

Landowners, Beavers, and Salmon on the Oregon Coast: Lead Entities Stakeholder Inquiry and Engagement Report¹

Michelle Y. Janning, Ph.D.²
March 2023

¹ To cite this report: Janning, Michelle Y. 2023. “Landowners, Beavers, and Salmon on the Oregon Coast: Lead Entities Stakeholder Inquiry and Engagement Report.” March 14, Michelle Y. Janning Consulting, Walla Walla, Washington. Funding for this project comes from the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB) and The Beaver Coalition (in-kind).

² See Appendix 1 for Consultant Biography.

INTRODUCTION

Why: Introducing the Lead Entity Engagement Interview Project

The project plan for “Landowners, Beavers, and Salmon on the Oregon Coast” submitted to the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB) in June 2022 states: “North American Beaver are critical components of healthy riverscapes. By building dams and digging canals they construct and maintain connected floodplains, creating a diversity of habitats for myriad species at the same time. However, over the last two centuries, beaver populations have been dramatically reduced through hunting and trapping, and riverscapes across the continent have been degraded by human activity. The best available science increasingly suggests that to accomplish restoration at the spatial and temporal scales needed, we ought to encourage the return of beavers into their role as head riverscape engineer.

The federal Recovery Plan for Oregon Coast Coho, in particular, identifies an increase in beaver ponds and beaver managed aquatic habitat as the single most impactful way to recover the endangered species. This is published, affirmed by state and federal management agencies, and yet, there is no evidence of notable progress on the ground.”

A collaborative multi-phase project has been introduced to address this problem, with several objectives:

Objective 1: Establish and facilitate a regional planning cohort for beaver-based restoration.

Objective 2: Assemble regional information on beaver, beaver-based restoration actions, planning, local sensitivities and priority areas, including public and private forests.

Objective 3: Facilitate knowledge transfer on the best available science for partnering with beaver and highlight regional successes.

Objective 4: Conduct strategic outreach with key landowners.

Objective 5: Create a “Report of Findings” including recommended “Next Steps” that identifies priority areas for restoration, the limiting factors to beaver-based restoration and coexistence efforts, and actionable ways that our management cohort of stakeholders could move through them and into the development of meaningful restoration projects.

The current report focuses primarily on Objective 2, and outlines the findings from Phase 1 of the project: *Lead Entities Stakeholder Inquiry and Engagement*. Additional phases of the project include GIS assessment and mapping, a Landowner Stakeholder Inquiry and Engagement phase, creating a planning cohort, developing stakeholder training, conducting training, and delivering recommendations and reports.

The aim of the Lead Entities Stakeholder Inquiry and Engagement phase is to explore the roles of management agencies and restoration practitioners in the implementation of low-tech process-based

stream restoration. In particular, this phase uncovers the ways that roles, organizational mission and goals, restoration practices and knowledge, barriers and opportunities, and personal and community attitudes may shape restoration outcomes.

METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

The overall approach to this project aligns with the tenets of socially-informed research (Janning 2023) and participatory design (Mahabadi et al. 2014), wherein people who ultimately will be involved with use or implementation of a system or process are included in the design of that process. In this sense, the interviews that took place as part of this project were helpful in terms of noticing patterns, but *also as a way to begin stakeholder engagement*. Because the ultimate goal of the larger project is enhanced engagement and learning about low-tech process-based stream restoration, it was necessary to create an inclusive way for ideas to be shared openly and honestly. The inclusive process consisted of paired efforts: the invitation by trusted and invested organizations of stakeholders to participate in semi-standardized conversations, along with the facilitation and systematic analysis of the interviews by a trained social scientist consultant who is an outsider to all organizations involved.

Where, When, and Who: Region, Timeline, and Participants

Participants in the interviews were “lead entities” or stakeholders involved directly in riverscape and watershed restoration on the Oregon Coast via state and federal management agencies, watershed councils, soil and water conservation districts, and consulting organizations. Participants included directors, staff members who work directly on restoration projects, board members, and consultants from organizations located (or working) in the range of Oregon Coast Coho salmon, which is from the Sixes River in the South to the Necanicum in the North.

