

Report of the Work Group on State-Supported Regional Water Planning & Management

House Bill 5006 (2021)

Table of Contents

Introduction	4
Background	4
Establishing the HB 5006 Work Group	4
Work Group Process and Timeline	5
Alignment-Seeking Process	6
Recommendations	7
Section I: Overarching Recommendations for Water Planning and Management in Oregon	7
Section II: Recommendations for the Next Generation of Place-Based Integrated Water Resources Planning	9
<i>State Recognition</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Agency Capacity and Support</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>Place-Based Planning Grant Program</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Place-Based Planning Program Guidelines and Requirements</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>Sustaining and Funding</i>	<i>16</i>
Appendices	18
Appendix A. Terms & Definitions	18
Appendix B. Community Engagement Guide	18
Appendix C. Oregon Consensus Assessment	18
Appendix D. Work Group Operating Protocols	18
Appendix E. Work Group Meeting Summaries	18
Appendix F. Coordinating Committee Meeting Summaries	18
Appendix G. Work Group Supporting Materials	18
Appendix H. Additional Sources Provided for Work Group Members	18
Appendix A. Terms & Definitions	18
Appendix B. Community Engagement Guide	20
Appendix C. Oregon Consensus Assessment	25
Appendix D. Work Group Operating Protocols	34

Appendix E. Work Group Meeting Summaries	40
Appendix F. Coordinating Committee Meeting Summaries	131
Appendix G. Work Group Supporting Materials	132
Appendix H. Additional Sources Provided for Work Group Members	133

Introduction

Background

Authorizing legislation from House Bill 5006 (2021) appropriated funds for the following:

“Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the General Fund appropriation made to the Water Resources Department by section 1 (5), chapter ___, Oregon Laws 2021 (Enrolled Senate Bill 5545), for the biennium beginning July 1, 2021, for the director’s office, is increased by \$500,000, for distribution to Oregon Consensus to convene a process to develop a framework and path for state-supported water planning and management at the water region and/or basin level.

Oregon Water Resources Department is directed to use provided funding to contract with Oregon Consensus to convene a workgroup comprised of a balanced membership including, but not limited to, conservation groups, agricultural water users, municipal water users, environmental justice organizations, tribal interests and state agencies including Water Resources Department and the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife to consider regional water management opportunities that build on the 100 Year Water Vision and further the goals of the Integrated Water Resources Strategy.”¹

Establishing the HB 5006 Work Group

From October through December of 2021, Oregon Consensus conducted a process assessment with various water interests (55 entities and 96 individuals interviewed) in Oregon and shared the findings with a Process Leadership team as a means “to inform process design considerations and topics to meet the direction of HB 5006.”² The Process Leadership team included leadership from Oregon’s House of Representatives (Representatives Helm, Owens, and Reardon), Oregon Water Resources Commission (Chair Reeves), Oregon Department of Water Resources (Director Byler and Deputy Director Rancier) and the Governor’s Office (policy advisors Crowell and Gratz-Weizer). Out of this Process Leadership team engagement, the workgroup was established in January 2022 and included the following participants:

- *Adam Denlinger, Special Districts Association of Oregon, Seal Rock Water District*
- *Ana Molina, Environmental Equity Committee*
- *Anton Chiono, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation*
- *April Snell, Oregon Water Resources Congress*
- *Bob Rees, NW Guides and Anglers Association*
- *Bobby Brunoe, Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs*

¹ <https://olis.oregonlegislature.gov/liz/2021R1/Downloads/MeasureDocument/HB5006/Enrolled>

² Oregon Consensus Assessment Findings Memo, January 10, 2022 (Appendix C)

- *Calla Hagle and Jason Fenton, Burns-Paiute Tribe*
- *Caylin Barter, Wild Salmon Center*
- *Chandra Ferrari, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ex-officio)*
- *Chrysten Rivard, Trout Unlimited*
- *Courtney Crowell, Governor’s Office (ex-officio)*
- *Dan Thorndike, Oregon Business Council*
- *Daniel Newberry, Johnson Creek Watershed Council*
- *Donna Beverage, Upper Grand Ronde Place Based Planning, Union County Commissioner*
- *Heather Bartlett, Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Indians*
- *Holly Mondo, Harney Community-Based Water Planning Collaborative*
- *Illeana Alexander (formerly Roselynn Lwenya), Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians*
- *Jeff Stone, Oregon Nurseries Association*
- *Jennifer Wigal, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (ex-officio)*
- *JR Cook, NE Oregon Water Association*
- *Kate Fitzpatrick, Deschutes River Conservancy*
- *Kathleen George, Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde*
- *Kelly Timchak, Curry Watersheds Partnership*
- *Kimberley Priestley, WaterWatch*
- *Lauren Poor (formerly Mary Anne Cooper), Oregon Farm Bureau*
- *Margaret Magruder, Association of Oregon Counties, Columbia County Commissioner*
- *Niki Iverson, League of Oregon Cities, Water Director City of Hillsboro*
- *Oriana Magnera, Verde*
- *Peggy Lynch, League of Women Voters*
- *Racquel Rancier (formerly Director Tom Byler), Oregon Water Resources Department (ex-officio)*

Work Group Process and Timeline

The workgroup held twelve meetings (mostly virtually) from January-December 2022 and worked through a shared learning, brainstorming and concept-building process related to the legislative charge to develop a “framework and path for state-supported water planning and management at the water region and/or basin level.”

Upon further scoping direction from the Process Leadership team and confirmed by the Work Group, recommendations focused on state agency capacity and community engagement in the water planning and management system (Section 1); and on evolving the state’s Place-Based Integrated Water Resources Planning program (Section 2). “Place-Based Planning” is a planning tool that was authorized as a pilot program in 2015, administered by the Oregon Water Resources Department, and set to sunset in July of 2023.

Details about the workgroup process can be found in the Appendices to this report, including Operating Protocols, Work Group Meeting Summaries, Coordinating Committee Meeting Summaries, Terms and Definitions, Community Engagement Guide, Supporting Materials, and Resources List.

Alignment-Seeking Process

Full workgroup deliberations and ad hoc, sub-group efforts of workgroup members (with the technical assistance of OWRD staff who scribed and coordinated content) contributed to the development of a set of recommendations that were iteratively developed through a single-text, straw proposal. After several iterations, a suite of recommendations was finalized with a final ‘alignment check’ at the last stage of the process to determine the collective group’s level of support. The scale used to indicate individual members’ level of support for each recommendation is as follows:

"1" Enthusiastic support - I would be a champion for this recommendation

"2" Support - I support this recommendation

"3" Neutral, on the fence, no concerns or very mild concerns with this recommendation

"4" Serious concerns or questions and will continue to raise them if this recommendation advances

"5" No way - will actively seek to block this recommendation from moving forward

All recommendations, with the level of support, are described in the next Section of this report. Recommendations that received all 1’s, 2’s, or 3’s from workgroup members are further **highlighted** in that section.

NOTE that representatives for the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde and the Environmental Equity Committee participated in the Work Group process but did not participate in the final alignment check on the recommendations.

Recommendations

The HB 5006 Work Group developed a set of recommendations to inform future policy development, funding allocations, and guidance around water planning and management (Section I) and the next generation of the state's Place-Based Integrated Water Resources Planning Program (Section II).

Note that recommendations are written to communicate concepts; consensus does not necessarily indicate agreement on specific legislation or budget priorities.

Alignment Key:

"1" Enthusiastic support - I would be a champion for this recommendation

"2" Support - I support this recommendation

"3" Neutral, on the fence, no concerns or very mild concerns with this recommendation

"4" Serious concerns or questions and will continue to raise them if this recommendation advances

"5" No way - will actively seek to block this recommendation from moving forward

The Work Group determined not to attribute individual results; nor to rank or prioritize or otherwise offer a deeper interpretation of the strength of the consensus check. Rather, they suggested the reader should use the numbered results to interpret the strength of the recommendation from the Work Group.

Section I: Overarching Recommendations for Water Planning and Management in Oregon

Context for Recommendations A and B: To meet statewide goals and mandates for managing instream and out-of-stream water needs with a changing climate, Oregon needs to make significant investments in water planning. Any state-supported regional water planning efforts must be underpinned with the budgets and capacity needed to do this work at the state level. To meet this need, state leadership must prioritize and address the current overarching system-level need for funding related to state agency data collection and analysis, agency capacity, and interagency coordination (note that the pursuit of strategies to address these needs is essential to support more effective water planning efforts in the future and should not delay regional water planning efforts in the near-term).

Recommendation A: The Legislature should allocate increased funding to support state agency capacity and resources for collecting, processing, interpreting, and distributing the water data

needed for more effective water planning and management of instream and out-of-stream needs. At a minimum, this should include:

- (1) Increased access to existing water data and prioritizing efforts to address known data gaps for water planning (e.g., data inventories for place-based planning as described in Recommendation I).
- (2) Developing climate-informed water budgets for basins across the state to better understand current and future hydrologic conditions.

Work Group Results on Recommendation A: ALL 1-3				
1's: 20	2's: 3	3's: 1	4's: 0	5's: 0

Recommendation B: The Legislature should fund, and the Governor should direct, the appropriate level of agency capacity needed for interagency data collection and analysis, technical support, and coordinated work-planning and budgeting to ensure robust engagement by and between agencies in support of water planning in alignment with each agency’s mission and authorities.

Work Group Results on Recommendation B: ALL 1-3				
1's: 17	2's: 6	3's: 1	4's: 0	5's: 0

Context for Recommendation C: Another important component of any water planning and management work is community engagement and collaboration. The workgroup has created a Community Engagement Guide with guidelines and best practices for how to meaningfully engage communities in regional water planning (Appendix B). This is intended to be accessible to and used by everyone involved in building a successful regional water planning and management collaborative (e.g., state agency staff involved with regional water planning, communities, etc.) The guide is intended to be a tool to ensure that a diversity of voices are proactively and continuously included throughout a water planning effort and in the ongoing management. It is intended to be accessible, flexible, and inclusive in order to support diverse regions and communities.

Recommendation C: The Community Engagement Guide should be provided to regional water planning and management efforts, in hopes that it will provide support to ensure that access to the process is transparent and inclusive.

Work Group Results on Recommendation C:
--

1's: 9	2's: 14	3's: 0	4's: 1	5's: 0
--------	---------	--------	--------	--------

Section II: Recommendations for the Next Generation of Place-Based Integrated Water Resources Planning

Context for Section II Recommendations D-V: Place-Based Integrated Water Resources Planning (referred to throughout this document as “place-based planning”) is rooted in the idea that place matters, that water management should be data-driven, integrated and coordinated, and that planning can help the people of Oregon collectively envision and chart a path toward a more balanced and secure water future.

The workgroup grounded its recommendations for the next generation of Place-Based Planning in the set of guiding principles outlined below:

- (1) Place-based Plans will be developed for an area associated with waters within a hydrologic boundary.*
- (2) The planning process will be transparent, inclusive, and collaborative, with a balanced representation of water interests.*
- (3) The planning process will be voluntary and involve a partnership between the state and communities.*
- (4) The planning process will involve strong public participation and community engagement.*
- (5) The planning process will be informed by the best available data and scientific information.*
- (6) The approach to planning will be integrated and based on the goal of better understanding and meeting instream and out-of-stream water needs now and in the future, including water quantity, water quality, ecosystem needs, and climate change.*

- (7) *State agencies will serve as active partners in place-based planning, within their missions and authorities.*
- (8) *The planning process will be guided by the principles in the state's Integrated Water Resources Strategy (p. 179) and 100-year Water Vision (p.21-22).*
- (9) *Place-based planning will be non-regulatory, consistent with state laws and policy, and will not jeopardize existing water rights.*
- (10) *Water is a public resource.*

If Place-based Planning is to continue, the Work Group offers the following recommendations to improve this planning tool.

State Recognition

Recommendation D: Having a state-recognized plan should provide planning groups:

- Agency support through coordination by the Water Core team (or other appropriate groups) to examine potential actions, incentives, or strategies that would advance the implementation of plans within each agency's mission and priorities.
- Assistance for implementation coordination and plan updates as described in Recommendation I and Recommendation P(5) and P(6).

Work Group Results on Recommendation D: ALL 1-3				
1's: 11	2's: 6	3's: 7	4's: 0	5's: 0

Recommendation E: The state should more clearly articulate the value of developing a Place-Based Plan (e.g., preference points or ranking for funding), receiving state recognition, and continuing to work collaboratively according to the plan. This should be included upfront in the PBP Guidelines, on relevant state agency websites, and after recognition in the interagency toolkit.

Work Group Results on Recommendation E:				
1's: 7	2's: 10	3's: 6	4's: 1	5's: 0

Recommendation F: To maintain state recognition and access to associated resources, all planning groups should be required to complete biennial reports to the Water Resources Commission that demonstrate their progress on implementation, and that their pursuit of plan

strategies and actions continue to represent a balance of instream and out-of-stream water interests and a commitment to collaboration and place-based planning principles.

Work Group Results on Recommendation F: ALL 1-3				
1's: 13	2's: 3	3's: 8	4's: 0	5's: 0

Recommendation G: The state may use state-recognized plans to identify common themes across basins to help inform updates to the Integrated Water Resources Strategy.

Work Group Results on Recommendation G: ALL 1-3				
1's: 6	2's: 15	3's: 3	4's: 0	5's: 0

Agency Capacity and Support

Recommendation H: The Legislature should provide funding for a formalized interagency team to support and engage in Place-Based Planning. Without funding support for this formalized team, agencies may elect not to provide the assistance detailed below if staff resources are not available.

At a minimum, the interagency team should consist of OWRD, DEQ, ODFW, OWEB, ODA, OHA, DLCD, DSL, and Business Oregon and be equipped with the capacity to provide the following, within their mission and authorities:

1. Consultation on the development of grant selection criteria and during the grant review process.
2. Coordination and consultation during the planning phase, providing technical and planning support to planning groups and developing educational resources to fill gaps in planning group capacity, knowledge, or skillsets.
3. Consultation and review of plans for state recognition.
4. Development and maintenance of a funding toolkit that would help planning groups navigate existing agency programs and funding opportunities.
5. Consultation and review of implementation reporting to ensure that the pursuit of strategies and actions in state-recognized plans continue to represent a balance of instream and out-of-stream water interests.
6. Coordinated work planning and budgeting to ensure robust engagement from an interagency team, as it relates to each agency's mission and authorities.

Work Group Results on Recommendation H:				
1's: 6	2's: 14	3's: 1	4's: 3	5's: 0

Recommendation I: The legislature should fund OWRD regional/basin coordination, outreach, and engagement staff throughout the state to help facilitate and guide groups through the Place-Based Planning Process. At a minimum, these staff would:

- (1) Provide consultation to groups interested in undertaking PBP.
- (2) Help identify the local leaders, key state and federal agencies, tribes, and stakeholders needed for a successful planning process.
- (3) Coordinate an interagency team as described in Recommendation G.
- (4) Support and participate in the planning process and any continued processes associated with implementation coordination.

Work Group Results on Recommendation I:				
1's: 13	2's: 4	3's: 5	4's: 2	5's: 0

Recommendation J: The Legislature should fund data inventories across the state to (1) understand the availability of data and information essential to Place-Based Planning and (2) identify and prioritize strategies to fill gaps where they exist. Data inventories would inform strategic and effective water planning for instream and out-of-stream needs and help prioritize state-supported place-based planning throughout the state with a focus on areas of scarcity.

Work Group Results on Recommendation J:				
1's: 11	2's: 6	3's: 6	4's: 1	5's: 0

Place-Based Planning Grant Program

Recommendation K: Place-Based Planning grant selection should be based on established criteria that consider planning group readiness and align with strategic priorities determined by the state.

Work Group Results on Recommendation K:				
1's: 6	2's: 11	3's: 3	4's: 4	5's: 0

Recommendation L: OWRD should create easily accessible materials, including a pre-application checklist, for potential conveners and planning groups to preliminarily assess (1) whether Place-Based Planning is the best tool to meet their needs and (2) their initial capacity and readiness to engage in Place-Based Planning.

Work Group Results on Recommendation L:				
1's: 10	2's: 10	3's: 3	4's: 1	5's: 0

Recommendation M: The Place-Based Planning grant program should be accessible to basins with different levels of capacity and resources and be structured to provide onramps for groups through different tiers of support. Examples of these tiers include:

- **Small Capacity Grants** to help groups, especially those in underserved areas, prepare and assess their readiness to engage in the Place-Based Planning process.
- **Planning Grants** to help support groups in following the Place-Based Planning guidelines to develop a plan and achieve state recognition.
- **Implementation Coordination Grants** to help support the continued engagement of planning groups as they move a state-recognized plan into action.

Work Group Results on Recommendation M:				
1's: 6	2's: 13	3's: 1	4's: 4	5's: 0

Recommendation N: The PBP grant should be structured to ensure planning groups that continue to meet criteria in planning and implementation guidance and are consistent with statewide IWRS principles are given priority to receive funding for continued planning and implementation coordination.

Work Group Results on Recommendation N:				
1's: 3	2's: 9	3's: 5	4's: 5	5's: 2

Recommendation O: PBP grants should require applicants to cost share either through in-kind or cash matching.

Work Group Results on Recommendation O:				
1's: 4	2's: 15	3's: 4	4's: 1	5's: 0

Recommendation P: At a minimum, the Place-Based Planning grant program should enable:

- (1) Support for meaningful community engagement, at the outset and ongoing. This would include resources for broad outreach, education, multiple channels for engagement, and capacity building throughout the process.
- (2) Capacity support specifically to tribal and other under-represented or marginalized communities for meaningful engagement in place-based planning.
- (3) Support for capacity and/or funding for professionals to help prepare for and execute planning according to the Place-Based Planning Guidelines. Examples include capacity for project management, creation of governance agreements, DEIJ trainings, technical plan writing, and foundational expertise in water science, ecology and biology, climate science, and water law.
- (4) Support for professional independent third-party facilitation with subject matter expertise.
- (5) Support for continued engagement of planning groups to move a state-recognized plan into implementation. This would provide capacity to planning groups to:
 - Refine plan actions and strategies,
 - Identify, prepare, and apply to funding opportunities to implement plan actions and strategies,
 - Coordinate with the interagency support team as needed,
 - Ensure that the pursuit of strategies and actions continue to represent a balanced representation of instream and out-of-stream water interests, and
 - Complete biennial reports to the Water Resources Commission on the status of implementation.
- (6) Support for planning groups to update plans when significant changes in local conditions, data availability, or climate change information indicate the need for a plan update.

Work Group Results on Recommendation P: ALL 1-3				
1's: 7	2's: 8	3's: 9	4's: 0	5's: 0

Place-Based Planning Program Guidelines and Requirements

Recommendation Q: The PBP Program should build on guidelines developed in the Pilot phase and update planning guidance to incorporate feedback and lessons learned from the Place-Based Planning Pilot and the Place-Based Planning Independent Participatory Evaluation (McLain et al., 2022), as well as the recommendations in this report. These Guidelines should be provided to the planning groups at the beginning of their planning process.

