Implementing a Watershed Approach

- Do you have clear goals and can you stick to them?
- Go get data on basin hydrology, hydraulics, geomorph and biology
- Put the basin first, *then* temper ideas with ‘reality’
- Collaborate, but *make decisions*
Small City in Kitsap County

- Basin boundary
- Channel alignment, stream reaches
- Wetlands
- Property ownership
- Stormwater system
- Culverts
Flood reduction / increases detention

- 4 = large scale, direct benefits throughout or high in watershed (above SR 305)
- 3 = direct benefits low in watershed (below SR 305) or high in watershed but limited in scale
- 2 = indirect benefits, throughout or high in watershed
- 1 = indirect benefits, low in watershed

Weighted 1.5 times due to lack of detention in basin and degree of flooding
Improves salmonid habitat

- 4 = direct benefits to multiple life history stages
- 3 = direct benefits to single life-history stage
- 2 = indirect benefits landscape scale
- 1 = indirect site-specific scale benefits

Weighted 1.1 times due to desire to restore anadromous salmonids, which would also improve conditions for native fresh-water mussels
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative weighting</th>
<th>(x1.5)</th>
<th>(x1.3)</th>
<th>(x1.1)</th>
<th>(x1.1)</th>
<th>(x1.2 if &gt;1)</th>
<th>Total Weighted Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total points possible</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale: 4=high, 1=low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basinwide/Programmatic Actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase enforcement of critical areas regulations e.g. connectors and clearing streams and wetlands (increased staff to conduct enforcement)</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
<td>4 (5.2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 (2.2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop diffuse stormwater management program (e.g. rain gardens, curb bumpouts, medians etc.) for new construction and existing upper basin parcels</td>
<td>3 (4.5)</td>
<td>3 (3.9)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 (2.2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop critical areas/watershed functions training program</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
<td>2 (2.6)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (2.2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach 1 - headwaters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Olaf’s church: Stream channel, floodplain, riparian zone &amp; wetland restoration</td>
<td>3 (4.5)</td>
<td>3 (3.9)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 (2.2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school demonstration rain gardens, bioswales, native landscaping demonstration project</td>
<td>3 (4.5)</td>
<td>3 (3.9)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 (2.2)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold’s property: Stream channel, floodplain, riparian zone &amp; wetland restoration</td>
<td>3 (4.5)</td>
<td>3 (3.9)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 (2.2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach 2A - Upper Wilderness Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install grade control log/boulder structures in Wilderness Park</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
<td>2 (2.6)</td>
<td>2 (2.2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install educational signage regarding stream and forest ecology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Timeline and Feasibility

**Shorter Timeline**
- 4 = <2 years
- 3 = 2-3 years
- 2 = 4-6 years
- 1 = >6 years

**Feasibility**
- 4 = publically owned land, few construction issues
- 3 = largely private, but potentially willing partners
- 2 = private, unknown interest
- 1 = construction challenges or unwilling private owner
## Costs and Funding Considerations

**Low Relative Costs**
- 4 = <$50k
- 3 = $50-100k
- 2 = $100-200k
- 1 = >$200k

**Aligns with Funding**
- 4 = aligns with several grant sources
- 3 = aligns with specific grant source
- 2 = aligns with general objectives of funding groups
- 1 = not aligned with currently known/available grants
On the Ground Implementation

- Think big – watershed’s aren’t ‘in a box’
- Think linked – engineers, hydrologists, public involvement specialists are your friends
- Think long-term – it takes time to erode mountains, stay committed
- Think local – local knowledge, local perspectives, public support are critical
- THINK, talk, discuss – don’t give up!
## Be the Change You Want to See

### Solution-Oriented
- New approaches require creativity and imagination
- New approaches aren’t anticipated by old rules
- Advocates open doors to good ideas
- What’s best is seldom what’s easy
- Assume good intentions and listen openly

### Problem-fixated
- But we’ve never done it that way before
- The code, REGLs, etc. doesn’t address that
- My boss, the council, the public, won’t like it
- I’ll have to work harder to do this
- I don’t like you … so I’m not interested
Everyone DOES Make a Difference

- A watershed approach is only as good as the local actions it generates!