Members of The Beaver Coalition recruited participants via email and phone calls. A list of the total possible potential lead entity participants – 65 individuals – was crafted, with an aim to recruit participants from varied roles and regions. Some were invited to participate in individual interviews, others in focus group conversations. Individual interviews included executive directors, staff members, and board members from multiple regions. Two focus groups were designed to foster conversations across regions within one type of role (one focus group consisted entirely of executive directors, another consisted entirely of restoration staff); the other two focus groups were designed to foster conversations across roles within a specific geographic region where low-tech process-based stream restoration had been implemented to varying degrees, each located in a different spot along the Oregon Coast.

A total of 37 individuals were interviewed³ between October 18, 2022 and January 12, 2023, all via

³ This project was approved by the Whitman College Institutional Review Board on July 25, 2022 (Approval number: IRB 22/23-02). See Appendix 2 for Informed Consent document.

recorded video or audio calls. Of these, 13 participated in individual conversations; these participants included four executive directors, five staff members, and four board members. Four focus groups included 24 participants, organized into separate groups as follows: watershed council executive directors (n=5); staff leading riverscape restoration projects (n=5), and two priority watershed groups, each with seven participants that included executive directors, staff, board members, and consultants from varied organizations. All interviews lasted between 45 and 90 minutes. An important limitation to the research was that no formal representatives of Tribal Nations in the region participated.

Size of participant organizations varied extensively, with some organizations made up of only one person who took on multiple roles and others made up of a dozen staff members. Among the individual interviewees, nine were from watershed councils and four were from soil and water conservation districts.

Individuals, organizations, landmarks, and regions are not named in this report in order to ensure confidentiality. Findings represent aggregated patterns, with occasional reference to the type of role that a person may play (e.g., a board member). Members of the project team from The Beaver Coalition have access to the interview recordings and transcripts, which may be used when designing follow-up workshops or engagement opportunities that can be tailored to location-based characteristics that may impact restoration efforts.

What: Conversation Topics

A multi-step collaborative process was implemented to craft the interview questions, based on academic sources (Pfaeffle et al. 2022) and content expertise from members of, and research assistants working with, The Beaver Coalition, along with interview design expertise about format, flow, and ethics from Michelle Janning. Janning conducted every individual and focus group interview. Each interview covered participant roles, organizational goals, restoration practices, barriers and opportunities, and attitudes. In particular, the conversations were meant to gauge people's support for and participation in low-tech process-based stream restoration involving beavers. The interviews began with introductory questions about roles and organizational mission and goals, then moved to questions about beliefs and practices surrounding riverscape restoration, as well as the inclusion or promotion of beavers in restoration. Barriers to this type of restoration were listed with a chance for people to reflect on each and name which ones stood out as the biggest barriers. The interviews concluded with questions about perception of community attitudes, and what incentives may be implemented to increase support for beaver-based stream restoration. The full interview guide is included in Appendix 3.

Focus group conversations included fewer questions so that all participants could participate without extending the interview time. Key questions in each broad topic were included in all focus groups.

How: Analytic Technique

The purpose of the project was to begin engagement about riverscape restoration across lead entities while also gathering responses and stories that could be systematically analyzed to find patterns within and across regions and groups that participated. Because of these goals, the interviews were semi-standardized; this means that most of the questions were asked of most participants in mostly the same order. Many times participants were asked to elaborate their responses if they were short or incomplete, and the conversational tone of the interviews meant that they could also ask for clarification, return to previously-discussed topics, revise their responses, or share stories that elaborated their responses. In this sense, the interviews resembled conversations. Because the questions varied to some extent, the findings must be read as a set of stories with noticeable patterns that have been uncovered systematically, but not as a scientific dataset with rigid quantifiable results. In addition, because the number of people in any given group (e.g., executive directors, board members, or a specific region) were often fewer than five, no statistical significance tests are used in this analysis and no precise numeric findings are presented. The findings, thus, are not generalizable; patterns may be a result of idiosyncratic characteristics of any given region, organization, or person included.