Work Group Results on Recommendation Q:				
1's: 13	2's: 9	3's: 1	4's: 1	5's: 0

Recommendation R: The PBP guidelines should establish a clear set of standards for engagement tied to accessing state funding for place-based planning, based on the following high-level principles from the Community Engagement Guide:

- (1) Regional Planning Should be a Collaborative with Communities
- (2) Participation in Regional Planning Should be Balanced and Inclusive, and Should Include both Instream and Out of Stream Interests
- (3) Regional Planning Should Be Transparent and Accessible for All
- (4) Regional Planning must recognize that Tribal Engagement is not a monolith and each Tribe may have a different level of engagement in planning, different structures for communication and outreach, and different governmental departments engaged in planning and implementation.
- (5) Regional Planning Should Foster Public Input Early in the Process and Ongoing
- (6) Regional Planning Should Sustain an Informed Public
- (7) Regional Planning Should Support Trust Building Between All Participants, Community Members, and the State
- (8) Regional Planning Should Demonstrate Accountability

Work Group Results on Recommendation R:				
1's: 9	2's: 11	3's: 3	4's: 1	5's: 0

Recommendation S: Add to the PBP Guidelines that building foundational trust with and among interested parties, planning groups, and state agencies should be prioritized prior to plan development and writing. This includes setting foundational norms for group engagement and developing and understanding foundational data.

Work Group Results on Recommendation S:				
1's: 2	2's: 12	3's: 9	4's: 1	5's: 0

Recommendation T: Add to the PBP Guidelines that to demonstrate commitment, planning groups should develop and memorialize their commitments to the planning process through a Charter, Memorandum of Agreement, Operating Protocols, or something similar. This should include a clear scope and purpose of the planning effort, which must remain within the State’s authority and public benefit obligations.

Work Group Results on Recommendation T: ALL 1-3				
1’s: 3	2’s: 13	3’s: 8	4’s: 0	5’s: 0

Recommendation U: Planning groups that receive funding from the PBP grant program should be required to (1) be facilitated by a neutral professional facilitator with subject matter expertise (with the choice of which option being the planning groups) and (2) document the plan utilizing the services of a professional technical writer with subject matter expertise.

Work Group Results on Recommendation U:				
1’s: 6	2’s: 12	3’s: 4	4’s: 2	5’s: 0

Sustaining and Funding

Recommendation V: To provide more consistent and sufficient funding to state agencies and planning groups throughout the place-based planning process, the Legislature should:

- (1) Create a fund that allows for carryover funding and a base budget for place-based planning; and
- (2) Support permanent instead of limited duration positions at agencies.

Work Group Results on Recommendation V:				
1’s: 9	2’s: 6	3’s: 4	4’s: 5	5’s: 0

Appendices

Appendix A. Terms & Definitions

Appendix B. Community Engagement Guide

Appendix C. Oregon Consensus Assessment

Appendix D. Work Group Operating Protocols

Appendix E. Work Group Meeting Summaries

Appendix F. Coordinating Committee Meeting Summaries

Appendix G. Work Group Supporting Materials

Appendix H. Additional Sources Provided for Work Group Members

Appendix A. Terms & Definitions

The following are working definitions to provide a common understanding of terms as they are used in this report and are not intended to be translated verbatim into legislation or rule.

Balanced Representation of Water Interests: (adapted from [PBP 2015 DRAFT Guidelines](#))

Each basin is unique in terms of interests and stakeholders. A balanced representation of water interests includes diverse individuals representing both instream and out-of-stream water needs and ensures that all persons potentially affected by a place-based plan are invited to have a voice in the decision-making process. This includes environmental justice communities, particularly members of minority or low-income communities, tribal communities, and those traditionally underrepresented in public processes. Some groups may represent multiple stakeholder categories (e.g., a city or district may also represent the local water utility).

Community: People who live, work, or play within the planning region; entities with an interest or obligation relative to water and ecosystems in the region; people or ecosystems impacted by water planning in the region or water impacted downstream of the region; and governments (federal, state, local, tribal).

Community Collaboration: Community members impacted by a process are engaged at the outset, asked to define values and outcomes for a process, and empowered to take ownership to shape the process and its ultimate outcomes.

Convener: (Adapted from 2015 PBP Pilot Request for Letters of Interest)

An individual, a group of individuals, an organization, or a team of organizations that bring(s) together a diverse group of people to undertake place-based planning that meets the criteria for conveners found in the PBP 2015 Draft Guidelines, including the requirement that the convener is impartial as to the outcome and be perceived as neutral. (Note: a detailed definition can be found in the [PBP 2015 DRAFT Guidelines](#)).

Neutral Facilitator: A facilitator is a person who helps a group of people to work together better, understand their common objectives, and plan how to achieve these objectives, during

meetings or discussions. In doing so, the facilitator remains "neutral", meaning they do not take a particular position in the discussion. Some facilitator tools can assist the group in achieving a consensus on any disagreements that preexist or emerge in the meeting so that the group has a solid basis for future action.

Place-Based: (Adapted from [PBP Website](#))

Orients knowledge, decisions, and actions around the specific context of a place in a way that recognizes the unique hydrologic characteristics of a geography, strengthens the connection between people, and place, and empowers people to work together to achieve a shared vision of that place.

Planning: (Adapted from [PBP Website](#))

A process used to align people, information, ideas, and resources, to 1) identify and understand an issue, need, or opportunity that requires action, 2) envision desired future outcomes, and 3) develop and evaluate strategies and actions to achieve the desired outcomes, 4) implement agreed upon strategies and actions, and 5) monitor, evaluate, and adapt as needed.

Appendix B. Community Engagement Guide

Purpose of the Community Engagement Guide

The Community Engagement Guide is a set of guidelines and best practices for how to meaningfully engage communities in regional water planning. This is intended to be accessible to and used by Place-Based Planning groups, and everyone involved in building a successful regional water planning and management collaborative (e.g., state agency staff involved with regional water planning, communities, etc.) The guide is intended to be a tool to ensure that a diversity of voices are proactively and continuously included throughout a water planning effort and in the ongoing management. It is intended to be accessible, flexible, and inclusive in order to support diverse regions and communities. The hope is that providing this guide to Place-Based Planning and other regional water planning and management groups, will provide support to ensure that no one is left out of processes.

Purpose of Community Engagement in Regional Water Planning and Management

Communities across Oregon are impacted by water planning decisions, whether local stakeholders who live within and use the water from a basin or statewide stakeholders who share these resources through ORS 537.110. Informing, engaging, and supporting the communities who may benefit from or experience the effects of regional water planning is an essential element of this work. Community-centered processes build a shared understanding of challenges and opportunities, establish proactive spaces rather than convening to respond to a crisis, and build shared language, knowledge, and capacity for a diversity of stakeholders to engage around water. A transparent and inclusive process can help create trust amongst a group and build longevity for an effort. It can also help to identify potential benefits, burdens, and systemic issues that may interfere with intended outcomes, or point to unintended consequences of certain decisions to develop a more informed plan with better, more equitable, and durable outcomes.

Bringing as many perspectives as possible into the planning process will incorporate an array of wisdom and experiences, create a deeper sense of ownership, and aim to avoid conflict or opposition to an effort down the line. Community engagement must begin at the onset of a process and may require meeting people where they are physically or philosophically, rather than merely opening meetings or asking people to sign off on work products with little room for change. This is especially important for communities that have been traditionally left out of the public process, such as environmental justice communities which are more likely to have broken trust in planning processes and require additional resources to help them to engage. Ultimately, work with communities is not a destination but must be ongoing, must evolve and adapt, and must help foster new leadership and capacity that can seed future processes.

Community Engagement Principles and Best Practices

Principle A) *Regional Planning Should Be Collaborative with Communities*

Best Practices

- 1) Community means: People who live, work, or play within the planning region; entities with an interest or obligation relative to water and ecosystems in the region; people or ecosystems impacted by water planning in the region or water impacted downstream of the region; and governments (federal, state, local, tribal).
- 2) Community Collaboration means: Community members impacted by a process are engaged at the outset, asked to define values and outcomes for a process, and empowered to take ownership to shape the process and its ultimate outcomes.
- 3) Communities engage to understand and articulate the purpose, goals, and needs for pursuing water planning, and self-determine whether to pursue and commit to a regional planning process.
- 4) Community partners provide leadership in a regional planning process.
- 5) While collaborative, it should be clear that federal, state laws and rules govern the effort.

Principle B) Participation in Regional Planning Should be Balanced and Inclusive, and Should Include both Instream and Out of Stream Interests

Best Practices

- 1) Planning groups value broad, diverse engagement and recognize this leads to more effective, durable outcomes.
- 2) Engagement approaches are based on the scope and charter of the group (i.e. issues identified and different requirements for participation).
- 3) Historically marginalized people and individuals that may be impacted by the outcomes are considered at the outset, to help identify who should be invited to the table before the process starts.

Principle C) Regional Planning Should Be Transparent and Accessible for All

Best Practices

- 1) Create a welcoming environment for new representation and interests
- 2) Identify barriers to engagement and work to address those specific needs early on.
- 3) Offer incentives and resources to encourage and enable people to come to the table.
- 4) Create multiple platforms for engagement (e.g. virtual, in-person, written, field tours, etc).
- 5) Hold meetings in an open and participatory manner.
- 6) Establish a user-friendly and accessible home for information and a point of contact for access to the process.
- 7) Provide public materials and information in multiple languages.

- 8) Provide adequate time for the review of materials.
- 9) Process should set clear and realistic expectations around how community feedback will be valued and incorporated throughout the process

Principle D) Regional Planning must recognize that Tribal Engagement is not a monolith and each Tribe may have a different level of engagement in planning, different structures for communication and outreach, and different government departments engaged in planning and implementation

Best Practices

- 1) Each tribe holds unique sovereign rights and has multiple avenues for achieving its goals for water planning and management, including consultation with federal and state governments.
- 2) Consultation between Oregon and tribal governments is a separate procedure from the community or public engagement in regional water planning. (ORS 182.162 to 182.168). Outcomes of consultation may impact regional planning efforts.
- 3) Tribal engagement in regional planning is important and should be meaningfully supported by the state throughout the process. "Tribes" are not a monolith and cannot be generalized (see number 1 above). For regional planning efforts, each tribe should be engaged individually to determine an engagement approach that will work for their interests and needs.
- 4) Regional planning should be aware of and acknowledge tribal rights, both inherent as well as those explicitly defined through treaties and trusts, formal consultation, settlements, and any completed or outstanding adjudication procedures that may impact the sideboards of a regional planning effort. It is only through consultation with tribes that all forms of tribal rights and interests can be identified and understood and included in planning efforts and plans.

Principle E) Regional Planning Should Foster Public Input Early in the Process and Ongoing

Best Practices

- 1) Engage communities and the public early and often in the process.
- 2) Develop an intentional plan for ongoing public input throughout the planning process, including strategies for identifying and reaching out to all impacted groups and people.
- 3) Create opportunities beyond 'public notice and comment' for public influence. Be clear about what the input space is within the process and document how public input is integrated into the effort.
- 4) Conduct regular communication and outreach to the broader public and interests throughout the process.

- 5) Support an ongoing two-way exchange of information that transparently communicates the feedback received, a clear review of that feedback, and documentation of what feedback was received, what was integrated (how/where), and what wasn't (why).

Principle F) *Regional Planning Should Sustain an Informed Public*

Best Practices

- 1) Educate communities about regional water concerns and the sideboards of a planning process so that they can more confidently and effectively engage in water planning.
- 2) Establish a foundational understanding of the context (state and federal law, sovereign treaty rights, allocations, water budget, etc.) within which the regional planning effort sits.
- 3) Address knowledge gaps around water through shared learning, clear communications, and approachable materials.
- 4) Engage the public, when possible, in regional data gathering and analysis review to make information more digestible and trusted.

Principle G) *Regional Planning Should Support Trust Building Between All Participants, Community Members, and the State*

Best Practices

- 1) Conduct community needs and assets assessments to address what's known and in existence, and where there may be gaps.
- 2) Provide time and resources to build a baseline of relationships before a process begins. Maintain momentum for sustained engagement.
- 3) Continue to build and maintain relationships along the way.
- 4) Consider opportunities to build trust within a regional group, including with state and federal governments and agencies.
- 5) Create opportunities for knowledge exchange between local communities and state agencies.
- 6) Coordinate public engagement with other efforts, when possible, to support capacity and broader participation, and to build upon existing efforts.
- 7) Establish a mechanism of accountability for partners, the public, and decision-makers where agreements are reached in a collaborative planning process.

Principle H) *Regional Planning Should Demonstrate Accountability*

Best Practices

- 1) Work with participants in the process, and those who are part of any external engagement, to create metrics and goals to measure the efficacy and implementation of Community Engagement guidelines in a regional planning effort.
- 2) Document and acknowledge how those guidelines were or were not achieved at multiple points throughout a planning process.
- 3) Capture both quantitative actions (e.g. specific activities, how many and how often) and qualitative feedback from participants (e.g. how the process felt for them, how the conflict was addressed, what people value, etc.) to develop a better and more holistic understanding of community engagement.
- 4) Gather this information and feedback continuously along the way as a feedback mechanism. This iterative collection of information and reflection can help to improve efforts going forward.
- 5) Identify who will be responsible for this measurement, documentation, tracking, and reporting. Consider utilizing an advisory body or steering committee made up of members in a process to help steward accountability and ensure feedback and metrics have a purpose and impact. This body can help ensure that adjustments are made to the process in response to the information gathered.

Appendix C. Oregon Consensus Assessment

To: Representative Ken Helm, Chair, House Interim Committee on Water
Representative Jeff Reardon, Vice-Chair, House Interim Committee on Water
Representative Mark Owens, Vice-Chair, House Interim Committee on Water
Meg Reeves, Chair, Oregon Water Resources Commission

CC: Tom Byler, Director, Oregon Water Resources Department

From: Oregon Consensus

Date: January 10, 2022

Re: Assessment Findings and Process Considerations Related to House Bill 5006
“State-Supported Regional Water Management System”

The purpose of this document is to describe high-level findings from an assessment conducted by Oregon Consensus and to inform process design considerations and topics to meet the direction of HB 5006 (2021). This memorandum conveys high-level findings on themes related to water management and the collaborative process that emerged from the assessment, and based on that, includes recommendations on how to structure the process for the next phase of engagement.

Background

HB 5006 appropriated General Funds into the Oregon Water Resources Department (OWRD) Director’s Office “for distribution to Oregon Consensus to convene a process to develop a framework and path for state-supported water planning and management at the water region and/or basin level.”³ Between October 2021 and December 2021, Oregon Consensus (OC) interviewed 55 entities and 96 individuals (see Appendix for list of participants by organization) for this assessment report.

About Oregon Consensus

Oregon Consensus (OC) was established by state statute as the State of Oregon's program for public policy conflict resolution and collaborative governance. The program provides mediation and other collaborative services to public bodies and stakeholders who are seeking to find new approaches to challenging public issues. OC conducts assessments and designs and facilitates impartial and transparent collaborative processes that foster balanced participation and durable agreements. The program is housed in the National Policy Consensus Center at the Hatfield School of Government at Portland State University.

Assessment Themes Related to Water Management

³ Available online:

<https://olis.oregonlegislature.gov/liz/2021R1/Downloads/MeasureDocument/HB5006/A-Engrossed>

Oregon's current system is reactive, under-resourced and disjointed, and the time is now to fix it. While most interviewees shared thoughts about opportunities to remedy the current situation and some even expressed optimism, they all agreed that Oregon needs to modernize the way it approaches water planning, management and investments. Further, the problem is considered urgent; and there is a collective awareness of the increasing stresses on the system with population growth and dynamic shifts, paired with changes in ecological and climate conditions. Some described the Oregon system as siloed, not integrated, and inequitable; and most described it as under-resourced and reactive. Questions that most often emerged from interviewees focused on the following: *How can there be better integration and alignment between grassroots, regional or basin efforts and the State's regulations, policies and practices? Should, or how should, state agencies be more integrated in their approaches to water use and quality regulations, policies, and programs?*

This work should build on prior efforts and look for innovations. Interviewees wondered how this effort linked to the Governor's 100-Year Water Vision, current place-based planning efforts, the Integrated Water Resources Strategy (IWRS), and other engagement related to water at the state and regional/local levels. Many suggested the work should build on past efforts and existing systems, while also looking for opportunities for innovative solutions. Interviewees pointed to community engagement, data management, defining 'infrastructure' (i.e., built and natural), and other areas for which innovation or new ways of thinking are needed.

Water resources are a complex system that need to be managed for both stability and change. The interviews highlighted a tension related to the system's ability to create certainty or predictability and also the ability to adapt to changing conditions. Interviewees suggested the HB 5006 process should examine a number of related topics: *How can the system be structured to support regional planning and management approaches based on the unique conditions that exist in a basin or region? At the same time, how can the system be structured to support certainty and accountability at the state level to fulfill its overarching responsibility to sustainably manage the waters of the state, for all needs?* Most interviewees suggested that while existing authorities and responsibilities of the state regarding water management should remain, there were many suggestions for how and why regional planning, with local engagement to identify needs and solutions, should be more explicitly integrated into water resource investment prioritization and decision-making at the state level.

Information about water use and availability is needed in order to inform future planning and management. The state of knowledge about water use and availability is inconsistent across Oregon, and this poses significant challenges to planning and management. For many, a clear understanding of and information on the state of water use and availability is foundational to future planning, management and investment strategies.

Educating and engaging communities is critical to securing a water future for all. Many interviewees suggested that a modern system needs to create more inclusive and equitable access to decision-making from the grassroots up. This should include intentional engagement to build and reflect community knowledge about needs and solutions, while cultivating support and shared responsibility for implementing solutions. Many interviewees described a desired outcome of this process would be to explicitly align regional/basin efforts with statewide

decision-making: *How can we have a more inclusive decision-making process for water investments with the use of local knowledge and regional needs assessments to inform decisions?* Likewise, many noted the need to better educate and engage communities to allow for effective input into decisions that will impact them.

There is broad agreement that equity is a core value for a modern structure. Several interviewees raised a key question: *How can the system be structured to create transparency and equity in water planning and management regarding access to resources and decision-making?* Interviewees noted areas for addressing inequities with regards to tribal and other BIPOC communities; and they also pointed out tensions and perceived inequities - a need for better equity - across geographies, population settings, human and ecological, and relating to water quality and quantity concerns.

Clarity is needed about how all the current water efforts intersect and relate with one another. Interviewees generally recognized the tremendous amount of attention and resources that are currently being focused toward water issues and with that, raised questions about how they all connect. Many interviewees expressed something to the following effect: *How will this effort be informed by, inform, or otherwise relate to other legislative, county, or state agency initiatives?*

Assessment Themes Related to the Collaborative Process

A budget note pertaining to HB 5006 legislation says, “Oregon Water Resources Department is directed to use provided funding to contract with Oregon Consensus to convene a workgroup comprised of a balanced membership including, but not limited to, conservation groups, agricultural water users, municipal water users, environmental justice organizations, tribal interests, and state agencies including the Water Resources Department and the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife to consider regional water management opportunities that build on the 100 Year Water Vision and further the goals of the Integrated Water Resources Strategy.” Building from this direction and input from interviewees, the following are process-related themes that emerged in the assessment.

- **The scope needs to be clearly defined and narrow enough** to allow for constructive engagement and a meaningful outcome. **Clarity on purpose and tasks that the group understands and can agree to will be important to ensuring the greatest likelihood of success**, particularly given short timeframes.
- **This effort will require strong leadership.** Many interviewees acknowledged the important role of the legislative leadership; the value of current Governor’s office staff involvement, and also recognized the need to transcend the current administration or legislative leadership given the complexity of issues and long term nature of change being contemplated. Interviewees expressed the value and characteristics of strong leaders in this effort which included being trusted, non-partisan and credible; and having the ability to encourage progress by focusing on process success and building agreements across a diverse set of needs and interests.

