

Aaron Wolf, Geosciences

wolfa@geo.oregonstate.edu

Denise Lach, Sociology

denise.lach@oregonstate.edu

Julia Doermann, Institute for Water and Watersheds juliadoermann@hotmail.com

Office Hours: By appointment

*“No problem can be solved from the same level of consciousness that created it.”
– Albert Einstein*

*“[S]hift to a higher realm of perception to find solutions to our problems and resolve conflicts. By doing this, we find opportunities in problems.”
– Alberto Villoldo*

Course Description

Experience suggests that in order to meet 21st Century water resource demands we must seek and share new methods, tools, and structures that help us move beyond entrenched positions to a common vision of the future. This includes creating tools, methods, and capacity to facilitate diverse interests and cultures coming together to craft strategies and policies that achieve mutual gains at all levels both before crisis strikes and even within times of crisis. The structures need to speak across multiple scales of decision-making in order to harmonize activities. Collaborative and less confrontational approaches are needed to build community rather than disrupt it. Overall, this era challenges us to seek new strategies that foster sustained, long-term environmental stewardship connecting people with the resource and their communities, and connecting communities and more centralized institutions to support stewardship efforts.

This capstone course for the graduate certificate in water conflict management and transformation offers an opportunity for students to learn about current and leading edge ways to make progress in complex watershed health restoration and contentious water situations. It explores conflict tolerance, prevention, management, and transformation through collaborative watershed restoration structures as well as through models of negotiation.

Readings, lectures and class discussions will explore the literature, practices and applications of negotiation and conflict resolution; organizational learning and change; new institutional networks and relationships; and leadership. It will explore it from the individual level to the societal level.

There will be an emphasis on experiential learning. Classes offer a place to learn and practice skills as well as hear from experts in the field that are using different approaches

to negotiation and problemsolving. Students will also chose a field experience (watershed council meeting, city council forum, shadowing, conference, seminar, etc.) and report on it at the end of the term. Finally, the course will help students understand how creative, messy and inelegant these processes and solutions can be.

Learning Objectives

By the end of the term you will:

- Have increased your listening skills through practice and critique;
- Have increased your understanding of the culture and environment you “swim in” to include power of “frames,” and multiple perspectives and scales (both geographic and temporal) on water conflict;
- Be able to reframe water conflicts from intractable to transformable through application of different negotiation tools, and different guiding philosophies and perspectives;
- Enhance joy in life and openness in your heart;
- Demonstrate creativity in the face of intransigence and negativity regarding water conflicts through in-class role plays; and,
- Have practiced and demonstrated your skills with a wide range of conflict transformation tools through in-class and extra-mural exercises.

Rules of the Road

- Be respectful and maintain a professional tone
- Be responsible
- Be inclusive
- Class starts and ends on time
- Turn off cell phones, beepers, pagers, computers, etc.
- Check your e-mail and BlackBoard regularly for information and announcements.
- Follow University policies regarding plagerism and other ethical conduct.

Readings and Texts

Articles for class are available on the class BlackBoard site.

Texts for the class are:

Wallace Stegner, Beyond the Hundredth Meridian, 1954.

William Ury, Getting Past No: Negotiating with Difficult People, 1991

John Paul Lederach, Conflict Transformation, 2003.

Course Structure

Most classes will begin with a “warm up” – something to help us move into a more creative place to work from in class. We will then have a lecture and discussion concerning the week’s topic, and reflecting on assigned readings. This will be followed by experiential exercises, and a class debrief of the exercises.

Between classes, you will be asked to complete the reading assignments and experiment with ideas from class in your daily lives and class project. You will then be asked to self-debrief through journaling about these experiences.

Course Requirements and Evaluation

In addition to the in-class exercises, there will be a term project that provides you an opportunity to apply and synthesize your coursework within a real-world circumstance. Each course element is described briefly below.