Each interview was transcribed using an automatic transcription service, and then de-identified and corrected for auditory errors by a research assistant. The transcripts were analyzed using Gibbs's (2007) descriptive/analytic coding technique. This coding technique begins with straightforward descriptions based on themes that stem directly from the interview questions (e.g., all interview transcript segments relating to definitions of a healthy stream are placed into one "code"). After this round, more codes are developed iteratively, moving toward categorization, which is a set of codes that capture features that the first round of descriptive codes may have in common (e.g., whether healthy stream definitions included in the transcript excerpts also reference biodiversity). Next, an in-depth round of analytic coding offers bigger picture interpretation of context and meaning, thus pointing to connections between codes that may be hidden (e.g., whether someone's role in an organization may relate to their inclusion of biodiversity in their definition of a healthy stream).

Importantly, some interviews were conducted individually and others within groups. As part of the analysis of focus group transcripts, any occasion where the conversation demonstrated explicit ways that the participants engaged with each other was coded as such. These focus-group-specific instances are elaborated in the Findings section below.

FINDINGS

Findings are presented in three sections:

- **Commonalities** among participants that relate to roles, mission and goals, knowledge and practices, barriers and opportunities, and attitudes

- **Variations** among participants that relate to roles, mission and goals, knowledge and practices, barriers and opportunities, and attitudes
- **Communication and Connection** as already-present assets needed for successful future engagement, demonstrated both within the focus group conversations themselves, and referenced in individual interviews

Commonalities

Every participant in every role – whether director, staff member, consultant, or board member – is personally dedicated to environmental sustainability, and each organization included has explicit dedication to protecting the environment (including Coho salmon habitat) on the Oregon Coast. In that sense, everyone is aligned in terms of overall mission (even if the way that mission may be fulfilled varies). Importantly, there are no large differences in response themes and patterns between focus groups (directors, staff, watershed 1, watershed 2). Additional commonalities among the people who participated relate to four key areas: definitions of a healthy riverscape; the inclusion of beavers in riverscape restoration; the importance of political landscape; and resource barriers amidst deep dedication. These commonalities, which include some variation, are elaborated below.

Defining Healthy Riverscapes

When asked to define a healthy riverscape, many participants talk about water quality and clarity. Across roles, regions, and levels of experience, a common definition emerges: a healthy riverscape consists of diverse vegetation and animal species and, in the words of one focus group participant, “total chaos.” Healthy streams and riparian landscapes are made up of meandering and complex multi-channel streams interacting with flood plains to enhance low velocity (and cold temperature) habitat for Coho salmon and consequently for beaver. Additional elements include the absence of excessive sedimentation and turbidity from upstream management practices. In many people’s responses, this differs from what they see as a more general public misperception: that a stream ought to be tidy, simple, and made up of a single channel.

The Inclusion of Beavers in Riverscape Restoration

Almost universally, participants acknowledge that a stable local economy that may be based on timber and/or agriculture is an asset for their communities. But they also believe in the importance of restoring habitats to the way they were before large timber and agricultural industries altered the landscape. This paired set of acknowledgments includes explicit reference to beavers, sometimes as the primary species of interest but more often as one of many interrelated animal and plant species that need protecting. Nobody in these conversations explicitly supports lethal measures for beavers, but there is variation in: a) whether the law that allows lethal measures should be changed; and b) whether trap-and-release is a viable alternative or a band-aid that ultimately would not resolve any restoration efforts since a new beaver family would likely take up residence in a place where previous inhabitants were trapped and removed/relocated. While there is variation in level of expertise and experience with low-tech process-based restoration generally and with beaver-based restoration

specifically among those people interviewed, everyone has heard of it and knows about its practice in the region. Most people interviewed, especially if they are directors or staff members involved in watershed councils, soil and water conservation districts, or consultancies, have participated in some form of riverscape restoration as part of their work. In most of these instances, consideration of beavers has been part of those projects. How awareness and consideration may translate into projects actively promoting or prioritizing beavers varies, however, and is discussed below.