- **The process needs to bring a variety of voices to the table and be balanced across different interests and geographies to reflect the diversity of Oregon’s water needs.** It should look for ways to build in access to information and input to the deliberations while also being structured to be nimble in order to make meaningful progress.
- **Change will take time.** While progress has been made and there is energy among water interests to act now, significant changes are a long-term endeavor and will require ongoing engagement and commitment by all parties.
- **A consensus-based approach supported by impartial facilitation and operating principles will be important to progress and durability of outcomes.** Many of the interviewees stressed the importance of working through an agreement seeking process with support from third-party facilitation to maintain fairness and integrity in the process, as well as lead to durable agreements that can be supported and championed in subsequent phases. strong mediation and process management skills, as well as enough situational awareness of the complexity of water policies, law and issue dynamics in Oregon to best support the group’s ability to efficiently and effectively conduct its substantive work. The group should develop a set of operating protocols including decision-making, group norms, communication outside the forum, etc., to steer the effort.

Recommendations for Next Steps

In summary, the assessment revealed an overarching desire for a more *integrated system* for water planning, management and investments that takes into account the complexity of Oregon’s water needs. Based on the assessment findings and the specific direction described in the legislation directing this effort, OC proposes the following approach to achieve a specific component of this outcome around establishing a **clear integration of regional based efforts with state tools and resources**.

NOTE: Interviewees identified many other topics related to integration that they felt would be worthy of a group’s effort to resolve. Among the most frequently mentioned were those related to data management, grant making timelines and requirements, permitting processes and aligning natural resource agency programs and practices tied to the IWRS. These issues will need to be addressed in different forums or subsequent efforts of this group to fulfill a more holistic need for an integrated system.

Scope and Purpose: HB 5006 legislation provided a clear **Scope:** “Develop a framework and path for state-supported water planning and management at the water region and/or basin level, considering regional water management opportunities that build on the 100 Year Water Vision and further the goals of the Integrated Water Resources Strategy.”

Given this, along with findings from the assessment, OC suggests the following **Purpose** of this work effort:

Establish a Work Group which, using a consensus-based process, will develop recommendations for an integrated approach to water planning, management and investments that connects grassroots, regional or basin planning with state resources and tools. These recommendations may be referred for potential legislation development, agency policy, informing local efforts, or others. The effort will focus on integrating three elements:

- Regional planning and local input;
- State support and sideboards; and
- A framework for decision-making that will enable the above two items to be achieved.

Deliverables: The Work Group's charge is to develop recommendations that will become legislative concepts and/or agency policy direction, based on learning, deliberation and consensus building. Specifics include:

- A "findings" document that evaluates pros and cons of different regional planning approaches
- A set of foundational principles for structuring a modernized water planning, management and investment system that informs the following:
 - A recommended structure or structure options for regional/basin planning
 - A recommended decision framework that integrates regional/basin efforts with statewide resources and tools

Group Membership: Membership make-up will take into account HB 5006 legislative language directing this work and an expressed desire from interviewees to create a table that is: inclusive and nimble, balanced across regions, local and statewide; balanced in-stream and out of stream interests; and engaged with new voices and others who have been participating in these discussions. A recruitment process will be forthcoming to establish membership. (See separate communication on this.)

Process Leadership and Support

To provide process direction and support to the Work Group, a Process Leadership Team will be comprised of the following:

- **Independent Facilitation Services:** Facilitation services for the forum will include preparing process documents, agendas, and meeting notes; facilitating work group forums; and assisting with the coordination and facilitation of broader engagement efforts into the process.
- **Balanced and Strong Leadership:** The Chair of the House Committee on Agriculture, Land Use, and Water and a member of that committee designated by the Chair, the House Co-Chair of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Natural Resources, and the Chair of the Oregon Water Resources Commission will serve in a process leadership capacity, ensuring the process goals and sideboards are well defined and that the group successfully meets its objectives in a timely manner. The entities will not drive the substantive outcomes, but rather will work to support consensus building and provide clarity as needed to promote progress of the group.
- **Lead Technical and Communications Support:** OWRD staff will be the technical resource lead and provide communications support to the Work Group forum.
- **Potential Steering Committee:** There may be value in the group considering developing a steering committee with a smaller subset of participants to provide process advice. This

will not be initiated at the outset of the process, but the group may want to engage a smaller group on process-related concerns as the effort unfolds.

Additional Opportunities for Engagement: The forum will have a designated web page hosted on the OWRD website containing all communication and documents relating to this effort. The web page will be updated regularly to remain current with the proceedings. Forum meetings will be open to the public. There will also be periodic, iterative opportunities for broader information sharing and input that will feed into the process. See below for more details on the timeline and feedback loop opportunities.

- Use of subgroups/working groups: It may be helpful for the Work Group to consider the use of subgroups to focus effort on particular topics. These subgroup efforts could serve as an opportunity to engage with a broader network of interested parties on key topics.

General Approach and 2022 Timeline:

(**YELLOW** highlights broader engagement opportunities.)

The following proposed approach and timeline assumes a set of recommendations that will be prepared in time for the 2023 Legislative session, as a milestone and marker nested in a longer-term effort. Future scoping and tasks of this Work Group will be developed as the process unfolds.

January-March 2022: Education Phase

Tasks:

- Develop and agree to working agreements and commitments to guide the group's effort.
- Develop a shared understanding of key factors impacting Oregon's water future: population dynamics, climate and ecological changes, infrastructure, etc.
- Study various regional/basin approaches and capture lessons learned, evaluate pros and cons for bringing into the Oregon system.

March 2022: Foundational Principles

- Task: Develop agreement around a set of principles that will provide the foundation for a state-supported regional water management and planning system for Oregon.

March: "Findings" and "Principles" information sharing and opportunity for broader feedback loop. The Work Group refines ideas based on feedback loops.

March-June 2022: Regional / Basin Construct

- Task: Develop concept(s) for regional or basin approach to water planning, management, investments that aligns with established principles. Seek agreement on concept(s).

June: Draft concepts shared for broader feedback loop and refinement by Work Group.

July-September 2022: State Construct / Framework

- Task: Define roles and responsibilities of the state to integrate with regional efforts and make strategic decisions about planning, management and investments.

September: Framework concepts shared for broader feedback loop and refinement by Group.

October-November 2022: Consensus agreements and next steps- comprehensive

- Task: Finalize consensus agreements, package recommendations, complete process report and determine next steps.

November: Broad information sharing opportunity to roll out consensus agreements and next steps.

APPENDIX I: INTERVIEW PARTICIPANT LIST BY ORGANIZATION

Organizations Interviewed

- Association of Clean Water Agencies
- Association of Oregon Counties
- Affiliated Tribes of the Northwest Indians
- Business Oregon
- Coalition of Oregon Land Trusts
- Commissioner Craig Pope
- Commissioner Kristen Shelman
- Commissioner Les Perkins
- Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde
- Confederated Tribes of Siletz
- Curry Watersheds Partnership
- Department of Environmental Quality
- Deschutes Basin Water Collaborative
- Deschutes River Conservancy
- Department of State Lands
- Harney County Place-Based Water Planning
- Family Farm Alliance
- Farmers Conservation Alliance
- Freshwater Trust
- Governor's Office
- John Day Place-Based Water Planning
- Klamath Tribes
- LaGrande Place-Based Water Planning
- League of Oregon Cities
- League of Women Voters
- NE Oregon Water Association
- Mid-Coast Place-Based Water Planning
- Oregon Association of Conservation Districts

- Oregon Association of Nurseries
- Oregon Association of Water Utilities
- Oregon Business Council
- Oregon Cattlemen's Association
- Oregon Department of Agriculture
- Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Oregon Environmental Council
- Oregon Farm Bureau
- Oregon Groundwater Association
- Oregon Health Authority – Drinking Water Services
- Oregon Lakes Association
- Oregon State Marine Board
- Oregon Water Resources Congress
- Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board
- Oregon Water Utility Council
- Oregon Water Resources Department
- Pineros y Campesinos Unidos del Noreste (PCUN)
- Special Districts Association of Oregon
- Sustainable Northwest
- Sybil Ackerman, Consultant
- The Nature Conservancy
- Trout Unlimited
- Tualatin Valley Water District
- Verde
- WaterReuse Pacific Northwest
- Water Watch
- Wild Salmon Center

Organizations that were contacted but did not participate in an interview

- American Whitewater Association
- Beyond Toxics
- Burns Paiute Tribe
- Coalition of Communities of Color
- Coalition of Oregon Land Trusts
- Columbia River Keepers
- Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians
- Confederated Tribes of Umatilla Reservation
- Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs
- Coquille Indian Tribe
- Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Indians
- NW Steelheaders
- Oregon Forest & Industries Council
- Oregon Outdoor Recreation Network
- Oregon Women's Sailing Association
- Oregon Small Woodlands Association

- Port Blakely
- Water for Life
- Willamette Riverkeeper

APPENDIX II: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. How would you describe Oregon’s current approach to water planning, management and investments?
2. What do you see as the biggest challenges and opportunities in the current water planning and management decision making approach? What would the result be if the current approach to water planning and management continues unchanged?
3. Do you think regions/basins could or should have new or expanded authorities or obligations for elements of water management (investment, planning, ongoing management)?
4. Similarly, do you think the State could or should have any new or expanded authorities/obligations that are different from what currently exists?
5. In your opinion, are there particular water planning or policy issues that would best be resolved at the basin or local level? How would these tie to the IWRS? What water issues would best be resolved on a statewide basis
6. Is there an equitable way/process to consider investments across the state? How do you include all impacted voices in guiding investment considerations?
7. Are there examples or ideas of governance approaches that you think would be helpful to consider as Oregon explores approaches to water governance?
8. Do you see a particular role for yourself/organization/government in this process? In what way? How do we assure a broad range of voices are included in design recommendations? Do you have suggestions of who else we should be talking to? Any suggestions on who should chair this effort?
9. Is there anything else that you’d like to share, or that wasn’t asked?

Appendix D. Work Group Operating Protocols

HB 5006 Work Group State-Supported Regional Water Planning and Management Operating Protocols

Background

HB 5006 directed the work of this Work Group. The legislation and budget note read:

“Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the General Fund appropriation made to the Water Resources Department by section 1 (5), chapter ___, Oregon Laws 2021 (Enrolled Senate Bill 5545), for the biennium beginning July 1, 2021, for the director’s office, is increased by \$500,000, for distribution to Oregon Consensus to convene a process to develop a framework and path for state-supported water planning and management at the water region and/or basin level.

Oregon Water Resources Department is directed to use provided funding to contract with Oregon Consensus to convene a workgroup comprised of a balanced membership including, but not limited to, conservation groups, agricultural water users, municipal water users, environmental justice organizations, tribal interests and state agencies including Water Resources Department and the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife to consider regional water management opportunities that build on the 100 Year Water Vision and further the goals of the Integrated Water Resources Strategy.”

Further informed by a process assessment conducted by OC (see Assessment Findings Memo for details), a Work Group has been established to meet the charge of the HB 5006 legislation. The Work Group's purpose and operating protocols are described in this document.

Work Group Purpose

The Work Group will use a consensus-based process to develop recommendations for a framework and path for state-supported water planning at the water region and/or basin level.

Objectives:

- Build upon past efforts including the 100-Year Water Vision and other Oregon regional planning processes.
- Further the goals of the IWRS.
- Gather information from the field, experts, and each other to build shared learning.
- Document information gathering and co-learning efforts.
- Create and strengthen relationships across groups with diverse interests and needs.
- Develop and deliberate on shared ideas for a State-Supported Regional Planning and Management Framework.

Work Group Members

HB 5006 included a budget note which included categories of groups to participate and further direction to set up a balance of representative seats. The named categories from the budget note are: conservation, agriculture, environmental justice, municipal, and tribes, as well as State Agencies: Oregon Water Resources Department (OWRD) and Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW). Additional categories of representation determined by the Process Leadership* to create a well-rounded representation of interests and geographies include: non-agricultural business interests, regional representation across Oregon's basins/watersheds, the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), and the Governor's Office.

Preferred Qualifications of the Work Group and its Members:

- Representation of interests across instream, out of stream, quality and quantity, and ecology/watershed health.
- Representation of statewide, regional, and community-specific experiences or perspectives.
- Representation of urban and rural experiences and perspectives from different watersheds dispersed across the state.
- Consideration of new voices to the table alongside those who have consistently been engaged in water policy negotiations.
- Consideration of diversity of backgrounds, identities and geographies.
- Demonstrated commitment to work in a consensus process to achieve the collective goals of all.
- Expertise or ability to take a systems-level view of the issues to develop a structure that serves all of Oregon.
- Interest in building relationships and learning collectively around water.
- Ability to commit consistent focus and time for a year-long effort which will require frequent (monthly or more often) meetings and a fair amount of in-between meeting work. This will include coordinating with constituencies to ensure no surprises and a good-faith effort to develop recommendations that everyone can live with.

Work Group Membership

Conservation

- Caylin Barter, Wild Salmon Center
- Kimberley Priestley, WaterWatch
- Chrysten Rivard, Trout Unlimited

Agriculture

- April Snell, Oregon Water Congress
- Mary Anne Cooper, Oregon Farm Bureau
- Jeff Stone, Oregon Nurseries Association

Environmental Justice

- Oriana Magnera, Verde
- Ana Molina, Environmental Equity Committee

Municipal, Local and County Governments, Special Districts

- Margaret Magruder, AOC, Columbia County Commissioner
- Adam Denlinger, SDAO, Seal Rock Water District
- Niki Iverson, LOC, Water Director City of Hillsboro & Chair of LOC Water/Wastewater Policy Committee

Tribes

- Bobby Brunoe, Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs
- Kathleen George, Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde
- Calla Hagle or Jason Fenton, Burns-Paiute Tribe
- Anton Chiono, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation
- Ileana Alexander, Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians
- Heather Bartlett, Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Indians

Non-Agricultural Business/Industry

- Dan Thorndike, Oregon Business Council
- Bob Rees, NW Guides and Anglers Association, recreation industry interest

Regional Perspectives

- Daniel Newberry, Johnson Creek Watershed Council
- Donna Beverage, Union County Commissioner
- Holly Mondo, Harney Community-Based Water Planning Collaborative
- JR Cook, NE Oregon Water Association
- Kate Fitzpatrick, Deschutes River Conservancy
- Kelly Timchak, Curry Watersheds Partnership
- Peggy Lynch, League of Women Voters

State Agencies (ex officio)

- OWRD - Tom Byler
- ODFW - Chandra Ferrari
- DEQ- Jennifer Wigal

Governor's Office (ex officio)

- Courtney Crowell

Attendance expected. To maintain the continuity of the discussion, it is important to have the members attend every meeting. Members are expected to make a good faith effort to attend all meetings. In the event of an unplanned emergency, the facilitation team will take steps to assure a missing member is provided an update about the meeting.

Use of Alternates: In the spirit of good faith commitments to engage in this process as a Work Group member, the use of alternates should only be used when absolutely necessary. Alternates should be prepared to serve in a proxy role by being up to speed and well-versed in the issues being discussed in the process and able to step in if needed without disrupting the work of the group. For major recommendation milestones, the Work Group will determine whether to proceed with a consensus check if the primary member is not present at the meeting.

Use of Task Groups: As a task-specific feature of the Work Group process, Task Groups may be formed to gather information and develop ideas or proposals for Work Group consideration. This process feature will be developed and directed by the Work Group as needed. Task Groups will not have a ‘decision making’ authority and all Task Group products will be iteratively funneled through the Work Group for further deliberation and consideration for consensus. Task Groups may be comprised of members of the Work Group, as well as additional outside expertise at the group’s invitation.

Additional Engagement Opportunities: The Work Group will determine its needs and articulate requests for broader stakeholder or public engagement, which may be in the form of:

- Recruiting additional perspectives or expertise to speak to the Work Group or work with Task Groups to inform development of ideas.
- Providing informational updates in other forums to inform key stakeholders of the work happening - may also include an invitation for input to the Work Group as it develops ideas;
- Identifying needs for a general public engagement process to help inform the Work Group, or to provide opportunity for the Work Group to share progress updates with the public.

OC and OWRD, with direction from the Work Group, will support broader engagement and public information sharing opportunities. This will include web-based information sharing, and hosting or attending public forums to provide updates on the Work Group effort and to gather feedback on specific pieces of work being developed within the Work Group process.

Decision-Making

The Work Group will strive for consensus on recommendations. Consensus is defined as, “willingness to accept the Work Group’s recommendation.” A consensus tool will be used by the facilitator to gauge levels of alignment on proposed concepts at iterative points in the process. A final consensus check on all recommendations will be done at the end of the process before a recommendation goes forward on behalf of the Work Group.

Consensus recommendations may be developed into legislative concepts, policy recommendations to the Oregon Water Resources Commission, or other decision making / implementation forums yet to be determined.

Consensus Tool: Using a scale of 1-5 to gauge the level of agreement on a given proposal or idea: “1” = I enthusiastically support this proposal or idea. “2” = I am ok with this proposal or idea. “3”= I am neutral, on the fence, or have minor concerns about this proposal or idea. “4”= I have serious questions or concerns, but will not ultimately block this proposal or idea. “5”= I oppose and will actively block this proposal or idea. As time allows, “4” and “5” will offer amendments to the proposal or idea and a consensus check of the group will be redone with the refinement. If time does not permit, work group member(s) can offer explanations for their serious concerns or questions and these will be documented.

Communications

Open to the public, documented meetings. The Work Group meetings will be recorded while on zoom. The OC facilitation team will prepare high level meeting summaries that will document the Work Group proceedings including issues discussed, options and proposals discussed, action items and consensus recommendations or other conclusions of the work. These meeting summaries will be posted on the OWRD project web page: [HB 5006 Work Group project page](#)

Work Group records, such as formal documents, discussion drafts, meeting summaries and exhibits are public records. Work Group communications are not confidential and may be disclosed. However, the private documents of individual work group members generally are not considered public records if OWRD or another public body does not use or retain copies.

Media relations: OWRD will be the point of contact with the public and media about meetings, agenda topics and general process related to this effort. As a general practice, OWRD will coordinate with the Work Group on media communications in advance.

Speaking on behalf of the Work Group: All members agree to refrain from making comments about or representing the views of other members with regards to this Work Group process in contacts with the media, nor represent or characterize the positions and views of any other work group member in other public forums. Unless explicitly and specifically delegated to do so by the Work Group, members agree not to speak on behalf of the group outside of the Work Group forum.

Member Participation Norms

It is expected that all members help to create an environment where all perspectives can be shared to promote comprehensive exploration of issues and the creation of shared and heard understanding and consensus building on recommendations. To that end, Work Group members agree to work in good faith:

- Respect others' time; be prepared for and attend meetings, and follow through on promises and commitments;
- Be respectful of perspectives different than your own;
- Stay focused on the Work Group charge;
- Bring concerns related to this work from their interest group or organization up for discussion at the earliest point possible in the process;
- Share all relevant information that will assist the group in achieving its goals;
- As appropriate, keep their organizations or interested communities informed of the process and substance;
- Stay accountable to and help other members stay accountable to the Work Group process as defined in these Operating Protocols;
- Engage in honest, open-minded, and constructive discussions to seek understanding and optimal outcomes; and
- Avoid substituting or alternating members whenever possible; and
- Raise process concerns in the group, not via outside forums or the media.

Should a group member appear to act in bad faith, the facilitator will talk with the individual(s) about the situation. A variety of approaches will be explored, accordingly, to redress the

concerns including the possibility of having the member removed. The authority to replace and/or remove a member from the group rests with the Process Leadership team.