1. Class Participation/Class Debriefing: 30 points.

Students will be expected to participate in class discussion, exercises and the class debrief. Since much of the class material will be discussed, developed, and practiced in class, your attendance and participation in all classes is required. It is expected that you come to each class prepared – having read the assigned material ahead of time and be ready to refer to it in our discussions. We will also spend part of every class debriefing. This will be an opportunity to learn and practice reflecting on class exercises and your experience in a critical, positive, constructive way and responding to other's reflections.

2. Self-Debriefing/Journal: 40 points

We will ask you to keep a journal during the duration of the class. Some weeks you will be asked to reflect on a specific question or questions. Other weeks we may give you an article or case study to apply class material to, analyze, and reflect upon. You will also be asked to do self-debriefing of your experiences both in and outside of the classroom.

3. Class Project/Applied Experience: 30 points

Our understanding of theories, concepts and tools we discuss and practice in class will deepen when we apply them to real-world efforts. Your class project/field experience is an opportunity to put these into practice. During the term, you will be asked to attend a public forum, such as a city council meeting or local watershed council meeting, or “shadow” a leader to observe the public discussion, input and decisionmaking process. We suggest you choose something that you can attend at least 2 times during the term. This will offer an opportunity to reflect on and/or use skills and understanding gained in class to current challenges in our community.

You will develop a term project on these field experiences. These can be creative and come in a usual or unusual form: a paper, movie, role play, song, poster, etc. It should reflect a well-organized, applied exploration of the term's class material, as well as a demonstration and critique of your mastery of concepts, tools, and theories explored throughout the term. The modality you chose should convey your experience, analysis, and synthesis clearly, reflecting original and critical thought.

WPM 599: Water Governance and Conflict Management: Spring 2007

This class meets Wednesdays from 12:00 noon to 2:50 pm in the Women's Building Room 205.

Dates	Major Topics	Reading Assignments (to be read by class on day listed). Check Blackboard weekly for additional postings.
April 4	Conflict and Context: Self-Awareness and Involvement	<p>Wolf, Aaron, et al, "Managing Water Conflict and Cooperation," <u>2005 State of the World: Redefining Global Security</u>, pp. 80-95.</p> <p>Isaacs, William, 1999, <u>Dialogue and the Art of Thinking Together</u>, "A Conversation with a Center, Not Sides."</p>
April 11	Conflict and Context: Institutional History, Challenges and Opportunities	<p>Wilkinson, Charles, "West's Grand Old Water Doctrine Dies."</p> <p>Wilkinson, Charles, "Water in the West," <u>Open Spaces: Views from the Northwest</u>, Vol.1, No.3 (Summer 1998), pp. 13-19.</p> <p>Arun Agrawal and Clark C. Gibson (1999), "Enchantment and Disenchantment: The Role of Community in Natural Resource Conservation," <u>World Development</u>, 27 (4), April, 629-49</p> <p>John W. Meyer, Brian Rowan, "Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony," <u>The American Journal of Sociology</u>, Vol. 83, No. 2 (Sep., 1977), pp. 340-363</p>
April 18	Conflict Resolution	<p>Ury, <u>Getting Past No</u>, 1991. (Entire book)</p> <p>Utton Center, "Crossing Cultural Boundaries," 2005.</p> <p>Pyramic Lake case study</p>
April 25	Changing Perceptions -- Expanding Choices	<p>Glennon, Robert, "Water Scarcity, Marketing, and Privatization."</p> <p>Neuman, Janet C., "The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly: The first Ten Years of the Oregon Water Trust." 2004.</p>
May 2	Changing Perceptions -- Basins without Boundaries	<p>Behavioral Assumptions of Policy Tools (Schneider and Ingram)</p> <p>South African Constitution</p> <p>EnLibra</p> <p>Sadoff and Grey</p>
May 9	Enhancing and Sharing Benefits	<p>Lederach, <u>Conflict Transformation</u>, 2003.</p>
May 16	Building Skills and New Ways to Relate to Systems and Each Other	<p>Clumsy solutions (Lach, Ingram, and Rayner)</p> <p>Arun Agrawal and Clark C. Gibson (1999), "Enchantment and Disenchantment: The Role of Community in Natural Resource Conservation," <u>World Development</u>, 27 (4), April, 629-49</p>