Political Landscape

Oregon is the Beaver State, and there is clear recognition across those people interviewed that the beaver is a complex cultural symbol that, when invoked, brings up political values that can be at odds with each other. Political differences are not frequently discussed in terms of specific political candidates or voting patterns, but rather as generationally- and geographically-embedded lenses that shape people's desire to: a) prioritize an animal over and above profit; and b) be willing to engage in conversation across perceived group boundaries. The people interviewed are in an optimal location to recognize something that is often invisible: there is a healthy respect for diverse political opinions in the area, at times presented as an asset for building bridges for more robust multi-party environmental and economic sustainability in the region, and at times presented as a challenge that can get in the way of progress. In many cases – regardless of whether political differences are seen as an asset or a challenge – the existence of more education and understanding alongside the promise of open minds among newer generations of residents who may be willing to change their ways are seen as good things.

Resource Barriers Amidst Deep Dedication

With few exceptions, participants see barriers to enhancing any kind of riverscape restoration projects – including those that promote beavers on the landscape – as primarily located in the area of resources. The most commonly referenced resource in need of enhancement is finding enough qualified staff and contractors to work on projects in areas with low population density. Wrapped up in this resource gap is a need for better wages, more time to learn new techniques and build the restoration skill set within the region (and among their own staff), and retention of qualified staff members who wish to remain in the geographic area (again related to wages). In a few instances, these resources are discussed as connected to timing of grant cycles, but not very often. Importantly, despite the recognition of resource barriers that relate to money, time, skills, and people, there is an unwavering dedication to both the regions themselves and to the work of restoration (of riverscapes and all landscapes). Even in the midst of challenges, it is clear that this is a group of people who love their work and see it as important, fulfilling, and challenging in important ways.

Variations

The people who participated in these conversations have much in common, as the aforementioned section details. However, several topics emerge that show variation in attitudes and experiences: knowledge, data, geography, and views about landowners.

Knowledge

Importantly, definitions matter. Despite a general awareness of low-tech process-based riverscape restoration involving beavers, participants have varied understandings of, and experiences with, these practices. In fact, the terms “stream” and “riverscape” are not defined precisely the same way across participants, evidenced by some people asking for clarification of the terms (and of related terms).⁴ Knowledge about governmental plans and policies vary depending on how close people are to both grant writing and conducting restoration practices. Those who are newer to the region (and sometimes role) are less familiar and/or less likely to speak with confidence about their knowledge; those who are board members are generally less familiar than directors and restoration project leaders (unless they have specialized knowledge of beaver-based restoration, which is true for a few). How the experiences vary also depend on how they frame geography, elaborated below.

Geography

Land use, geography, and topography vary across the regions included in this research, which impacts the prioritization of beavers (and riverscapes) in preferred restoration projects. For some individuals, issues such as wildfires, managing excessive stream speed coming from high elevations, and controversy over city park use are perceived as more pressing issues, simply because they’re perceived as more immediately apparent among community members themselves. In other words, because of the variation in the land itself, people vary in how much they see beaver-based restoration (in particular in what they perceive as small streams) as relevant (or not) to their regions. The variable prioritization of other key “scapes” that include fires, ponds, forests, hills, parks, and even road infrastructure impacts level of support for beaver-based restoration. This kind of project specifically referenced as both species-specific and landscape-specific may be seen as less possible or less important to some simply because – except in cases of angry landowners or drivers navigating flooded culverts – there is less of an immediate and dire visible disaster in the midst.