Rights in Other Forums

Participation in the group does not limit the rights of any member. Members will make a good faith effort to notify the group in advance if another action outside the process will be initiated or pursued which could affect the issues, proposals, or agreements being discussed.

Organizational Structure

Process Leadership and Support

To provide process direction and support to the Work Group, a Process Leadership team will be comprised of the following:

- **Independent Facilitation Services:** Oregon Consensus will provide facilitation services for the forum that will include process development and management, preparing process documents, agendas, and meeting notes; facilitating work group forums; and assisting with the coordination and facilitation of broader engagement efforts into the process. OC will work on behalf of the whole group to support consensus-building efforts toward outcomes that the group can support.
- **Balanced and Strong Leadership:** At the outset and to get the process underway while the Work Group is forming, Legislative leadership from the former Interim House Water Committee (Representatives Helm, Owens and Reardon) and the Chair of the Oregon Water Resources Commission (Reeves) will serve in a process leadership capacity, ensuring the process goals and sideboards are well defined and that the group successfully meets its deliverables in a timely manner. They will not drive the substantive outcomes, but rather work to support consensus building and provide clarity as needed to promote the progress of the group. As needed, leadership can support the process to affirm that the work that is happening is in fact responsive to the legislative intent that directed it.
- **Lead Technical and Communications Support:** OWRD staff will be the technical resource lead and provide communications support to the Work Group forum. Other state agencies will also engage and provide technical support as needed and determined by the Work Group.
- **Work Group Coordination Committee:** A smaller subset of Work Group members may be initiated, at the group's request, to volunteer and work with Oregon Consensus and OWRD staff on agenda planning, including organizing around information gathering and initial discussions about potential broader engagement efforts, among other process topics. All information discussed by this committee will be transparent and reviewed/refined by the full Work Group to affirm direction as the effort unfolds.

Appendix E. Work Group Meeting Summaries

Meeting #1 Summary January 31, 2022 from 12:30-3:00pm

Meeting Attendees:

Work Group Members: Adam Denlinger, Ana Molina, Anton Chiono, April Snell, Bob Rees, Bobby Brunoe, Calla Hagle, Caylin Barter, Chandra Ferrari, Chrysten Rivard, Courtney Warner Crowell, Dan Thorndike, Daniel Newberry, Holly Mondo, Jeff Stone, JR Cook, Kate Fitzpatrick, Kathleen George, Kelly Timchak, Kimberley Priestley, Margaret Magruder, Mary Anne Cooper, Niki Iverson, Oriana Magnera, Peggy Lynch, Roselynn Lwenya, Richard Whitman, Tiffany Monroe, Tom Byler, Wally McCullough

Facilitation Team: Robin Harkless and Jennah Stillman, Oregon Consensus

Process Leadership: Representative Reardon, Representative Helm, Representative Owens, OWRC Chair Meg Reeves

MEETING SUMMARY:

Welcome, Opening Remarks and Group Charge

Facilitator Robin Harkless, Oregon Consensus, welcomed the group and invited members of the HB 5006 Process Leadership team to provide opening remarks. All shared their appreciation for everyone making the time to be there today and for their commitment to this work.

Meg Reeves, OWRC Chair, acknowledged the importance of this group's work ahead regarding the many water resource challenges across the state. Noting the significant efforts of past and current regional planning efforts, she highlighted the value of planning from the ground up that includes diverse community voices and localized knowledge into the process. Representative Reardon acknowledged that although there are many considerations for Oregon's water future relative to climate disruption, population growth and pollution, the legislative direction for this group's scope of work is to improve approaches to water planning and funding decisions. By developing a framework for state-supported regional and basin-level planning, the intention is to build on past efforts and the 100 Year Water Vision, and to further the goals of the IWRS, which will serve all Oregonians.

Representative Owens shared that there are now more water challenges facing Oregon than ever and as such, the state can't take a 'one size fits all' approach. He noted that the Place-based Planning Pilot funding will sunset in 2023 and there are lessons to be learned in order to inform what model comes next. He also spoke to the scope of the work group and acknowledged that although conversations may be needed for topics such as permitting, water rights, prior appropriations, etc. that they should not drift into the goal of this process. This group can determine recommendations for how regions and communities can best meet the current and future water needs and balance respective water interests in the state, and how the state can best support those planning and implementation efforts moving forward. He noted that the work of

this group is anticipated to manifest in policy recommendations for the 2023 legislative session, and that the representatives will support the process and outcomes.

Representative Helm acknowledged the historic moment and need for this group, with the opportunity to have an important impact on the future of Oregon's water management. He noted the current challenges and climate threats facing society, recognizing the persisting reality of drought and the incremental pressure on resources and people. He encouraged the work group members to come together for collective progress, for recommendations and priorities that will be handed to the next Governor to make those ideas a reality.

Courtney Warner Crowell, Water Policy Advisor for Governor Brown, shared that she and Morgan Gratz-Weiser from the Governor's Natural Resource Office will be engaged throughout the process and are committed to shepherding this work into the next Governor's administration. She noted that managing state water resources will become more challenging over time and they look forward to supporting this collaborative work in order to build resilient and forward-looking systems.

Tom Byler, OWRD Director, echoed his appreciation for the points shared and stated that the HB 5006 legislation directed OWRD and Oregon Consensus to convene this work group. OWRD and other state agencies will participate in an ex-officio role, to listen and serve as technical resource experts. He noted that OWRD will also be responsible for communications and are in the process of developing a dedicated webpage ([here](#)) for this effort where information regarding the process, upcoming meetings, and summaries and materials for past meetings will be available. Also, OWRD will be looking at a variety of ways to communicate about this work more broadly and bring as many voices as possible in. OWRD is committed to keeping this group updated about other important conversations underway, such as the Tribal Task Force on Water, engagement with environmental justice communities, and others, and that information would flow both ways regarding this effort in order to understand different processes, where and how they may connect. He added that OWRD recently hired a new employee, Lili Prahl, who will soon join this effort.

Oregon Consensus and Agenda Overview

Robin Harkless, Oregon Consensus, noted that the OC facilitation team has been working closely with the Process Leadership team to get this effort organized to this point. She shared that Oregon Consensus is a program housed at Mark Hatfield School of Government at Portland State University that serves as a public policy alternate dispute resolution service for Oregon governments and communities, with specialization in collaborative governance and decision-making on behalf of the public. OC will work in service to the work group members to guide the process and help build collaboration and consensus recommendations. She then discussed the initial assessment that OC conducted and reviewed the themes that emerged. She noted that the assessment, in consultation with Process Leadership, informed and organized the process structure to ensure meaningful discovery, deliberation and consensus-building for recommendations on structuring a system that integrates regional and local efforts with state tools and resources, and creates a state framework for decision-making.

Work Group Introductions

The work group members each introduced themselves and shared their hopes and expectations for this effort. A summary of the responses pertaining to process hopes included, but was not limited to:

- Advancing and modernizing water management for longevity
- Building upon existing strategies to update the IWRS
- Integrating the full breadth of state tools and working beyond silos
- Balancing in stream and out of stream uses
- Developing recommendations for the next legislative session
- Building trust and relationships, co-learning from different perspectives and experiences, and addressing differences in a productive way
- Identifying a resilient, adaptable, and feasible framework for planning and implementation
- Addressing species facing extinction and the connection to native people, and incorporating Traditional Ecological Knowledge into planning
- Effectively translating deliverables to communities and bringing more voices to the table
- Bringing accountability and water justice into work moving forward
- Incorporating hydroelectric interest

Following this, Robin mentioned that all nine federally recognized tribes have been invited to serve on the Work Group. Membership may change as more tribes respond, but otherwise the work group as it stands is set for the next year.

Operating Protocols

Robin then reviewed the proposed draft Operating Protocols, which she noted were intended to set-up the collaborative process, develop a shared understanding and alignment on procedures, and allow the group to focus on the substantive issues moving forward. She provided a very high level overview of the draft document, pointing to the purpose, make up and deliverables of the group; decision making and communication protocols; and the approach and timeline sections.

She also discussed opportunities for broader engagement and input, which she noted would be based on direction from the work group but could be developed for information sharing and feedback in external forums; bringing voices in to the Work Group process; or other channels. Regarding communications for the work group, Robin shared that meetings will be open to the public and the facilitation team will document the meetings with high level summaries that capture the discussions, action items, and any clear areas of alignment or consensus. The meetings are not intended to be recorded. Meeting summaries and supporting materials will be posted on the OWRD webpage. She noted it is proposed that OWRD be the point of contact for media and will coordinate with the work group as needed to confirm information going through media channels. This process is set up to be consensus- or agreement-seeking and a consensus tool will be offered at the next meeting and the group will look to approve the Protocols at that time.

Feedback and Questions:

- There was a suggestion made to be more specific regarding work group members not speaking on behalf of the whole group unless specifically delegated to do so, to clarify that this is specifically connected to this work group and process and not others.
- A question was raised regarding who would be responsible for writing the final recommendations. In response, Robin shared that as a best practice, the group would consider writing their own and potentially use a Task Group to draft recommendations for the full work group to review, provide feedback, and approve. Oregon Consensus will directly support the consensus recommendations drafting efforts and can assist with pen-holding for the time being if the group prefers.
- An inquiry regarding the process to communicate questions or topics of interest to address in future meeting agendas was raised. In response, Robin noted that those requests should be sent to her and Jennah Stillman (Oregon Consensus Project Associate). OC will initiate a system for gathering and compiling information sources before the next meeting.
- One member shared that they felt the purpose of the work group still felt a bit unclear, particularly regarding the sideboards for management and for who a recommended decision making framework would apply to.
- A question was raised regarding whether the need for more data to support regional planning efforts would be addressed.
- A suggestion was made that it could be helpful to post examples of similar efforts and lessons learned on the OWRD webpage or shared forum to inform the work group and others, in an effort to not reinvent the wheel.

Next Steps

In closing, Robin shared that a robust discovery process will be important for the first couple months of work and that at the next meeting, the group would dive into substantive topics. She also shared that we will aim to set a regular cadence for the meeting schedule moving forward based on general availability of the group. She invited work group members to review the Operating Protocols and send any friendly amendments by way of email, which would be integrated into an updated version and would be sent back to the group for advance review before Meeting #2. She also acknowledged that there are many voices and communities that aren't necessarily sitting at the table, and that there is intention to work in partnership to reach out and make connections to bring information and to share information out throughout the process. There will be more to come regarding this broader engagement approach.

Tom added that Meeting #2 will aim to develop a shared baseline understanding of the system that we have today and the context of how things work. This will likely include a presentation from OWRD and perhaps additional state agency staff, and will be paired with reflections from on the ground experiences in basin- community, or regional- scale planning around the state and their experiences in navigating the current system. Meeting #3 will add in reflections from models outside the state and perhaps other sectors.

Meeting #2 Summary

March 8, 2022 from 11:00am-3:00pm

Meeting Attendees:

Work Group Members: Adam Denlinger, Ana Molina, Anton Chiono, April Snell, Bob Rees, Bobby Brunoe, Calla Hagle, Caylin Barter, Chandra Ferrari, Chrysten Rivard, Courtney Warner Crowell, Dan Thorndike, Daniel Newberry, Donna Beverage, Holly Mondo, Jason Fenton, JR Cook, Kathleen George, Kimberley Priestley, Margaret Magruder, Mary Anne Cooper, Oriana Magnera, Peggy Lynch, Richard Whitman, Roselynn Lwenya, Tiffany Monroe, Tom Byler, Wally McCullough

Facilitation Team: Robin Harkless and Jennah Stillman, Oregon Consensus

MEETING SUMMARY:

Welcome and Introductions

Facilitator Robin Harkless, Oregon Consensus, welcomed the group and invited members to introduce themselves and where they were currently located. She shared that a couple work group members were unable to attend the meeting that day, but were still engaged in the effort. Lili Prael, the new WRD Regional Planning Coordinator, was introduced and acknowledged that she would be available to provide support for the work group moving forward. Robin then reviewed the meeting agenda and noted the objectives to continue providing an orientation to, and understanding of the process, and working towards agreement in initiating that work together.

Operating Protocols and Meeting #1 Follow-up

Robin shared appreciation for the feedback, comments, suggestions, and questions that members provided on the Draft Operating Protocols. She acknowledged that reviewing and discussing the protocols would serve as a critical step in the Work Group determining its norms to be most effective and accountable in working together to deliver tangible results and meet the legislative direction from HB 5006. She suggested that the goal for today was for the work group to reach a place of sufficient comfort and clarity in their operating procedures to take the next step into content and set the course for task-oriented work and directed information gathering.

The group then reviewed the Draft Operating Protocols (previous version can be found [here](#)). A summary of the following themes discussed included, but were not limited to:

- **Purpose and Deliverables.** Many acknowledged the significant amount of work, broad deliverables, and ability to accomplish that in one year, as well as the challenges of doing so in a virtual forum. Some shared that developing a recommended structure for regional/basin planning felt manageable, but also noted that the state's role in support and integration of regional efforts was a critical component for success. Some expressed that addressing and modernizing the state's decision making framework was important but may be too large of a lift for the timeline at hand. Recognizing the diversity and wealth of experience embodied in the work group composition, there was general agreement around the importance of evaluating and building upon past efforts, cultivating shared learning, and building trust and relationships, as well as concrete shared ideas or recommendations.
- **Information Gathering.** Individuals offered suggestions for topics or information they wanted to see, this was a brainstorming format and not a discussion among the group at

this meeting. Some raised the suggestion and desire for the group to understand the history and current status of water planning and management in Oregon, as well as lessons learned from various regional efforts in order to identify successful components, gaps, roadblocks, and opportunities for improvement, both on the regional and state level. Some of the initial inquiry areas identified by work group members were around how other states have supported and integrated regional planning to develop a state water plan with clear region-level goals and strategies; inventorying what has/hasn't worked in the past; participatory engagement in past planning; identifying who wasn't at the table and how they were impacted by planning efforts; how accountability has/hasn't been addressed and what that should look like; engaging the Racial Justice Council in collecting statewide data to inform investment decisions and identify opportunities to make meaningful impacts; engaging other state agencies based on their roles with water and regional planning as needed (ODA, DSL, DLC, OWEB and ODF); and developing shared definitions for 'regional,' 'state-supported,' and 'local.'

- **Task Groups.** As the work group focus shifts to substance and the inquiry needs/areas become more defined, the work group will determine what content is most important to cover during full meetings together in support of shared learning, and what topic-specific work or questions should be directed to task groups. The task groups can identify and recruit additional expertise or resources needed in order to inform the needs and ideas directed by the work group. A question was raised regarding how to balance the time commitment and challenges of capacity with the various work spaces and timeline.
- **Coordination Committee.** There was general agreement about the need for a volunteer subset of the work group to work with Oregon Consensus and help coordinate content in-between meetings to ensure that agendas are being developed to meet the group's needs, and help organize process elements so that the work group space can be focused on issue substance. Robin noted that this coordination work will be transparent and shared with the full group, and anyone will have the opportunity to provide feedback. Volunteers for this group included: Oriana Magnera, Holly Mondo, April Snell, Margaret Magruder, Kimberley Priestley and Caylin Barter.
- **Tribal Engagement.** Some members expressed a desire to learn more about different tribal perspectives related to water planning and management, and asked how to integrate tribal representation in the process that is different from other stakeholders.

Robin also shared a visual representation of the work group's process structure and proposed timeline ([here](#)). Based on the group's overall direction, discussion and refinement, Robin proposed to revise the protocols once more in order to get the document to a more finalized place before the group confirms it and moves forward. She suggested that as the Work Group's conversations and information sharing ensues, more specific scope and deliverables will become clearer. There was general agreement to revisit the topic of deliverables in a few months.

State of the System- State Lens

Tom Byler, OWRD, provided a brief overview of the history around the state's water planning and the ways in which it has, or hasn't, changed to exist today. He also spoke about what is involved with planning, how it ties to key strategic documents, how it intersects with various state agencies and their authorities and responsibilities, and how it links to this group's work

ahead. Kim Fritz-Ogren, OWRD, introduced the presentation where she, Jennifer Wigal and Rian Hooff from DEQ, Curtis Cude from OHA, Chandra Ferrari from ODFW, and Eric Hartstein from OWEB each briefly spoke to their respective agency's various roles, programs, tools and responsibilities related to regional and statewide water planning and management; capacity considerations; and areas of interagency coordination. You can view the [presentation slides](#) and watch [the recording](#) for more detailed information.

Work Group Debrief and Thoughts, Themes, and Questions Emerging

Some work group members acknowledged that other state agencies, beyond those that presented during the meeting, are also involved in water programs and responsibilities, and as such, should be considered to bring into the process. The suggested agencies and potential topics to consider included, but were not limited to: ODA (agricultural use), OHA (drinking water systems), ODF (work with DEQ on water quality), DLCDC (siting of storage/land use program), and DSL (wetlands/natural systems).

In its debrief of the presentations, individuals offered suggestions for topics or information they wanted to see, this was a brainstorming format and not a discussion among the group at this meeting. Some noted that although state management is not a 'one size fits all,' the structure appears to be siloed as it relates to natural resource agencies involved in water related efforts. Many expressed a desire for better integration of state agency work, management, resources, and data sets, which was acknowledged would take time but also that there are many building blocks (e.g. IWRS, basin plans, agency planning efforts, etc.) to start with. It was also acknowledged this work group's effort is not intended to divest the state in management authority, but to identify mechanisms and pathways to better integrate regional efforts with the state structure.

A couple members raised questions about additional information they hoped to learn from state agencies, like what gaps the agencies themselves saw in engaging with regional planning and implementation, or barriers that they encountered when serving people and projects around the state. Related to the interaction between state agencies and regional planning efforts, another suggestion was made to consider hearing from community perspectives about how the agency engagement, gaps, or barriers were experienced on the ground, and to learn how different regional planning efforts have or haven't engaged with these state programs, tools, and resources.

Next Steps

Operating Protocols: Robin shared that OC will send-out the updated protocols based on today's discussion for work group member final review and approval, to confirm that they are complete and clear enough to move forward in this process. Any major lingering questions or concerns regarding the process for the group should be shared as a suggested edit. Any suggested edits will be shared with the rest of the group via email.

April Meeting Content: As directed by the work group, the next meeting will focus on hearing from various regional/basin planning groups in Oregon to share their experiential perspectives on what worked well, or what didn't, and any thoughts on gaps or experiences working with the state. This initial round of presentations will feature efforts that involved work group members,

like the Place-Based Planning pilots (and evaluation results), Deschutes Basin Collaborative, Columbia River-Umatilla Solutions Team, and Tualatin Basin Flow Management. This learning process will be ongoing, but this next round of information sharing and dialogue could help direct the topics and needs of potential task groups, which will likely initiate in April or May. The coordination committee will discuss this approach as well as emerging needs, and can offer ideas back to the full work group.

In-Person Meetings: The group signaled a general desire to meet in-person. Robin shared that OC will send-out a poll to gauge interest, availability, and considerations for safety and logistics, and would possibly look to May or June for a potential in-person meeting, depending on the will of the group. The group also discussed the idea of possibly adding on additional community forums, field tours, etc. to in-person meetings, but acknowledged the current uncertainties due to COVID-19 mandates in transition. Robin shared that resources are available to support work group member travel for in-person meetings.

Closing Remarks: Courtney Warner Crowell shared that the Governor's office signed the first drought declaration of the year, which signals why this discussion and work around regional water management is critical. Representatives Reardon, Owens and Helm affirmed the group's direction and noted the importance of the work group members having ownership of the process and products, as well as adhering to the sideboards previously discussed, and following guidance from the legislation and budget note. They shared their appreciation for the commitment to this critical effort, and providing an eventual product that helps direct the state.