		Naturalistic Decision Making (Klein)
May 23	Opportunities through Emerging Issues, New Governance Structures, and Sharing Hopes and Aspirations	Senge, et al, <u>Presence</u> (selection) Isaacs, William, 1999, <u>Dialogue and the Art of Thinking Together</u> , "Setting the Container." (Meeting management readings)
May 30	Leadership in Complex Times	Isaacs, William, 1999, <u>Dialogue and the Art of Thinking Together</u> , "Convening Dialogue." Ury, <u>Getting to Peace: Transforming Conflict at Home, at Work, and in the World</u> , Ch 3. Senge, <u>Presence</u> , ch. 15. Article on civil society from <i>Yes! A Journal of Positive Futures</i>
June 6	Acknowledging Passages, Reflection and Integration	Kaufmann

April 4

Conflict and Context: Self-Awareness and Involvement

- Introduction to hydropolitics and general frameworks for addressing water conflict (Aaron Wolf, Denise Lach, Julia Doermann)
- Self-awareness and listening skills in conflict and its resolution (Aaron Wolf)

April 11

Conflict and Context: Institutional History, Challenges and Opportunities

- Guest Lecture: Geoff Huntington – The role of U.S. and western environmental and water laws in conflict
- The social and institutional context (Denise Lach)

April 18

Conflict Resolution and Perceptual States

- Perceptual states – transforming conflict within and through ourselves (Julia Doermann)
- Understanding the stories that give our lives meaning
- Using perceptual states with groups and in the natural resources/water policy arena for reframing conflict and finding solutions (Julia Doermann)

April 25

Changing Perceptions -- Expanding Choices

- Guest lecture: Bruce Aylward, Deschutes River Conservancy – Using market tools, water management tools, exchanging goods or funds for water, water banks, etc. to increase opportunities for conflict resolution

May 2

Changing Perceptions -- Basins without Boundaries

- Looking at scale (Aaron Wolf)
- Other frameworks for understanding and addressing conflict (Denise Lach and Julia Doermann)

May 9

Enhancing and Sharing Benefits

- Guest lecture: James Honey, Sustainable Northwest – Reframing water conflicts to sustainability (i.e. considering ecology, economy and community concerns simultaneously) in the Klamath Basin
- Seeing from the Whole (in contrast to reductionist thinking)

May 16

Building Skills and New Ways to Relate to Systems and Each Other

- Place-based networked organizations (e.g. watershed councils); social trust; and decisionmaking. (Denise Lach)
- Hearing positions, interests, and collective myths (the stories that give us meaning) in conflict and finding new opportunities

May 23

Opportunities through Emerging Issues, New Governance Structures, and Sharing Hopes and Aspirations

- Guest lecture: Ken Bierly – How communities share hopes and aspirations; how the “heart” enters public policy and its implementation (The Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watershed Restoration); and the use of a guiding philosophy
- Meeting skills, meaningful measurements of success/kairos time; the importance of relationships (Denise Lach)

May 30

Leadership in Complex Times

- Guest lecture: Kathleen Dean Moore – water and awe: the ethical and spiritual aspects of water
- New types of leadership and assessing what is needed; advice for leaders; and collaboration across broad scales. (Julia Doermann)

June 6

Acknowledging Passages, Reflection and Integration

- Taking it forward, reentry, class debrief (Doermann, Lach, and Wolf)

Appendix 5

WRP 509: Water Governance Practicum Summer 2007: Course Description and Schedule June 18-22, 2007

Instructors

Aaron Wolf, Geosciences

wolfa@geo.oregonstate.edu

Denise Lach, Sociology

denise.lach@oregonstate.edu

Julia Doermann, Institute for Water and Watersheds

juliadoermann@hotmail.com

Hosts

Grande Ronde Model Watershed Program
Wallowa Resources

La Grande & Enterprise, OR
Enterprise, OR

Course Description

Though watershed councils are still relatively new and growing in their capacity, these place-based, networked structures offer an example of 21st Century governance structures that can operate and be a place to integrate many of the 20th Century laws and institutions. They are increasingly able to simultaneously hold multiple, often-competing elements of a community – its environment, economic interests, and social needs, and offer a community structure for making resource decisions that benefit the entire watershed and its inhabitants.