Data

Some people interviewed desire better data and benchmarking for low-tech process-based restoration (involving beavers or otherwise), especially preferred among those with scientific backgrounds, those who view scientific expertise as necessary to trust new processes, and those who have worked on beaver-based restoration for many years and are eager to have it more legitimized in the eyes of governmental, granting, and industry groups. Some who are frequent grant writers or who are involved in policy-making or advocacy also see the ways that benchmarks that are readable across stakeholder groups would be beneficial.

⁴An addendum to this report that is available as an internal document has been sent to The Beaver Coalition. This addendum contains the complete set of responses to the question of whether an organization participates in “low-tech process-based stream restoration, defined as restoring the process that leads to habitat rather than building habitat.” This is included as a lengthy addendum so that organizers of future educational materials can see the variation in interpretation of terms associated with this project and can easily access the current state of knowledge and practice among lead entities on the Oregon Coast.

Landowners

Everyone interviewed recognizes and respects local stakeholders and the role of people who own property in their region, highlighting the significance of local relationships as key to moving forward with any kind of changes. Many note that there are landowners who are already proponents of the kinds of riverscape restoration discussed in this project. However, some people interviewed wear multiple hats as both a landowner and participant in one of the included organizations. And others note that their personal relationships with landowners helps projects move forward, usually because a landowner's willingness to engage in conversation about potential change is easier coming from a neighbor and long-term friend than from an organization that people are not sure they can trust. The way trust is discussed relates to politics – even if organizations themselves are non-governmental, they can be perceived as an extension of the government. If a landowner is already untrusting of governmental oversight on their private property, this misconception can be hard to overcome. For some people who are new in their positions, particularly at watershed councils, this relationship- and trust-building can be a challenging part of their work.⁵

Communication and Connection

Riverscape restoration is an increasingly important area of focus for the individuals and organizations included in this project, both in terms of goal prioritization and a desire for more resources (knowledge and staffing and equipment) to make it sustainable. The Coho recovery plans are helping give groups working on watersheds a concrete place to look for vocabulary, agency involvement, and legitimacy to be able to use when talking with local constituencies (including landowners). But part of the process of this increased need and desire is also about communication among themselves. As one member of a watershed project focus group conversation noted, “a lot of it is communicating how much beaver are a part of the overall watershed processes...You know, habitat is, I think, one of the things that just – in this long story of Oregon's changing history – is something we try. And you know we try and embrace the history, but also, you know, look to upgrade these areas that you know might need some help.”

And here is the key finding about communication that emerges from these interviews: When asked to reflect on a list of potential barriers to low-tech process-based riverscape restoration involving beavers, participants were UNlikely to mention one in particular: communication among organizations. In other words, a nearly ubiquitous perception among those who participated in the

⁵ Importantly, interviewees were asked whether they could imagine any useful or helpful incentives or changes needed in order for landowners in the region to increase their support for the inclusion of beaver in low-tech or process-based stream restoration. Not everyone could answer this, but among those who did, the most common types of incentives revolved around economics and help with logistics. Frequently, respondents suggested that some landowners may respond well to tax breaks (both individual and corporate landowners). A bit less frequent was the mention of having trusted people who also understand various types of stream restoration offer assistance in such a way so that no revenue would be lost with revisions to the landowner's property.

individual interviews is that communication among organizations in the larger region is an asset to enhanced riverscape restoration efforts. This sentiment came most strongly from directors and restoration project leads, but it also rang true for people who serve as consultants or board members. And it was especially apparent towards the ends of some of the focus group conversations, where group members were exchanging information and alluding to future conversations to help each other navigate their restoration work.