Upcoming Meetings: The OWRC will meet on March 17 and 18th, and the initial Place-Based Planning Evaluation will be presented on the 18th tentatively around 10:45am. The meeting recording will be posted on the website afterwards ([here](#)). The next work group meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, April 5th from 11am-3pm on Zoom.

Meeting #3 Summary **April 5, 2022 from 11:00am-3:00pm**

Meeting Attendees:

Work Group Members: Adam Denlinger, Ana Molina, Anton Chiono, April Snell, Bob Rees, Calla Hagle, Caylin Barter, Chandra Ferreri, Chrysten Rivard, Courtney Warner Crowell, , Dan Thorndike, Donna Beverage, Heather Bartlett, Holly Mondo, Jason Fenton, Jennifer Wigal (alternate for DEQ), JR Cook, Kate Fitzpatrick, Kathleen George, Kelly Timchak, Kim Fritz-Ogren, Kimberley Priestley, Lili Prahl, Margaret Magruder, Niki Iverson, Oriana Magnera, Peggy Lynch, Rebecca McClain, Robert Brunoe, Tiffany Monroe, Tom Byler, Wally McCoulough.

Facilitation Team: Robin Harkless and Jennah Stillman, Oregon Consensus

MEETING SUMMARY:

Welcome and Introductions

Facilitator Robin Harkless, Oregon Consensus, welcomed the group and acknowledged a new member, Heather Bartlett, who had been appointed to represent the Cow Creek Umpqua Tribe since the last meeting. Robin shared appreciation for the workgroup members who had volunteered to serve on the Coordinating Committee and assist with the content categorization and agenda for this meeting. In continuing the shared learning process and information-gathering based on the group's direction and questions of interest, she noted that topics for today were focused on various place-based or regional planning efforts throughout the state. The intention for the high-level presentations was to bring collective information forward for the group, to see how different efforts have emerged, evolved, and navigated the state system, and to help determine topic areas to focus this group's effort.

Operating Protocols

As a reminder, Robin shared that the draft Operating Protocols document had been updated since the last meeting and was sent to the work group for review as an action item. She noted that the major changes included scaling back "Purpose" language and deferring to the known legislative charge, which directs the group to discuss state-supported region and/or basin level water planning. Work Group members had the opportunity to share any consensus responses for "5" serious concerns that they 'do not agree with and cannot live with as written,' and to propose an alternate proposal before the meeting. Robin acknowledged that although no "5's" were elevated during that time, a couple members had shared "4's" via email regarding serious questions or concerns and that for one member, this was due to not having spent enough time in the process. Additionally, a couple members had raised issues regarding definitions for 'regional,' 'place-based,' 'local' and 'grassroots,' as well as 'community.' Robin noted that this was an important topic to revisit and work through in substantive conversation, and acknowledged a memo that had been sent from AOC/LOC with suggestions for definition.

Robin asked the group if the Operating Protocols were good enough for now, with the intention to revisit them later in the process deliberative space to assess any adjustments or changes that may be needed. She shared that if there were still any continued serious concerns to get to a place of procedural step forward, the OC facilitation team would follow-up with those individuals and work with them to determine how to address their concerns. Work Group members then provided their 1-5 responses in the chat. A 'consensus' was reached by Work Group members present, with four 'serious questions and concerns' regarding continuing uncertainty about the scope/purpose of the group that the OC team will follow-up on.

Robin acknowledged the challenge of starting without a specific task and encouraged members to continue bringing questions and ideas forward to make meaning of their time together.

Oregon Regional Planning Efforts

(View the [presentation slides](#) or [watch the recording](#) for more detailed information.)

Robin teed up the presentations by reminding the group that the framing questions came from Work Group members and that each effort would not be judged or compared to other planning efforts; but were intended to share their lessons learned and help identify a collective story about how 'place-based' or 'regional' planning efforts have emerged or evolved, how they look on the

ground, and how they have navigated the state system; to inform this group's work. She also acknowledged that the time was limited for presentations and that supplemental background information on each of the planning efforts was documented by OWRD's Lili Prah, in consultation with the presenters. A link to that living / draft document can be found here: [Regional Planning Efforts FAQ](#).

Place-Based Planning Pilot Evaluation

Rebecca McLain, Principal Researcher, National Policy Consensus Center, shared an overview of the Place-Based Planning Pilot program and evaluation. The main challenges identified in the evaluation regarding the program's Five Step Framework included, but were not limited to: vague guidelines and steps that weren't available early on; high-level of distrust with state agencies; tension between local and state expectations; challenges in balancing multiple, diverse water interests in process; consensus-decision making; and capacity. Suggestions for process adjustment and improvement included, but were not limited to: adding a 'step 0' for relationship building; advanced data set preparation by the state; clear expectations for what should be in the plan; adding a step around plan implementation guidance; addressing capacity (for both agency staff and planning groups). Rebecca also noted that improvements had already been made through the pilot learning that have addressed many of the challenges noted above. In conclusion: the program is important, complex and hard to do, and needs a longer time horizon of support.

NOTE: The Lower John Day PBP pilot was not presented today.

Mid-Coast Water Planning Partnership

Adam Denlinger, SDAO, Seal Rock Water District, shared key takeaways from the Mid-Coast PBP perspective which included, but were not limited to: breaking down silos was an important first step, as was developing an inclusive community forum; it took time to develop trust and build relationships; and offered field tours as a mechanism of stakeholder engagement. He noted that it would have helped the process to have better sideboards on expectations and overall mission clarity, given that too much capacity was spent in the weeds on some topics when it could have been focused and prioritized earlier on for more efficiency with capacity. Additionally, he shared that one significant success of the partnership included the development of the Mid-Coast Water Conservation Consortium.

Upper Grande Ronde River Watershed Partnership

Donna Beverage, Union County Commissioner, provided an overview of the key elements involved in the planning effort which included, but were not limited to: staying within budget, largely due to the significant contribution of volunteer time; continuity with one consultant that was the right fit for their process; creating space for individuals and side meetings to work through issues separately and then bring resolutions forward to the main group; and developing an educational outreach video. She spoke about the basin-level planning scale and the sub-basin organizational approach to elevate different realities and needs within the basin. In determining who would be part of the decision-making process, she noted that individuals were required to live or work within the watershed basin in order to vote.

Harney Community-Based Planning Collaborative

Holly Mondo, Project Manager, Harney Community-Based Planning Collaborative, shared key elements of that effort which included, but were not limited to: building trust and relationships with the community in the beginning and acknowledging the differing levels of comfort with coming to the table; the group's structure, which included an internal team of paid project staff, a coordinating committee subset, and a larger collaborative which included working groups that focused on specific topics and targeted steps; and using a 1-5 consensus agreement process tool. She acknowledged that it wasn't clear what state-supported has meant or will mean for this process, but noted that there was a generally good relationship and partnership with the state, despite a lack of trust. Other challenges included, but were not limited to: a lack of clarity for how the state will fund or implement the plan; subsequent impact on community perceptions for how this work will be prioritized moving forward; transitions with project managers and general capacity; rigidity with the linear planning structure; lack of efficiency in the sequencing of steps and in addressing unforeseen gaps for needs that arose along the way (data, capacity, technical assistance requests, etc). Holly shared a suggestion that in order to demonstrate the value of the plans, OWRD could consider providing a staff person for each region to be responsible for implementing them. She also noted that if the plan is approved by the state, there is hope that it would be elevated to receive funding in order to implement.

Columbia River-Umatilla Solutions Team

JR Cook, NE Oregon Water Association, and Kimberley Priestley, WaterWatch, shared an overview of the CRUST process. They noted that it was initiated to stave off continued legislative battles over Columbia River water and fix long-standing over-appropriation issues of native groundwater aquifers and as such, had a high level of state commitment and support which included, but was not limited to: the Governor's Office direction and co-convening leadership; state agency directors at the table for every meeting; sideboards provided by the Governor's office. Other key elements included, but were not limited to: having the necessary data to inform decisions; targeted geographic range, the development of screening principles which helped focus ideas brought to the table and improve overall efficiency; having a 'consensus bucket' and 'not consensus bucket' to allow for flexibility and progress in conversations; and providing some protections to participate in the process. Challenges include, but are not limited to: lack of memorialization for future steps which broke continuity of understanding through political transitions and required re-education; lack of agency commitment to implement recommendations of CRUST, the need for implementation benchmarks; and lack of clarity with the state's role as a partner or a leader.

Deschutes Basin Water Collaborative

Kate Fitzpatrick, Deschutes River Conservancy, and Bobby Brunoe, Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs, shared that the DBWC does not have a comprehensive plan, but have made progress through an iterative process of planning and implementation. The key elements that they identified included, but were not limited to: integrating tribal perspectives and policy in consensus building; continuity, resources and capacity provided by a designated entity (DRC) to sustain efforts; establishing a data baseline that involved existing state and federal, along with active gathering from local sources; hosting engagement forums for the broader community to educate and share information about water. They noted that the state's engagement evolved over time from a reactive administrative role to active support of and contribution to the basin study process. They noted, however, that long-time OWRD representation on the DRC board has been

valuable and has provided continuity at the local level. They felt that the state was not best equipped to respond to basin policy challenges and questions, and would like to see them moving forward as important partners to engage with in problem solving around policy issues. They indicated that an important element of state support was investing in community capacity and facilitation for sustaining efforts.

Water for Irrigation, Streams and the Economy

Craig Harper, Watershed Administrator for Medford Water Commission, spoke about the WISE effort in southern Oregon, which he noted had received strong support from the state and was still continuing implementation through evolving efforts in connection with the Rogue Basin Partnership and watershed councils. Key elements included committing to and maintaining an efficient schedule and providing funding for a full-time coordinator. Implementing pilots early on helped demonstrate the effectiveness of the collaboration and brought more funding in. Some of the challenges included, but were not limited to: a lack of tribal participation early in the process, and declining public and stakeholder engagement overtime, which he noted was due to a long project timeline, limited capacity and reluctance to move forward.

Tualatin River Basin Regional Water Supply Partnerships & Flow Management Committee

Niki Iverson, Water Director City of Hillsboro & Chair of LOC Water/Wastewater Policy Committee, shared an overview of the Tualatin River Flow Management Committee. Key elements of this effort included, but were not limited to: local data management; multi-agency and partner collaborative funding structure to support shared staff capacity, monitoring and maintenance; coordination on partnership projects that include shared data and issue identification; ongoing stakeholder engagement and education; robust communication of annual reports and daily listserv with accessible data information for the public; success with voluntary conservation measures; requirement that all users measure and monitor water use in the basin; ongoing alternatives analysis to verify viability or inform adaptive management.

Work Group Discussion and Brainstorming

The group used a virtual brainstorming ‘sticky note’ exercise to share their reflections on themes from the presentations: critical concerns the group should be looking at; principles that they thought might be important for the system/structure; or key topics for the Work Group to explore or address. A summary of the following topics and questions suggested by individuals and in follow-up discussion with the presenters, included, but was not limited to:

Baseline data, needs, and assets

- Understand who the water users are.
- What places do not currently have a water plan?
- Identify what foundational data is needed upfront.
- Agency role in collecting, analyzing and providing timely data and technical assistance (coordinating around this timing and availability).
- Desire for more information about the current data gaps (pure data, studies, scale of information, etc), for statewide-use and/or certain areas, and planning needs.
- State funding is needed to address data gaps (e.g. water supply, use and demand; incorporate TMDLs).

- Consider water quality along with quantity, and projected future to meet the needs of the community and ecology. Address both instream and out of stream needs (bedrock of PBP and from IWRS).
- Funding for facilitation.
- Is there a way to prioritize the level of need for planning and discussion?
- Consider the role of septic systems or exempt wells, recognizing that smaller/financially limited towns need updated sewer and drinking water systems.
- What are the problems/future problems, and how to talk about those?

Informed and engaged community(ies)

- How do you determine who gets a seat at the table in the process?
- What are ways to determine decision-making authority?
- For planning geographies, consider that stakeholders from outside a given basin may have interests and standing planning (e.g. recreation, fish, wildlife, treaty rights, etc) for the public resource.
- Address the needs and rights of historically marginalized people.
- Need to understand tribal engagement and at what level it is best integrated.
- Suggested presentation from the Water Futures Project to educate and help inform a shared understanding of marginalized communities and their experiences.
- How were County Commissioners engaged in PBP or other planning processes?
- How were local water right holders engaged and how were conflicts addressed? Planning for the future engages around the fact that the resource is largely already allocated to water right holders.
- What are different regions' willingness to participate in different processes?
- Timing matters. Need to build trust and understanding early and ongoing with stakeholder involvement, especially those facing big impacts and big barriers to engagement. Can't take too long and risk losing interest or momentum.
- What are ways to create engagement opportunities for broader feedback from those who aren't at the main table, or who have not been included? What was the motivation for those initially not interested, to come to the table to create a better solution? How to seek out those perspectives?
- It's not just about engaging more stakeholders, but engaging the right balance of stakeholders to achieve community and state outcomes.
- How to move beyond efforts to "pass the responsibility" and try to shift the need for change to other parties?

Flexibility to adapt and respond to unique conditions and characteristics of a place

- Acknowledge the resource disparity between different areas.
- Suggested presentations from planning groups who haven't gone through the maturation process as other regional efforts.
- How can the state accommodate and support existing, established planning efforts and areas that do not yet have one, in the same system?
- How does the planning process work in counties where water rights haven't been adjudicated (e.g. Douglas County)?
- Most of the groups that presented defined their own 'place/region.' Didn't that work?

- Importance of planning scale - each basin is unique. Broad regional approaches may be too large and political boundaries may not match up.
- The state's species protection and water quality regulations are not adequately protecting salmonid species which are facing extinction in some basins.
- How do we embed climate change projections in our planning (2050 horizon)?

Regional planning and state management

- Acknowledge need for leadership from the state.
- Water is a public resource that belongs to all Oregonians, not simply to those living in a certain community. Any planning needs to recognize this and include voices that represent broader interests in water.
- If not PBP, what is the state's alternate plan or backstop?
- Oregon has many laws and tools in place that could lead to more robust water management, but are not fully utilized. How to fund the state so they can use those tools, or build political support for them?
- Consider the impact of both state and case law (Jackson County groundwater regulation, overturned).
- How does the desire for flexibility in the law and need for regulation play out in planning to meet needs and get the same outcome?
- Suggested presentations from additional state agencies involved with water planning.
- How to dovetail regional work with state water management?
- Continuity across politics and participants, as well as accountability from the state, are key but difficult to maintain.
- The state should provide funding for planning and adequate agency engagement and coordination (all relevant agencies).

Implementability

- Need for implementation guidance.
- What is limiting implementation of the plans (current water law, resources, data, infrastructure, etc)?
- Identify needs of state-support (legislative or otherwise) that create present and future accountability around resourcing and implementing plans (e.g. funding, recognition, prioritization for projects, etc).
- How do we evaluate the effectiveness of plans over time?
- How are plan projects prioritized?
- Acknowledging the differences between areas and their local resources (e.g. Tualatin vs Upper Grand Ronde), how does the state support different areas of need?
- How do we ensure that the timing/priority of projects produces instream and out of stream benefits at similar pace/scale?
- Long term investments of time, money and labor are needed to make progress with plan implementation and infrastructure.
- If the state will help fund implementation, then what is the collective role (of those in the place/plan) to support the work?
- For PBP presenters - What would you change in the legislation for the next round of PBP, and what do you need going forward?

- Don't create new process if we can't ensure that existing processes maintain momentum and course correct when needed.

OWRD Updates

Tom Byler, OWRD, shared a brief update regarding the PBP authority which is scheduled to sunset in July 2023. The agency wants to have the option, while it evaluates the evaluation and determines whether or not to move forward with PBP or some variation. To comply with state timelines, OWRD will submit a placeholder legislative concept by April 15th but it won't have any definition around it and could be potentially informed by elements of this work group's conversations. He encouraged the group to read the full PBP Evaluation report and other resources of interest on OWRD's webpage [here](#).

Next Steps

Some group members raised concerns about the lack of clarity on scope and purpose, and therefore focus of the group. One member raised a concern about the balance of interests at the table, and voiced the differences in people's experience working in regional planning or water policy.

Robin reminded the group that it would be up to the collective to determine their work going forward, and that the hope was the insights learned through the presentations would in part inform their focus. She acknowledged some of the Work Group members' concerns and need for articulating a clearer focus and scope, and a desire to start getting into the substance of conversations with each other. She committed that OC will offer a suggestion and work with the Coordinating Committee and the full group to confirm direction. She reminded everyone that the Coordinating Committee is not a decision-making group, nor tasked to drive the process, but will help work with OC to set-up agendas and content to ensure productivity and alignment with the needs of the whole group. Mary Anne Cooper volunteered to participate on the Coordinating Committee.

The next Work Group meeting is scheduled for May 3rd from 11am-3pm on Zoom. Robin added that based on the input received, there was a general shared interest to meet in-person and the team will work to coordinate an in-person event in June. The meeting then adjourned.

Meeting #4 Summary May 3, 2022 from 11:00am-3:00pm

Meeting Attendees:

Work Group Members: Adam Denlinger, Kathleen George, Kelly Timchak, Ana Molina, Anton Chiono, April Snell, Caylin Barter, Chandra Ferrari, Chrysten Rivard, Colby Drake, Dan Thorndike, Dan Newberry, Holly Mondo, Jennifer Wigal, Kate Fitzpatrick, Kimberley Priestley, Margaret Magruder, Morgan Gratz-Weiser, Oriana Magnera, Peggy Lynch, Bobby Bruno, Tom Byler, JR Cook, Bob Rees, Niki Iverson, Mary Anne Cooper, Calla Hagle, Donna Beverage, Kathleen George

Other Attendees: Representative Reardon, Representative Helm, Representative Owens, Kim Fritz-Ogren (WRD), Lili Prah (WRD), Nirvana Cook (WRD)

Facilitation Team: Robin Harkless and Jennah Stillman, Oregon Consensus

MEETING SUMMARY:

Welcome and Introductions

Robin welcomed the group and reflected on the last work group meeting in April, where some had lingering questions regarding the charge and scope of this effort. To follow up, Robin shared that the Oregon Consensus and Water Resources Department staff teams worked together to compile an organizational framework of high-level, essential elements for the water planning and implementation system, at the water region and basin level. The Coordinating Committee had a chance to review and provide some initial feedback on this framework as well. These features were culled from guiding documents, past processes, and the work group's conversations to date, and would be further discussed later in the meeting. Following this, she invited opening remarks from the legislative leaders who had championed this effort and helped to initiate the work group process.

Representative Owens acknowledged that the WRD Place-Based Planning Pilot program will sunset in 2023 and currently does not have a path forward. He shared his hope for the work group to develop an option for the legislative process that advises the next iteration to better support communities in planning, and to identify additional areas of state-support needed to achieve outcomes. He spoke about the work group's responsibility to help the state and communities better develop this framework that integrates all voices and identifies what data and information is needed, in order to meet water needs now and in the future. Representative Helm spoke about the reality of an ongoing drought condition that illuminates the need for communities to better plan for and adapt to climate change while protecting multiple values and uses, and implored this group to help this effort and WRD by creating new approaches. Representative Reardon echoed the remarks mentioned previously and shared that he looks forward to seeing and supporting what this work group puts forward.