John Paul Lederach's [Conflict Transformation](#) helps us understand how unusual and visionary this is. He says that conflict transformation requires real change in our current ways of relating that includes and goes beyond the resolution of a specific problem towards a clear and important vision; and in the process, builds healthy relationships and communities, locally to globally. This transformation transforms us as well.

The practicum will take us on a journey to northeastern Oregon. Here, we will take what we've learned during Spring term out to the field and deepen it, check it, and grow it further as we visit projects, players, and the landscape.

Expectations for the class

1. Apply concepts of conflict and governance transformation in a local experience.
2. "Sense the whole" of an ongoing transformative governance structure.
3. Gain skills in understanding the interests/needs of a wide array of stakeholders.
4. Synthesize information into a report for local participants.

Our hosts and who we'll be meeting with

Our two hosts are the Grande Ronde Model Watershed and Wallowa Resources. The Grande Ronde Model Watershed (<http://www.grmw.org/>) was one of the first watershed councils in the state. They were chosen for funding by the state in the early 1990s (along with some watershed councils in southwestern Oregon), and have had one of the longest

track record of doing collaborative restoration work through local governance structures. They work well with the state, the tribes, the federal government and neighboring states in coordinating efforts at different scales and meeting multiple social and environmental goals simultaneously.

Wallowa Resources (<http://www.wallowaresources.org/>) is another well-functioning group that intentionally deals with some of the economic and social benefits that can be simultaneously pursued with environmental restoration.

This is a great opportunity to get a sense of what it takes individually, institutionally, through relationships, and on-the-ground to work towards the goal of restoring watersheds, salmon and community health. We will also experience some beautiful examples of how people are working from their hearts and souls, and have an opportunity to find out more about what gives them the courage, comfort (or not) and motivation to work in this life-giving way.

Schedule

Sunday, June 17

Depart for Eastern Oregon from in front of Wilkinson Hall on campus

Monday, June 18th

Discussion and visits with Board members and key partners in the GRMW

Tuesday, June 19th

Visit Confederated Tribe of the Umatilla Indian Reservation's Adult Fish Weir to witness the return of adult spring chinook salmon completing their almost-700 mile trip back from the Pacific to Catherine Creek, the site of much collaborative restoration effort.

Visit and discuss common habitat problems and solutions in Catherine Creek to create and/or restore offstream rearing habitat, critical habitat, and fish passage.

Wednesday, June 20

Visit additional sites where partners have created and enhanced wetlands, in part to create habitat and in part to "treat" tail flows from upstream irrigation prior to that water reentering the Wallowa River.

Discuss tools to achieve this, such as a conservation easement, and an inter-basin transfer of water, as well as the effects on the irrigation management of Lostine River water.

Discussion with partners about how we all move into the future with the concerns of water quality, fish habitat, and irrigation all needing to be addressed (including partners from NOAA Fisheries, Nez Perce Tribe Fisheries, Oregon Dept. of Fish & Wildlife,

Oregon Dept. of Water Resources, Natural Resources Conservation Service, and Oregon Water Trust.)

Visit example of private landowner cooperation, innovative channel construction, and the potential for small scale eco-tourism in Wallowa County.

Thursday, June 21

Visit the largest re-channel project GRMW has participated in to improve fish spawning and rearing habitat; discuss collaboration in Wallowa County and development of Wallowa County Nez Perce Tribe Salmon Habitat Recovery Plan; and discuss their Community Planning Process - Collaborative Watershed Assessment and Restoration work.

Meet with local rancher to discuss implications of Clean Water Act and related legislation on private ranching and range management in the county.

Practice skills for collaborative work.

Friday, June 22

Students offer presentation on overall impressions from the week.