CONCLUSION: CONTINUED ENGAGEMENT

The conversations that make up this lead entity stakeholder engagement and inquiry project offer tremendous hope for continued engagement. The dynamics in the focus groups shed light on this potential. For the most part, the focus groups showcased people's willingness to listen, share ideas, complement each other, and push individual ideas to the group without fearing retaliation. The individual interviews shed light on the dedication to riverscape restoration as a crucial part of environmental sustainability efforts. And the appreciation for local viewpoints and stories – even if drastically varied in political leaning or tone – is vividly apparent. These individuals know their communities and they respect local stakeholders. They understand that time and social connections matter if anything needs to happen. They are patient and know that this is hard work that will pay off. They see hope in some recent legislation that may make implementation of restoration efforts a bit easier, even if they wish they had time to really dig into those pieces of legislation. But they also see – sometimes in their own stories – exhaustion, rapid funding deadlines, misunderstandings from landowners, and lack of qualified long-term personnel to do the job.

Any engagement efforts that stem from this initial set of conversations will point to valuing and capitalizing on local stories and long standing social connections, along with a framing of beaver-based restoration as an evidence-based process that these individuals already understand: *something that takes time*. In addition, it will be necessary to recognize that beavers (and the streams that they impact) are part of larger complex ecosystems with immense amounts of biodiversity and variation based on size and speed of stream, topography, fire and rain exposure, and type of land use (agriculture or timber or urban community spaces). Because of this variation – even in an area that has much in common – it may be important to acknowledge the difficulty of prioritizing only one species or one restoration practice. If limited resources, staffing turnover, and lack of understanding of the practice are also present, this makes openness to these practices even harder. However, while there seems to be a lot of variation across roles, organizations, and regions in terms of capacity and willingness to engage in more low-tech process-based stream restoration, there is nearly universal desire to learn more. Thus, framing of beaver-based restoration as a way to integrate larger aims – especially if this framing can occur with more robust data-driven metrics that can be seen as evidence for continued governmental and inter-agency collaboration, and especially if the engagement can capitalize on the already-present collaborative spirit among organizations – will be crucial moving forward.

REFERENCES

Gibbs, Graham R. 2007. *Analyzing Qualitative Data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Janning, Michelle. 2023. *A Guide to Socially-Informed Research for Architects and Designers*. New York: Routledge.

Mahabadi, Shahab Mirzaean, Hossein Zabihi, and Hamid Majedi. 2014. "Participatory Design: A New Approach to Regenerate the Public Space." *International Journal of Architecture and Urban Development* 4(4): 15-22.

Pfaeffle, Tori, Megan A. Moore, Amanda E. Cravens, Jamie McEvoy, and Aparna Banzai-Dodson. 2022. "Murky Waters: Divergent Ways Scientists, Practitioners, and Landowners Evaluate Beaver Mimicry." *Ecology and Society* 27(1): 41.

Appendix 1: Consultant Biography

Michelle Janning, Ph.D. (Michelle Y. Janning Social Research Consulting) is a sociologist and consultant who specializes in interview and survey research about relationships, communities, and the use of spaces. She is Professor of Sociology and the Raymond and Elsie Gipson DeBurgh Chair of Social Sciences at Whitman College. Janning has published numerous books and articles on the sociological importance of roles and relationships in the built environment, is frequently interviewed in national and international news outlets, and is a frequent keynote speaker about “people research” in the design of systems, curricula, and built environments. She can be reached at janninmy@whitman.edu. Her work is featured at www.michellejanning.com.

Appendix 2: Informed Consent

Thank you for your willingness to participate in this conversation about streams along the Oregon Coast. This project is sponsored by The Beaver Coalition. This organization's mission is to empower humans to partner with beavers through education, science, advocacy, and process-based restoration. We are primarily trying to understand individuals' and organizations' attitudes and behaviors surrounding stream restoration, especially in places that are habitats for young Coho salmon. We recognize that this is a complex issue. Please know that there are no wrong answers. We want you to answer honestly. The end goal is to develop training opportunities for stakeholders based on what we learn from people like you, and – this fall and winter – from public land managers and private landowners.