Holly Mondo then shared a brief overview of the Coordinating Committee's discussion around developing the agenda and essential elements foundational platform. She acknowledged that because previous water planning approaches have generally occurred in siloes, it was important for the work group to assess and streamline these standards articulated in past forums and products, determine which features, roles and resources need to be further defined, and identify gaps going forward. In order to continue fostering an ongoing learning process, Holly shared that there would be opportunities in-between meetings to further explore topics and record those sessions so that work group members can participate or watch later.

Following up on the April 5 work group meeting, Robin noted that some minor edits regarding technical clarifications of the planning presentations had been received and integrated into an updated version. She invited any additional comments or edits on this before formally approving them. One work group member requested additional time to review the notes, and another

member requested that any updated versions include redline edits to highlight changes. Robin then provided a review of the agenda, which she noted was intended to set the stage for an in-person meeting in June.

Oregon Water Resources Department Updates

Tom Byler, WRD, acknowledged that regional water planning and management may mean different things to different people, and asked the work group members to consider 1) the fact that Oregon is in an era of water scarcity; 2) how to develop an actionable plan with potential projects to respond to underserved areas or critical needs; and 3) a process to support successful project implementation for state funding and tangible results. He spoke about this group's opportunity to provide recommendations to the legislature and next Governor, and how, if those are acted upon, it can help support the state's water management system and issues going forward. He then offered suggested topics for the work group to consider such as the state's role, improving funding processes, essential criteria in order to access funding as a public resource investment, and what it should look like for the state to help with the full arc of data for planning, plan development and then transitioning to implementation. Following this, Tom shared that the Tribe-Agency Water Vision Task Force would commence in June, and also clarified that it will be a more formal engagement space for sovereign entities and the state to exchange information between tribes and agencies regarding water interests and authority responsibilities. He also spoke about the IWRS update and noted that the formal update had been delayed due to funding priorities passed in the 2021 legislative session that would support informing the update, including recommendations generated in this work group forum. Additionally, Tom shared that the state's Water Core Team (consisting of deputy level representatives from OWRD, DEQ, ODFW, ODA, OWEB, ODF, ODOT, ODOE, OSMB, DLCD, Business Oregon, Governor's Office, Regional Solutions, OHA, and DSL) meets twice per month to coordinate on various water issues. He noted that the Water Core Team space can be used to update all agencies about this work group effort, and WRD can work with the Water Core Team to directly engage additional agencies for work group conversations down the road as needed.

Essential Elements Framework

Robin circled back to the essential elements framing and reminded the group that these high-level features were reflected in various ways in the IWRS, 100 Year Water Vision, Place-based Planning Guidelines and evaluation, and in work group conversations to date, and were intended to be an initial organizing feature. She spoke about the intention to help the group determine where its focus and deliberations should be with regards to what more needs to be defined or structured, and roles and responsibilities of the State to support and uphold the elements. Reflections from work group members included, but were not limited to: acknowledgement of different types of planning and the spectrum of phases and necessary tools that may exist to meet different communities needs; acknowledgement that some elements address process and others address policy; a question about whether 'upholding water as a public resource should be renamed to 'recognized by the state'; a question about where resources and timing definition shows up in all elements; a question about where assessing 'readiness' comes in; a suggestion to reference specific language from guiding documents wherever possible as to avoid reinventing the wheel; and acknowledgement that planning is intrinsically linked to implementation, and that the essential elements may need to go further to bridge and support this

connection. Some specific verbiage and organizing suggestions were made as well, as captured below.

Initial suggestions from work group members regarding sub-elements, definitions, or roles/responsibilities included, but were not limited to:

Accountability

- To elevate comfort and create more trust, planning groups could document and acknowledge how they have addressed each of the elements/issues to ensure the process is being followed
- Meet in and out of stream needs
- State recognition of a plan
- Define ownership of management for projects
- Develop a pathway to implementation

Informed and Engaged Community

- Maintain an open and transparent process
- Make sure everyone's interests and needs are represented

Planning Coordination and Capacity

- Unbiased facilitator
- Financial resources to support and sustain efforts.
- State agency to provide technical expertise to analyze data or answer lines of inquiry

Scope and Sideboards

- Balance of interests
- Agency capacity and participation (and necessary funding to support participation)
- Clarify and uphold the foundational law of state and authority to implement law and manage water resources

Tribal Water Perspectives Panel

Robin shared that in following the group's line of inquiry around how different communities relate to water, Oregon's water system and regional planning, that the tribal representative work group members were willing to share their perspectives about each of their sovereign nations' and tribal communities' experiences, interests, and connections to water and regional planning.

Calla Hagle, Burns Paiute Tribe, spoke about her involvement in the Harney Basin Place-based Planning pilot and noted issues regarding missing data and limited capacity for tribal participation. She shared that the basin had been overallocated even prior to the planning process beginning, which led to difficult decisions that needed to be made. Recognizing that tribes are sometimes not consulted for meaningful input early and often in a planning process (by both state agencies and regional communities), she acknowledged the importance of defining and honoring the tribal consultation process, when it should begin, how to do so meaningfully, and how to support ongoing engagement.

Bobby Brunoe, Warm Springs Tribe, discussed the importance of water to their tribe, and how it is honored in all ceremonies and integrated into the core of all staff roles and responsibilities. He also spoke about the importance of data and the need for more basin-level information, the importance of proper funding to have good collaborative conversations, the need to identify what

policies are currently in place, any areas for policy adaptivity in the future, as well as the tribe's capacity challenges in trying to participate in different forums.

Kathleen George, Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde, acknowledged that she was speaking as a Tribal Council member today and discussed the interconnectedness of tribal identity and culture with water and fisheries, the need for healing, and an issue of great urgency. She reflected on the history of Oregon's water rights system, recognizing that rights were distributed when many tribes were being federally terminated and that many historic issues and institutional inequities are still present today. Noting the enduring impact of this policy, she also affirmed the obstacles that the nine remaining federally recognized tribes continue to face coming to the table, capacity challenges to participate when invited, different power dynamics within different regions, and tribal exclusion that still exists. She also acknowledged that water rights adjudication for tribes is not an enduring solution, nor without its own challenges, as some tribes still do not have these rights and the process takes a very long time.

Anton Chiono, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, acknowledged the foundational importance and interconnectedness of water and the tribe's overall approach to managing for ecosystem health, function and sustainability. He reflected on the tribe's past involvement in water planning across the region and an overall challenge with lack of fundamental data to engage in effective planning, management and policy decisions (particularly for in-stream). He also noted that many efforts had been discontinued due to lack of funding. His takeaways from the Place-Based Planning process highlighted the need for more state agency funding and capacity for staff to participate in planning efforts, and the need for further definition around who gets a seat at the regional table and tribal engagement (not just those affected by planning in a particular basin, but also treaty rights and broader public trust considerations).

The key themes from follow-up questions and comments included, but were not limited to:

- Recognizing tribes' differences in capacity, support may be needed to bring tribes to the table and meaningfully represent their interests and needs in a process.
- It is important to have conversations about how tribes would like to be engaged early on, but ultimately not to slow the process down (like this one).
- It is important to develop a foundational understanding of tribal rights (treaties, adjudication, etc.) and incorporate them in the beginning of a planning process as sideboards.
- Expectations and approaches for NGO partnering with Tribes vary. Recognizing that engagement can lead to strong partnerships, this requires initial learning and reaching out to initiate connections to form the relationships necessary to partner. In general, NGOs should meet with technical-level staff but also acknowledge that there are many different NGOs, and not all may want or need to be engaged from a tribal perspective.
- Acknowledge the difference between technical 'c' consultation (such as this effort) and formal tribal council/government level 'C' consultation.

Essential Elements for Water Region or Basin Planning and Implementation

Following up on the 'essential elements' framing approach, Tom Byler, WRD, briefly spoke about the importance of having standards for a water region or basin level planning, in order to

enable and guide state investments, resources, and support in planning efforts going forward. He shared that this work group could help identify where and what those standards should be, and where prescription was not needed in order to maintain flexibility. In order to access certain state funding or other resources, what features should be present, defined and evaluated?

Robin then invited the work group members to engage with one another in small group conversations around one of the proposed essential features, 'Informed and Engaged Communities,' which she noted had arisen in each meeting to date, and related to the tribal perspectives panel. She asked the work group to discuss why it is important for the overall system, what the defining attributes were, and whether the state should have a specific role in partnering, assuring or assisting with this?

The work group members then went into breakout group discussion and the following is a summary of the verbal report-outs provided by each breakout group to the full work group. To review the full raw notes captured by each breakout group that chose to do so, please see the appendix.

Importance: In general, it was noted that informing, engaging and supporting communities in regional planning is important to build a shared understanding about problems or opportunities, and to be intentional about initiating conversations rather than responding to crises. A transparent and inclusive planning process can help create trust amongst a group and build longevity for an effort. Bringing as many perspectives as possible into the planning process will incorporate an array of knowledge, create a deeper sense of ownership, aim to avoid conflict or opposition to an effort down the line, and ultimately develop a more informed plan with better outcomes.

Defining Characteristics:

- Strong leader and/or skilled facilitator to manage the process
- Articulate the goal, the community the effort is serving, and who needs to be included (local interests, statewide interests, relevant state agencies, multi-generational perspectives)
- Tribal engagement
- Invite all perspectives at the table, and identify who may be missing before the process starts
- Initiate building relationships and trust before a process starts
- Determine methods of transparency and accountability (metrics of success and responsibility for tracking)
- Build a foundational understanding of the framework the effort is operating within (state and federal law, treaty rights, data, allocations, etc)
- Share information back out into the broader community
- Discuss and plan for capacity for long term engagement and adaptive management

State Role:

- Ensure there is sustainable resourcing to support planning duration (bridging biennial funding)
- Provide funding for a skilled and neutral facilitator

- Provide existing data from all relevant state agencies for each region (water supply, demand, etc), help identify a baseline and any data gaps, conduct measurement and reporting, help track data progress
- Provide resources for outreach, communication, education, engagement and capacity building throughout the process
- Support agency participation at the planning table and provide technical expertise to participate when requested
- Encourage interagency coordination and integration
- Develop a funding process similar to watershed council development/funding process
- Provide guidance/best practices/expectations document on how to inform and engage communities in planning (especially for under resourced communities) and sideboards of what that looks like for the state standard (broad list of definitions for who should be included)
- Support capacity building
- Uphold legal responsibilities (authority) around basin planning.

In closing, Robin shared that the work group’s next meeting would be an in-person work session on June 7th from 10am-3pm in Bend, and would focus on moving forward from the ‘essential elements’ framing to determine where improvements are needed in the system of water planning and transitioning a plan to implementation, and developing initial concepts around how to do so. Following the work session, there will be a hosted happy hour for work group members and a potential field tour in the morning of June 8th (which will be determined by critical mass). She noted that resources are available to support work group member participation, mileage reimbursement, and provided lodging and food. If someone is not able to attend in-person but may be interested in sending an alternate, to provide a proxy on behalf of the organization or entity that they are representing, to reach out to Robin to discuss that approach. Virtual participation may be an option, but is not preferred. She shared that Oregon Consensus will continue to work with the Coordinating Committee to further develop the plan for this gathering.

She reminded the group about the ongoing learning opportunities that can be coordinated to support the needs of the group and set-up separately from the meetings going forward and will be made available to all as a resource and reference. To date, the additional primary recurring learning topic requests include: 1) What have other states done and standardized regarding certain features of regional water planning and state integration; 2) Watershed Councils history, funding structure, operation and state relationship; 3) Water Futures Project and any current/in development water-related, environmental justice policies. She invited work group members to please share additional questions or suggestions as they emerge, and will provide more information on these upcoming learning opportunities as details come together. Robin also noted that if the group is interested in meeting in-person more frequently (in addition to the scheduled June 7, September 6, and December 6 dates), to share that and could be accommodated. Following this, the meeting was adjourned.

Meeting #4 Appendix

INFORMED AND ENGAGED COMMUNITIES

Breakout Group Discussion Notes May 3, 2022

1. Why is it important for the overall system?
2. What are the defining attributes/characteristics or conditions?
3. Should the state have any specific role in partnering, assuring or assisting this element? If so, in what way/context?

Group 1 (Anton, April, Colby, Dan T, Kelly, Morgan)

Importance: Water is important to everyone. Important to bring everyone to a level playing field of understanding different water uses. It shouldn't take a crisis to get everyone to the table, but that is often how it goes.. If there is a structure, then it may lead to more productive conversations and take us out of reactive mode into proactive mode. Without available resources, then the problems continue to increase or even compound. Building in shared understanding around climate change is important - this is a big topic (bigger than all of us individually). More engagement/understanding can lead to better outcomes. Fix things now to avoid larger problems later. If people aren't at the table, the solution may not be as effective, or there may even be a legal problem with a third party at some point in the process.

Defining Attributes/Conditions Etc.: Inclusivity and openness. Be intentional in your reach. Show up to the same table, give your time. Be present. Find a coordinated space to “place everything” so that when water users want to know where to go, that all the communication pieces are coordinated and connected. Providing educational meetings, scoping meetings, engaging with council and membership. Ongoing outreach needs to continue, and the opportunity needs to be available to all who want to participate. Build in more time for relationship building and make our interactions less transactional. Coordinate engagement across layers, and how coordination can come out between all those entities in a more coordinated way. Make sure info is available in different languages, forms, etc. Provide flexibility in participating - input at different points in process, available from different platforms (like virtual/in-person/field/etc.).

State's Role: Funding and informational/data support. Specialist support, capacity. Step in to assist with data gaps. State should recognize importance in the continuation of convening people and providing information. Sometimes you don't need everyone at the table, but they still need to be informed. State truly needs more capacity in regional agency staff – more funding at the local level. Specialist staff levels are low statewide, and restoring these specialists would be key to local communities to build on trust and close data gaps. Put people on the ground – keep the on-the-ground context and understanding. Put an assistance “structure” in place (think OWEB regional review team model).

Group 2 (Bob, Kate, Kathleen, Margaret, Tom)

Facilitator's Note: This group chose note to document notes along the way but shared a verbal report-out, as captured in the meeting summary.

- 1) Necessary for durable and sustainable solutions, and plans. Opens up opportunities for understanding different perspectives and values.

Group 3 (Calla, Chrysten, Kimberley, Niki, Oriana)

- There's various types of planning and which one/ones we're talking about it changes the framing
 - Our charge feels challenging because there are different layers at the state level
 - The state could provide guidance when they're involved
 - Not making assumptions about who a group represents
 - When state gives funding the same expectations may come into play
 - When it's not statewide, need **guidance and best practices (like a guide document)**
 - Layers of state engagement versus sovereign engagement varies by type of planning
- Not waiting to reach out, especially to tribal governments when things are under way but **building relationships and trust where possible early**
 - Helps overcome fears and helps address and create space to deal with conflict
 - Better practice that can help avoid conflict and litigation
- With tribal governments (and community orgs) need time for review of materials (like a plan), process, relationship etc.
 - Step of consultation with agencies at government to government level after initial technical staff review
- Coordination across agencies can be challenging (ex. could address quantity issue but never touch on quality with agency siloing)
 - We have distinct legal authority and it's hard to reach a good outcome without buy in from all stakeholder groups
 - **Need to build best practices around building scope and sideboards for planning groups**
 - Not uncommon to have a conversation with one agency and follow up conversation with another agency and the opinions conflict
 - **Create better coordination between agencies as a best and standard practice**
 - **Need for adequate funding for agencies and engagement and process work**
- Around the definition of included communities, there are groups that represent the public interest of water statewide; some planning groups embrace this and others do not
 - Include groups that represent statewide water issues
- Around the definition of informed communities, there's a real need for data -- not just what we know but what we don't know in a basin
 - **Start doing basin assessments; include relationship and community mapping and address what's known and in existence and where there are gaps**
 - Need to know where the water is
- When there's a lot of community engagement up front and a process takes years, people fall off and can't keep up with those conversations
 - People feel disillusioned years into a process; **people want to see progress and transparency**
- Always comes back to capacity

- Water management and measurement sometimes happens at the community level when there's a framework in place
 - Municipalities have requirement around measurement; is there funding to help small farmers/communities benefit from measurement?
 - Measurement can help people make good business decisions
 - Data is a key piece
 - **Measurement and reporting is important to building trust and transparency**
 - Public resources are often/should be tied to reporting
 - **Lack of data at the beginning can derail a process**
- **If time is spent on these efforts then they need to be supported and funded** by the state – it's demoralizing when people put in effort and it isn't amplified.
- **Education and capacity building are important to bring communities along**
 - **Two-way flow of information and questions**
 - When you wait until there's a crisis to do an education event, people are crisis-oriented
 - We need this kind of work to be **statewide and proactive**
 - **We need sustainable tables that can help people understand why this work and data is important**
- **Need a base of relationships and data to be ready for any process**
 - WRD Deschutes process - policy/regulatory trigger, first six months were focused on understanding data, science around groundwater interference issues
 - That foundation, sideboards, and data was important for setting people up to have the hard conversations
- Need to not do everything at once; baseline setting is important and setting clear process steps especially around data
 - Helps people start from similar places
 - No disagreements on all of the data that is needed
- Stipending and valuing people's time as organizations or community members is important to help people come to the table
 - Big for community organizations, small governments, tribal governments, rural communities
 - Also lack staff and capacity to do work internally
 - **State should create fund for this work**
 - Need avenue for people to apply for funding to be at the table and manage the work – shouldn't be role of watershed councils
 - Hard to get funders to cover staff time for processes without good sideboards and timelines – state/planning processes is a better source
 - Stipends don't address capacity issues or long term resources and needs like creating full positions
- Planning efforts don't replace the responsibilities or authorities of the state
 - Plans may inform the state, but the state still has legal requirements and authority around managing water in basins and planning should not dilute this

Group 4 (Daniel N, Holly, Mary Anne, Donna, Peggy)

Overall System –

- In any planning process, important to have the people that process will impact in the room and at the table - creates a sense of ownership, and allows them to take the reins of what's going to happen to their future. It makes the process a lot smoother, and creates trust and longevity into the planning process. They are able to also communicate out to their community.
- Eventually it's about ownership - if you have ownership in the product, you will support the product and make sure it moves forward and gets funded. Ensures all relevant information is brought forward and considered by the group and that results in a more robust plan.
- The more people at the table, the more information you have about the area - everyone will have different pieces of information to add to the discussion. It makes whatever comes from that planning process more robust. The system that does planning is less likely to see litigation - if no one is excluded, it makes for a better overall product.

Defining Attributes -

- All interested parties at the table, a skilled facilitator who can work amongst the various interests, the data from the various state agencies for that region (demand, available supply, water quality).
- Balance between local and statewide interests? Want to have strong local engagement, but there are statewide groups (not agencies) who should be engaged. Various perspectives on the correct balance between state and local interests, and whether they are distinct interests.
- Need to ensure tribal engagement, and their reservations might not line up with the full extent of their ancestral homeland.
- The state government is not the biggest interest, but must be there. The various state agencies involved in water quality and quantity must be there as relevant to each region. They will need staffing to do this.
- Transparency and accountability is a critical attribute of an informed community.
- Metrics - a way to know that what has been accomplished is the outcome that the community is looking for, and assurance whether it happened. Need to define what are the deliverables for the plan in terms of what you are trying to accomplish - is it a plan? Something else? Question about whether deliverables were possible to define early on.

State Role in Informed and Engaged Communities:

- Think there needs to be some sideboards from the state on what an informed and engaged community table looks like (i.e. what stakeholders are at the table and who is not), especially because we hope the state will fund these efforts and help with implementation. *Broad types of groups that should be included.*
- Concern noted about impact to process if the state disagrees about whether a group was representative/had all necessary people at the table at the end - that needs to be dealt with up front. Having those sideboards/guidelines will be really helpful to make sure that during the planning process, the community is meeting those foundational expectations. *Making sure that the state agrees you have the right people/groups represented.*
- Because we are dealing with so many statutes and rules, important to have the state provide some legal guidance to the groups from time to time.