We will record the Zoom conversations, and nobody except the research team will see these or the full transcripts. These files will be saved in a password-protected drive, and the recordings will be deleted after the project is done. Your individual responses will be kept confidential. If you are participating in one of the group conversations, we also ask you to keep others' responses confidential. We may share what we learn in reports or presentations, but we will never report anything where your identity and your answers are linked. We may list the names of participating organizations, but not individual people.

We don't foresee any risks to you for participating in this project, although we know that discussing land use and watershed health is complex and can be controversial, and this may make it a little hard to talk about. We see the primary benefit as enhanced knowledge about barriers and opportunities to foster stream health in the region, so that next steps can be informed by what people are *actually* doing and thinking.

We are partnering with the Sociology Department at Whitman College to ensure that our approach is scientific, rigorous, and ethical. The project has been approved by the Whitman College Institutional Review Board. If you have any questions about the methods in this project, please contact Dr. Michelle Janning at janninmy@whitman.edu. If you have questions about the project approval with Whitman's Institutional Review Board, please contact irb@whitman.edu. If you have questions about The Beaver Coalition, please contact Jakob Shockey jakob@beavercoalition.org.

If you consent to participate, please reply to this message [or note your consent in the chat window] noting that consent. If you are participating in a focus group, your consent includes agreement to keep others' responses confidential as well. Thank you again!

Appendix 3: Interview Guide

(Italicized topics are in both individual and group interviews; non-italicized topics are primarily in individual interviews)

Module 1: Introduction and Roles

Name, organization name and location, role in organization

Length of time in organization

Past employment

Whether personal views align with views associated with organizational role

Module 2: Goals and Priorities

Primary mission and two prioritized goals

Extent to which riverscape restoration is explicit part of organizational mission

Proportion of riverscape restoration goals that are about protecting the local economy v. restoring natural processes

Steps needed to achieve riverscape restoration goals

Extent to which Coho salmon habitat restoration is explicit part of goals

Extent to which partnering with/promoting beavers for Coho salmon habitat restoration is explicit part of goals

Module 3: Current Practices and Definitions of Success

Definition of a healthy stream

Extent to which organization has participated in low-tech process-based stream restoration defined as restoring the process that leads to habitat rather than building habitat

Level of support for low-tech process-based stream restoration

Desire for more knowledge about low-tech process-based stream restoration

Thoughts on: conducting low-tech process-based actions to promote beaver presence; measures such as flow devices and tree protection; live trapping and relocating beavers; lethal measure to get rid of beavers; beavers as a symbol for communities, schools, or regions

Knowledge about a) the state's conservation plan for Oregon Coast Coho Salmon, b) the federal Recovery Plan for Oregon Coast Coho Salmon, and c) the Private Forest Accord

Module 4: Barriers and Opportunities

What may lessen an organization's desire or ability to successfully implement stream restoration projects that seek to restore natural processes, particularly if they promote beaver

How much each of these is a barrier that may make low-tech process-based stream restoration involving beaver hard to successfully implement

→ *Communication within or between organizations*

- *Funding or economic issues*
- *Infrastructure or bureaucratic issues*
- *Level of landowner support and cooperation*
- *Power imbalances within an organization*
- *Political disagreements*
- *Size of organization*
- *Staffing turnover*
- *Shortage of skilled restoration practitioners or other labor*
- *Complexity in time grant cycles, work windows, permitting, etc.*
- *Understanding (or not) of success metrics for restoration*
- *Other barriers*

Current opportunities being taken advantage of, and NOT being taken advantage of, to make improvements in low-tech or process-based riverscape restoration involving beaver
 Incentives or changes needed in order for people in the region to increase their support for the inclusion of beaver in low-tech or process-based stream restoration

Module 5: Attitudes

Perception of whether views align within organization

Community and personal attitudes about low-tech process-based restoration involving beavers

Personal attitudes

Perception of community knowledge about low-tech process-based restoration involving beavers

Perception of factors that shape level of support of private and/or public forest owners or managers for beaver-based restoration

Other topics interviewee wishes to discuss

Strategies for reaching out to landowners in the area for future engagement