- The state wants feedback from regions on what they think the state should do - the state doesn't have it all figured out. It's an opportunity for communities to engage with the state about what an informed community looks like - it can be an ongoing dialogue.

Group 5 (Caylin, Chandra, Jennifer, JR, Bobby, Kim)

- **ROUGH NOTES - free form conversation**
- "Included" is important - language was part of prompt but not in the "notes" header
- **Inclusive planning builds trust - defining the community is everything**
- **water planning is multibiennial, multigenerational - not making it inclusive allows "enderrounders" to undo it - have to have foundational understanding of legal framework and data, capacity for long-term engagement**
- Need broad set of stakeholders who see themselves as part of solution - buy-in & willingness & capacity to invest -- what are commitments to seeing process play out -- durability -- what is finish line? What are expected outcomes?
- reemphasize durability - identify some options in planning process, but identifying how they play out on ground is the tricky part
- **adding in "INFORMED" piece, and what's possible in terms of data and analysis, and what do we know and what we don't know, how do we deal with the unknown - not acting in the absence of information can be an action in and of itself**
- what does adaptive management look like?
- Can be challenging to have metrics and objectives defined up front
- some information foundational to moving forward, some can be added as you go
 - **what is foundational information that agencies should be providing to communities? Lots of data, but not always easily accessible**
- what is definition of "community"? different from land use context - water transcends boundaries, bulk of cost is infrastructure & power to move it and maintain it. Hermiston is different from Yakima Nation is different from irrigators is different from environmentalists.
 - "Community" might be local community using the water, also include people who rely on the resources from outside local community
 - who decides who is in the room - public can decide, invite everyone
- **timing is key to defining community. short? just a few years, maybe project-based, smaller geography and possibly smaller community. long? more basin level.**
- Two different scales for planning - Regional planning a la PBP (state initiated with state requirements) AND ad hoc place-based planning, possibly around a project - these planning efforts can move in tandem - what elements are critical to supporting BOTH?
- Pilots and/or smaller-scale planning efforts - Build engagement for the longer range!
- Defining "community" - What can we do to sustain water for next 50 years in Umatilla County vs what can we do to sustain water indefinitely - bring it to entire community by making it longer range, Columbia water use brings in Division 33, takes it into interstate and potentially international conversation - Columbia River Treaty and recognition of environmental uses
- Mismessaging that can occur when scope (temporal and/or geographical) gets bigger without community getting bigger
- Reliance on state or another sovereign to implement plans
- State role?

- Data & analysis
- Implementation support
- How to bridge the biennial cycle and show sustained commitment (Kitzhaber's 10 year budget effort)
- Example - Deschutes basin water summit, planning meeting of sovereigns - define vision - inclusive, collaborative, and basin-wide
 - Having WRD at table very helpful for accessing data, but limited funding for implementation but more coming through recently
 - ODFW at table too - good partnerships
 - Phased approach - start with upper basin (upper basin study was done, HCP for irrigation, then spotted frog) - incentive of ESA species to gel the group and start working
 - **Decades of work**
- **Local/region - provide monitoring, reporting, accountability in following the plan, "money-makers for the state" in terms of generating state revenue**
- **State - provide peer reviewed data set to run through and model, and informed decisions on investments, and adaptive management - held by STATE not local, for accountability**
- Have the plans inform the POPs!
- **Marry the bottom-up grassroots planning and the top-down state-led planning - track progress and revise**
- Look at other states
 - **Interest in learning from other states** - lessons learned, what worked, mechanism to do certain pieces
 - Example - Yakima Basin Plan - executive and legislative charge to complete plan and memorialize it, regional oversight entity that tracks progress and reports out on implementation
 - Allow regions to define planning oversight entity pursuant to state requirements
 - Governor leadership is key
- DEQ & WRD interested in providing information where possible - **WRD has done a lot of research and thinking on these topics**
 - E.g., scope and scale
 - This conversation helps cue in Lili on work that could be done between meetings
 - Important to have at helpful level of detail - don't want to overwhelm people

Meeting #5 Summary
June 7, 2022 from 10:00am-3:30pm

Meeting Attendees:

Work Group Members: Adam Denlinger, Anton Chiono, April Snell, Bob Rees, Bobby Brunoe, Caylin Barter, Chandra Ferrari, Chrysten Rivard, Courtney Crowell, Dan Thorndike, Daniel Newberry, Holly Mondo, Illeana Alexander, Jeff Stone, Jennifer Wigal, Kate Fitzpatrick, Kelly Timchak, Kimberley Priestley, Margaret Magruder, Mary Anne Cooper, Niki Iverson, Peggy

Lynch, Tom Byler, Calla Hagle (via Zoom), Jason Fenton (via Zoom), and Donna Beverage (via Zoom)

OWRD Staff: Kim Fritz-Ogren, Lili Prah, Bryn Hudson

Facilitation Team: Robin Harkless and Jennah Stillman, Oregon Consensus

MEETING SUMMARY:

Welcome and Introductions

Robin welcomed the group to the first in-person meeting and shared her appreciation for everyone that was able to gather there together. She then invited the work group members to introduce themselves. Following this, Robin provided a high-level overview of the work group's progress to date in honing in on a scope directed by the broad legislation, engaging in shared learning, creating and strengthening relationships, and building upon past efforts to move forward. She shared that the work was now shifting to identifying what needs to change in the system in order to optimize state-supported regional planning. That approach would first look at the phases of the system (pre-planning and planning), then moving from planning to action, and finally, taking a whole system view. She clarified that the conversation today was not about reaching consensus or conclusions, but about identifying key areas for the work group to generate options and solutions going forward.

Getting Grounded in the Learning

Tom Byler, OWRD, shared his excitement for the opportunity at hand for this work group to think bigger and pursue ideas for a new system of collaborative water planning and investments that supports the diverse needs of Oregonians as we enter an era of water scarcity and moves planning into action to create projects that benefit communities over time. He also addressed the spectrum of water planning and level-set on the scope and scale for this group, using a water supply planning typology document developed by the Dept. as a reference. He suggested the importance of taking a comprehensive view (not single issues) and looking at the larger regional and basin geographic scale (not single communities).

Lili Prah, OWRD, shared a synthesis review of the materials provided to work group members in advance of the meeting, to provide context from a state lens and identify connections to help frame the forthcoming discussion. The materials she discussed included: 1) a reference document identifying 'essential elements' or features of a state-supported regional water planning system that emerged from previous work related to water planning (e.g. IWRS, 100-Year Water Vision, PBP evaluation and findings); 2) a document with suggested definitions of pre-planning and planning phases and the state of those phases currently existing in Oregon; 3) the American Water Resources Association (AWRA) overview of state water plans and comparisons between different features and structures; funding mechanisms, etc.; 4) the Place-Based Planning Pilot FAQ Evaluation sheets that highlighted recommendations for improvements to and use of the PBP model.

Following this, Robin invited work group members to share any additional reflections or findings from the pre-reading materials. Additional themes were shared, including, but not limited to:

- The root issues around funding and state investments;
- Acknowledgement that unlike many other states, Oregon does not have an official state water plan;
- How to address needs for regional flexibility;
- Trust building as a key principle for success;
- Clear sideboards needed at the outset;
- Determining alternatives to regional planning - what is the backstop?

Small Group Work Session: Pre-Planning + Planning

Robin provided an overview of the workshop approach and objective for the work group to explore the features of an ‘ideal’ or high functioning system, and how to get there. Small groups first focused on the phases of pre-planning and planning, and reflected upon the following questions: What essential elements, features or principles should be present for regional groups to do this phase? What should the state be responsible for? What should the regional groups be responsible for? Based on the understanding of the current Oregon system, where are there gaps or needs? She noted that items related to broader system strategies found in the IWRS, any suggested follow-up requests to OWRD, or research or information gathering needs would be captured as ‘parking lot’ ideas. Robin also clarified that the workshop brainstorm sessions were intended to tee-up the afternoon large group conversation about how to move the identified gaps, needs, and ideas forward. **A summary of the flip chart notes from the small groups can be found in the appendix.**

Facilitator’s Note: A survey was sent to the Work Group after the meeting which will help prioritize the workload and focus for the coming months’ of work. The high-level notes captured in small groups, as well as the large group discussion, and past meeting summary notes will be used to draft initial ideas for each of the issue areas determined to be important by the work group to address in this process.

Full Work Group Discussion: What to Do About It?

Following lunch, Robin reviewed the high-level themes that emerged from the small groups around how to structure and optimize regional pre-planning and planning phases. Themes that showed up in all small groups were around **data gaps and coordination; drivers and supports needed for planning readiness; and creating a collaborative ‘home’ for planning that can serve as institutional memory and coordinating function for long term efforts.** The full group then further discussed issues raised in the small groups regarding potential gaps or needs for the Oregon system, and generated ideas about how to address those identified issues. A synthesis of the identified key needs and gaps, and potential ideas to addressing them within this process included, but were not limited to:

Pre-Planning Phase Need/Gap: There is currently no framework to support this phase or guidelines around best practices. As recommended from the Place-Based Planning pilot evaluation to create a step 0, this could include building trust among stakeholders and between the communities and the state agencies; creating an accessible pre-packaged set of necessary data and analyses for a planning effort; providing more training relevant to conducting a

multi-stakeholder process; community outreach, facilitation, and consensus decision-making. *Work Group members discussed ideas for addressing this need or gap.*

- 1) Create a Pre-Planning framework and guide for future regional planning. Essential elements or features could include:
 - a) Creating the conditions for an engaged, inclusive collaborative table and ‘trust building’.
 - b) Establishing a coordinating home for planning.
 - c) Baseline information (e.g. current regulatory and sovereign overlays for that region, ‘current state’ of water for that region, and any particular data gaps that would need to be collected to inform long term planning.)
 - d) Goals and sideboards to set the scope and scale for Planning.
- 2) Develop a framework for a ‘one stop shop’ approach that would serve as a streamlined and state integrated approach to assess readiness for regional planning; assist communities and regions in determining where they are on the planning continuum to determine the appropriate pathway and resources needed for a planning effort; connect them to various funding streams or assistance programs; and categorize varying levels of state-support for different types of planning efforts.

Planning Phase Need/Gap: Place-Based Planning pilots and other regional planning efforts have revealed the need for flexibility and a set of state-determined sideboards or guidelines to enable effective planning, based on unique needs and conditions of the region. *Work Group members discussed ideas for addressing this need or gap.*

- 1) Review the existing Place-Based Planning Guidelines to determine if anything is missing, should be changed, or clarified to address the need for balance of state-established sideboards and standards with regional flexibility. This review and update could integrate a) the Evaluation Recommendations and b) the ‘Essential Elements/Features’ document. Determine which pieces should be ‘required’ and which should be ‘optional or best practice’.

Planning Phase Need/Gap: Learning from past, ongoing and piloted regional planning efforts show that water planning takes time and there is a need for mechanisms or structure that enables continuity of efforts and institutional memory to support success and long term sustainability. *Work Group members discussed ideas for addressing this need or gap.*

- 1) Develop ideas for establishing regional coordinating ‘hubs’, entities or structures which would provide an institutional place for long term planning related efforts (e.g. data and analysis / updates over time; group norms and decision-making tools; plans and plan updates; place for regional staff and communities to convene; development of project ideas, etc.)

Moving a Plan to Action Need/Gap: The Place-Based Planning pilot evaluation and other regional planning efforts showed a need or gap in determining whether and how a regional plan

will be acted on, and how it integrates with the state's management system. "What does the plan get us?" *Work Group members discussed ideas for addressing this need or gap.*

- 1) Examine Oregon and other state models that have established structures for state review of regional plans.
- 2) Look at frameworks for establishing more certainty for regional planning efforts, to meet intended goals and align with management requirements. This could be a set of threshold questions or criteria ('check points') for review between each phase of the system that specify the deliverables necessary to access investments (funding, ongoing technical support, etc.) from the state for moving a plan to action. This could also identify ideas for resources that could be assured to regions if they meet the necessary thresholds.

Interagency Coordination Need/Gap: This need or gap has been identified within regional planning as well as more broadly with regards to integrated water resources management. *Work Group members discussed ideas for addressing this need or gap.*

- 1) Review various sources of input that describe the gaps and needs for interagency coordination.
- 2) Examine the type and level of agency staff needed to support regional planning efforts as have been learned from past regional planning efforts.
- 3) Look at frameworks for better interagency coordination on regional planning.
- 4) Look at frameworks for better interagency coordination on IWRs implementation.

Data Need/Gap: "Data gaps" have been identified as a need to address as they relate to regional planning, PBP pilots, and more generally for effective water management. *Work Group members discussed ideas for addressing this need or gap.*

- 1) Undertake a review of the key data gaps and challenges that have been identified in past regional planning efforts, and hear from state agencies about activities that are aimed at addressing these challenges. Identify remaining gaps or needs and offer ideas for how to address them.

Continuity Need/Gap: Long term planning requires long term investments which do not currently exist. *Work Group members discussed ideas for addressing this need or gap.*

- 1) Conduct a cost analysis of various regional planning efforts to determine what the range of investments are needed to support these efforts over time.
- 2) Look at how other states fund and sustain long term regional planning efforts.
- 3) Create a framework for establishing long term investments in water planning. Articulate the areas of resource support the state should assure to regional planning efforts (could include: dedicated regional staff from various agencies for consistent technical support and ongoing tracking of regulatory and sovereign obligation compliance, providing professional facilitation services, data analysis, etc.)

Public Comment

Public Comment was provided by Harmony Burrigh. Harmony commented on the need to understand the level of staff support required to stand-up and provide continuity to regional planning efforts; suggested looking at historical documents to determine what issues have persisted, and why; and made a comment about public outreach related to the IWRS; and data gaps.

Final Thoughts and Questions, Wrap-up, and Next Steps

In closing, Robin reflected on the group’s generative conversation in identifying several issues that could inform subsequent task-related work to develop options for changes to the system. To move work forward from today’s meeting, Robin shared that OC, OWRD and the Coordinating Committee would draft a roadmap through the end of the calendar year with proposed benchmarks and goals for each meeting. **The next work group meeting has been rescheduled to July 12th from 11am-3pm. The September 6th meeting is currently intended to be in-person, location to be determined.**

Robin also reminded the group about the option for ongoing learning opportunities that could be coordinated separately from the meetings going forward, and will be made available to all as a resource and reference, to support any learning needs for this process. She shared that to date, the primary learning topic requests included: 1) What can we learn from other states about their approaches to regional water planning and state integration?; 2) Watershed Council history, funding structure, operation and state relationship; and 3) Water Futures Project and any current/in development water-related, environmental justice policies or policy frameworks. She invited work group members to continue to share additional questions or suggestions as they emerge. The meeting then adjourned.

Meeting #5 Appendix [Small Group Notes Summary](#)

Meeting #6 Summary **August 2, 2022 from 11:00am-3:30pm**

Meeting Attendees:

Work Group Members: Adam Denlinger, Ana Molina, Anton Chiono, April Snell, Bob Rees, Bobby Brunoe, Caylin Barter, Chandra Ferrari, Chrysten Rivard, Courtney Warner Crowell, Dan Thorndike, Daniel Newberry, Donna Beverage, Heather Bartlett, Holly Mondo, Illeana Alexander, Jason Fenton, Jeff Stone, Jennifer Wigal, JR Cook, Kate Fitzpatrick, Kathleen George, Kimberley Priestley, Margaret Magruder, Mary Anne Cooper, Niki Iverson, Oriana Magnera, Peggy Lynch, Tom Byler.

Staff: Lili Prah, OWRD

Facilitation Team: Robin Harkless and Jennah Stillman, Oregon Consensus

MEETING SUMMARY:

Welcome and Introductions

Robin Harkless, Oregon Consensus, welcomed the group and invited the Work Group members to introduce themselves. She shared that the substance of today's meeting was intended to build upon the system gaps and needs ideas discussed during the last meeting in Bend, which were further directed by a survey where work group members identified and affirmed priority topics to address going forward. The main topics included data, community and public engagement, pre-planning (planning readiness), and moving a plan to action. In an effort to further develop ideas for those gaps, needs, and ideas discussed to date, Robin noted that today's meeting would focus primarily on a draft framework and scenarios that OWRD had been tasked to develop, laying out potential pathway approaches for Pre-Planning (readiness) and Moving a Plan to Action phases of the system. Secondly, the group would hear a high-level update of the work of the Community and Public Engagement Task Group. She added that the Work Group will hear from DEQ and potentially other state agencies with an update on the data management project in September.

OWRD Legislative Concept for Place-Based/Regional Planning

Tom Byler, OWRD, shared a brief update on the Department's legislative concept associated with the 2023 sunset authorization of the Place-Based Planning program and water planning fund. He acknowledged the overlapping conversations with this Work Group and shared his hopes that this Work Group can develop consensus-based products and recommendations to the legislature and future Governor that address the broader system of regional planning and management, of which Place-Based Planning could be a component. He added that depending on this group's agreements, as well as timing, recommended ideas could inform legislative recommendations or concepts, including the placeholder LC that OWRD submitted through the executive branch.

Work Group member questions and comments included, but were not limited to:

- Acknowledging the importance of holding a place in the legislative process to address the sunset authorization for place-based planning, some Work Group members raised remaining confusion regarding how to address the overlap with this work group's efforts, how they will be linked, or where it may be duplicative.
- Related, a question was raised about how to bring ideas or proposals forward in this work group process. One Work Group member shared that Margaret Magruder/AOC had drafted an ad hoc proposal and was curious about if or when that would come forward in this process. This led to some clarification from Coordinating Committee members, who had discussed this process question during their call on 7/22 and in following email communication. A few members of the Coordinating Committee shared that they wanted to establish a clear and fair process for any ad hoc ideas from individual work group members to come forward, and that for the August meeting the work of OWRD should first be shared and discussed by the Work Group. This process item was included on today's agenda and was discussed again at the end of the meeting (see below for more detail).
- A question was raised regarding clarification on the Coordinating Committee's general decision-making process, as well as a question regarding the role of the state

representatives in moving ideas forward relevant to the Work Group effort. It was clarified that the ‘Process Leadership’ group which includes Representatives Owens, Helm, and Reardon, as well as OWRC Chair Reeves, provided leadership support to get this process going and indicated interest in receiving and supporting ideas and recommendations from this Work Group, but have not been serving in a convener role.

- Robin Harkless, OC, acknowledged that the exchange around the issue of bringing the ad hoc idea forward had been challenging for the CC, but she observed that all members of the CC agreed they want a fair process and that they do want work group members to bring ideas forward and to be heard. For today, the Work Group was being asked to lean into the content developed by OWRD on their behalf and as such, she moved the group on.

Draft Framework and Conceptual Assumptions

Tom Byler, OWRD, shared that the conceptual framing document being presented had been provided to the Work Group for review in advance of the meeting. It focused on a set of foundational assumptions for the framework and scenarios, with emphasis on two specific areas of the system that do not currently have structure: pre-planning (readiness) and moving a plan to action. He clarified that this conceptual framing was not intended to replace any existing planning functions or programs, but to support the development of a more holistic, integrated regional water planning and management system. Lili Prah, OWRD, then provided an overview of ten fundamental assumptions, which she noted were based upon the Work Group’s previous conversations and shared learnings; the ‘Essential Elements’ organizing document shared earlier in this process; Place-Based Planning guidelines and evaluation; the IWRS, and the 100-Year Water Vision.

The draft assumptions are as follows:

- A. The system of regional water planning and implementation in Oregon contains 5 phases: (1) Pre-Planning; (2) Planning; (3) Moving a Plan to Action; (4) Project Implementation; and (5) Monitoring, Evaluation, and Adaptation (Figure 1). While other paths exist and can be outcomes of the pre-planning, this group will focus its efforts on the main pathway identified by the dark blue boxes numbered 1-5 in Figure 1 below.
- B. The regional plan will be developed at a watershed(s) or basin scale;
- C. The planning process will be transparent, inclusive, and collaborative, with a balanced representation of water interests
- D. The planning process will be voluntary and community-initiated and led, in partnership with the state
- E. The planning process will involve strong public participation and community engagement
- F. The planning process will be informed by the best available data
- G. The approach to planning will be integrated and based on the goal of better understanding and meeting instream and out-of-stream water needs now and in the future, including water quantity, water quality, and ecosystem needs
- H. State agencies will serve as active partners throughout the phases of water planning and implementation
- I. The planning process will be guided by the principles in the state’s Integrated Water Resources Strategy (p. 179) and 100-Year Water Vision (p.21-22)

- J. The basin/regional approach to water planning is not intended to replace existing programs or paths for water resources planning and implementation. It will be non-regulatory, consistent with state laws and policy, and will not jeopardize existing water rights.

Following this, Robin asked the Work Group members to identify any major concerns to flag from this list that may need further discussion. Those included, but were not limited to:

- Build upon recommendations in the IWRS and PBP evaluation to consider a stronger state role in supporting professional, neutral facilitation (D).
- Consider reframing language for ‘project implementation’ to ‘action implementation’ (A).
- Question of whether there is an opportunity for a subset smaller than watershed or basin scale to pursue state-support in this approach (B).
- Suggestion to add ‘changing climate’ (G).
- Related to (J), there was a brief discussion about the opportunity for regional groups to engage with the state around potential policy changes to meet shared goals under the plan, which Tom noted was a possible outcome of the planning process identified in the proposed framing (Moving a Plan to Action) but not assumed as an outcome at the outset of a planning process.
- Add ‘and determine data gaps’ (F).
- Margaret Magruder/AOC said there are issues with all of the assumptions and specifically noted the areas where there was desire for more integration of local elected officials for constituent accountability (C, D, and E) and a lack of clarity around how the 100-Year Water Vision will be used as a guide (I).

ACTION: OWRD will refine this section and offer it back to the Work Group.

Pre-Planning Options and Scenarios

Lili shared an overview of the Pre-Planning phase framing scenarios and options for state-supported activities of regional planning groups and of state agencies; potential outcomes; and connections to the next phase of the system. Lili explained that the intent was to initiate further work group conversation to develop its own option for whatever level of state support was determined should be associated with this phase and what activities/outcomes might need further Work Group development in moving forward with potential recommendations.

Work Group members shared comments about the importance of accessible data, community engagement, and a situational assessment in this phase. Suggestions for state activities and responsibilities included, but were not limited to: providing baseline data and developing a process to identify and fill data gaps; helping regional planning groups create a basin water budget framework; and creating and supporting a readiness assessment. There were also a handful of comments raised regarding the Place-Based Planning pilots and a desire to continue building upon those lessons learned. Suggestions for regional group activities included, but were not limited to: conducting early community engagement; demonstrating buy-in for a planning process (potentially as a component of the situational assessment); developing a

governance agreement around how the group will work together; and identifying an independent facilitator. A comment was shared that this Pre-Planning step could be an opportunity for improving coordination of state agency budgets.

The group also discussed whether there is a need to determine if this process entails mandatory criteria to access funding, is a baseline assessment to determine readiness and levels of support needed, or a general toolbox of optional mechanisms to provide early guidance to move forward with planning efforts. Many comments were raised about the need for baseline funding for regional planning. **The group signaled general interest in moving all state-supported activities listed in the framework scenarios forward but the level of specificity remains to be determined.**

Additional questions were raised regarding: What or who initiates pre-planning (e.g. state role in supporting basins forming groups where they don't exist vs waiting for groups to coordinate and approach the state)? How do you clearly show/assess readiness and buy-in to move into planning? If there is potential funding available at the end of a pre-planning step, what guidelines and/or requirements could help ensure impactful and equitable state investments? How could this step support both new planning opportunities and previously established regional groups?

An anonymous poll was initiated to gauge initial alignment around what should be state-resourced components of pre-planning (readiness), and to identify where further detail may be needed. The results of the poll are [here](#). **Facilitator's Note: Work Group members expressed differences in their understanding of the questions asked in the survey, whether it was intended to address just the Pre-Planning phase or the full breadth of planning. This prompted a check with the Work Group, and identified general agreement that future work on drafting ideas should merge/encompass the suite of planning in the system, not broken out into phases as was laid out in the August 2 OWRD framework document.*

ACTION: OWRD will work with interested Work Group members who indicated willingness during the meeting, via the June task priority survey, or any others that come forward.

Moving a Plan to Action Options and Scenarios

Lili shared an overview of the Moving a Plan to Action phase framing. Members of the Work Group discussed the different scenarios of state-supported activities and investments and **shared comments about the need for clear criteria, demonstrated buy-in, and sufficient state funding to successfully move plans forward.** They discussed that the overall state-supported regional planning path is voluntary to pursue but that in doing so, there may be requirements to access funding. Some felt that full state funding was necessary to enable regional groups to be effective (for pre-planning activities too), and others noted that there had been inadequate state funding to fully support the Place-Based Planning pilots. There was a general agreement identified around the importance of a regional group demonstrating 'skin in the game' for funding accessibility, and an acknowledgement that this threshold of buy-in and balanced participation currently lacks definition. A suggestion was raised that the Work Group could potentially help develop a flowchart or criteria for this process to help agency funding decisions

that considered a flexible, equitable spectrum recognizing the varying access to resources, capacity, time, and dollars amongst regions. Additionally, some members shared comments about a desire for the state to provide baseline funding for regional planning. Kate Fitzpatrick offered to share some information about the Deschutes Basin Collaborative's funding model and some associated numbers as an example of what it takes to sustain a regional water planning endeavor. Additional questions were raised regarding: How would matches be addressed? Is the Work Group interested in continuing the Place-Based Planning program, and if so, what adjustments and funding may be needed for that specifically going forward?

Circling back to crosscutting thoughts about the planning system as a whole, it was suggested that there did not appear to be any disagreements about the planning approach as a whole but that there were different perspectives surrounding terms and interpretations of functionality. One particular tension was noted regarding the definition of who gets included in local/region/community. Following some discussion, a comment was shared that the Public and Community Engagement Task Group is currently developing a definition for 'community-led' that addresses the need for including and balancing local and statewide groups, which could inform this issue. As a follow-up thought, one Work Group member suggested moving the governance charter development activity from the potential Pre-Planning requirements to the overall Planning phase as an early activity, so that it would not be an initial barrier to getting going, and so that the state could help set the collaborative table.

As for next steps, Robin clarified that the framing document, as OWRD suggested within the document itself, was intended to tee-up Work Group discussion about what pieces need to be addressed in structuring this system and where further work is needed. Tom shared that if any Work Group members wanted to provide additional feedback on the framing document or identify any unclear language that should be further clarified moving forward, this should be shared as soon as possible so it can be considered in the next iteration. **It was requested that for any feedback shared with OWRD, the full Work Group be copied as well for transparency.**

ACTION: OWRD will take the feedback from today's discussion to further develop the draft framing and identify if there are areas where Task Group work may be needed, recognizing that interested volunteers had been identified both during the meeting and previously in the topics survey. OC and OWRD will also determine a clear and concise process for getting feedback on the next draft iteration of work, for written feedback from Work Group members who are unable to attend full work group meetings.

Community & Public Engagement Draft Guidelines

Peggy Lynch shared an update on behalf of the Task Group (which includes Adam Denlinger, Ana Molina, April Snell, Chrysten Rivard, Mary Anne Cooper, Oriana Magnera, Peggy Lynch). Having met twice to date, with another upcoming meeting on August 15th, she shared the high-level overview of the guide outline that they are working to develop on behalf of the Work Group. The general sections include: Purpose of why informed and engaged communities are important to regional water planning and management; Principles and best practices; Suggested state responsibilities to ensure that regional planning efforts meet the identified principles engagement; and potential considerations for accountability mechanisms and other potential

tools based upon on the ground learnings. Peggy noted that the Task Group intends to engage the Environmental Equity Committee and Water Futures forum to support an external review and refinement of this draft guide, which would be shared with the full Work Group in advance of the September 6th meeting for discussion.

Next Steps

Robin shared a reminder and summary of the Coordinating Committee’s process advice regarding how to use the Work Group forum to bring ad hoc ideas forward in a collaborative, consensus-seeking space. It was clarified that this opportunity is intended to address an optional pathway for ad hoc proposals separate from the OWRD drafting or related task group work. She shared that going forward there would be a standing agenda item for those ideas, and would require that any materials be sent to the Work Group at least one week in advance of the meeting, clearly stating who the materials are coming from, and are first shared with the Work Group before circulating more broadly. Following an overview of the upcoming meetings (below), the meeting was adjourned

Upcoming Meetings

- August 23, 9am-12pm via Zoom
 - September 6th is currently scheduled as an in-person meeting with hybrid participation optional, but will depend on the commitment of critical mass to move forward. The agenda tentatively includes: Review of the updated product draft from OWRD; Review of the draft work product from the Public and Community Engagement Task Group; Data portal project informationing sharing from DEQ; and any ad hoc ideas from individual work group members. (*NOTE: Margaret/AOC indicated that she plans to share a draft concept for work group consideration and would like time on the agenda to discuss it.*)
 - October 4, 11am-3pm via Zoom
 - October 20, hold for a 2-3 hour meeting via Zoom (time to be determined)
 - November 1, 11am-3pm via Zoom
 - December 6, 10am-3pm tentatively in-person (to be determined)
-

Meeting #7 Summary September 6, 2022 from 10:00am-3:00pm

Meeting Attendees:

Work Group Members: Adam Denlinger, Anton Chiono, April Snell, Bob Rees, Calla Hagle, Caylin Barter, Chandra Ferrari, Chrysten Rivard, Courtney Warner Crowell, Dan Thorndike, Donna Beverage, Heather Bartlett, Holly Mondo, Illeana Alexander, Jason Fenton, Jeff Stone, Jennifer Wigal, JR Cook, Kate Fitzpatrick, Kathleen George, Kelly Timchak, Kimberley Priestley, Margaret Magruder, Mary Anne Cooper, Niki Iverson, Oriana Magnera, Peggy Lynch, Raquel Rancier, Tom Byler.

Process Leadership: Representative Owens, Representative Helm and Morgan Gratz-Weiser

Staff: Lili Prah, OWRD

Facilitation Team: Robin Harkless and Jenna Stillman, Oregon Consensus

MEETING SUMMARY:

Welcome and Introductions

Robin Harkless, Oregon Consensus, welcomed the group and shared a handful of updates. She noted that Tiffany Monroe had expressed she would not be able to continue on with the process due to capacity issues with her work and does not have an alternate. Additionally, Wally McCoullough acknowledged he has not been able to attend meetings recently due to workload but will stay engaged with an alternate going forward.

Tom Byler, OWRD, shared that he is retiring from the Department and will be transitioning to the private law sector, with his last day being next week. Deputy Director, Racquel Rancier, will be the new official OWRD representative engaging with the work group for the remainder of the process.

Robin reminded the Work Group that the Process Leadership team (composed of key legislators that championed this work, OWRC Chair, OWRD leadership, and the Governor's Office) had helped initiate this effort and have been active listeners as the Work Group has conducted its work to date, in anticipation of supporting and moving forward any consensus agreements developed. She shared that the Process Leadership team and Coordinating Committee had recently met to discuss concerns about the broad scope and the need to refine it and meet the legislative intent. To that end, a threshold question was posed to the Work Group about evolving the next generation of the Place-Based Planning program, "Do you agree that continuing a program like Place-Based Planning is desired?" OC heard back from all but five Work Group members with a strong indication of agreement to proceed with this focus. (*Update: Following the meeting one additional response was provided, indicating agreement*). Now with this baseline set, Robin shared that the group needs to determine how to improve it, expand upon it, and institutionalize it. Robin then invited Representatives Helm and Owens to share their remarks.

Representative Helm shared his appreciation for the time Work Group members had contributed and the progress made to date. He noted that although Representative Reardon was unable to attend the meeting, he wanted to relay his gratitude. Representative Helm expressed a call to action, seeing the critical water disasters that many places around the country are experiencing, and for this group to help Oregon plan for its water future by developing a path for regional or basin level responses going forward. He acknowledged that the legislation and mission wasn't clear enough from the outset, and the subsequent frustration expressed by some around the progression speed or level of details desired. The opportunity for this group, he reiterated, is to advise on maintaining and expanding the Place-Based Planning program to improve a broader reach and create more opportunities to solve issues and identify solutions at a community-level, by developing recommendations for the 2023 legislature and for OWRD to administer in partnership with cities, counties and all local communities.

Representative Owens affirmed his support for the group focusing on the Place-Based Planning program evolution and reflected on his own experience going through the pilot in the Harney Basin, which he suggested was challenged by not having enough information to make decisions, a lack of clarity around what having a plan actually means to the state, and whether or how it will be implemented. He shared his hope that this Work Group will improve the flexibility needed for the program and create more certainty for communities who want to engage in this work going forward, which will require a significant investment.

Robin acknowledged the Coordinating Committee and its role in process advice leading up to this deliberative moment. The pivot toward deliberating on the substance will be the primary focus for all going forward. Building upon the threshold question previously posed to the group, she explained that OWRD had refined the draft straw proposal and recommendations for the Work Group. The feedback provided by Work Group members in the worksheet responses helped set the deliberative agenda as the starting place for the conversation today, but may not be everything that needs to be on the table. She recognized that these issues are complex and for most if not all, are very personal. She invited Work Group members to engage with compassion and respect for each other and the delicate issues in front of them, focusing on the substance and taking the opportunity to ask questions of one another to better understand others' interests. Robin then reviewed the 'Timeline for Decision-Making' and how the consensus tool would be applied to the discussion today.

Straw Proposal Review and Deliberations

Tom Byler, OWRD, shared his hope that the straw proposal would help frame key questions, as reflected by the Work Group in previous conversations and learnings from the Place-Based Planning pilot, with the goal to drive discussion around what the end product could look like. Emphasizing the opportunity to redefine Place-Based Planning going into the future, he reflected on different directions for recommendations, which he noted could address the specific program needs, or could address broader system-level issues.

Lili Prael, OWRD, provided an overview of the framing and background for each section of the proposal including 1) A purpose statement and Guiding Principles placeholder, 2) Terms and Definitions as framing context for the recommendations; and 3) Program or Pathway Recommendations.

Robin clarified that the Work Group had not been asked to do a specific review and consensus check on the Guiding Principles section, but noted that some individuals did provide comments in their worksheet responses - this section will be addressed at a future meeting. In addition, she explained that any feedback not included on the deliberative agenda was assumed to be a friendly amendment and will be integrated into the next draft (v2), in order to focus today's large group discussion around some of the perceived bigger substantive issues. Based on the results of the deliberations and additional input provided via the worksheets, those updates will be reflected on the next draft (v2) of the proposal. She added that all responses provided in the worksheets had been categorized into different buckets: 1) Substantive - those items listed on today's deliberative agenda, 2) Comments interpreted as "friendly amendments" which will be incorporated into the next iterative version of the document, and 3) Clarifying questions which

OWRD and the Engagement Task Group (on the community engagement section) would be asked to respond to during today's meeting. Any outstanding substantive concerns can be raised in the next iteration or flagged today during the 'ad hoc' agenda item.

Terms and Definitions

Lili Prael, OWRD, provided a quick overview of the various sections of the straw proposal. She noted that the Terms and Definitions were inserted based on requests from work group members that getting clarity and alignment on shared understanding of some of the terms would help the group enter the recommendation deliberation space more clearly, and would help clarify intent of their recommendations after this process. Some respondents to the worksheet raised questions about where the Terms and Definitions were intended to go; two work group members went a step further and recommended that these should not be considered for legislation; rather used to inform the Water Resources Commission as it considers the next generation of PBP. (*Robin checked with the Work Group on this procedural recommendation and no concerns were voiced.*)

Recommendations Related to Balanced Representation of Water Interests:

1. Require concurrence of local governments (including Special Districts): Margaret Magruder, AOC, shared her perspective that a successful planning effort should not be initiated in a basin or region without first having local government agreement to participate in the process, and referred to WA statutory language as reference. She clarified that her proposal was aimed toward local governments concurring in order for a planning group to apply for state funding to initiate Place-Based Planning, not have 'veto' power on the plan itself.

After discussion amongst the Work Group, a consensus check was conducted on the following statement: **To apply for state funding to initiate Place-Based Planning, local governments must be involved. There was not a full group consensus/support for this proposal to move forward (11: 5's, 2: 4's, 2: 3's, 3: 2's).**

Work Group member feedback included, but was not limited to:

- Dan - Should this be under Terms and Definitions, or a recommendation requirement? Not all local governments may be functioning well and by requiring it, it could stunt a process. Inclusion would make the process stronger and anyone who wants to be involved should be able to, but it shouldn't be an absolute requirement.
- Anton - Giving counties, municipalities, etc. veto power can ultimately prove to be problematic, which was an unintended consequence with the WA provision in the Umatilla basin which actually derailed progress due to the requirement. Those entities are essential to being there at the table, but garnering support to proceed should not be required.
- Mary Anne - Local government should be at the table but should not have full veto power, nor anything that could jeopardize existing water rights. There should be better defined sideboards to determine who should be at the table.
- JR - Requiring concurrence of local government has been more problematic than helpful. A trusted facilitator is the most important component, but that could look different in different areas and depending on the foundational request of a given planning effort. Indicating a strong commitment from senior water rights holders, the

city and county can help the state to assess viability of investment, which could be folded into a rating system to help determine who is ready to embark upon planning, but not include any veto authority.

- Kimberley – Agree with objections and concerns of previous commentors. Agree that it is important that local governments are at the table and part of the planning process as it will lead to a more successful plan; however, we would not agree to veto power, even in advance of planning, even to set the table. If we follow the path of current PBP, where people “apply” to do the planning; having cities and counties on the application make for a stronger application, but not having them on it does not mean planning could not move forward.
- Oriana - Noted a difference between representation and a balance between power and feeling of value within the process.
- Donna - Different areas will have different representation, so a one-size-fits all requirement doesn't make sense. Structure participation around a basin and its needs. Can invite people to the table, but they don't have to be at the table.
- Nikki – Local government implements land use laws so planning is stronger if local governments are at the table; that will happen naturally. We need to focus on what will bring people to the table.

ACTION: Margaret will consider whether to refine this proposal for a future iteration of the straw proposal.

2. Require an active role for the State in leading the planning effort, in addition to technical support and guidance: Kimberley Priestley, Water Watch, flagged this as a larger topic for conversation and made a proposal to require an active role for the state in leading the planning effort, in addition to defining its role as technical resource. She reminded the group that this was identified in the PBP evaluation as a tension area, with a need for stronger state guidance and clarity around roles and responsibilities. HB 5006 directed this group to build upon the IWRS and the Governor's 100 Year Water Vision, both of which have a strong role for the state.

After discussion amongst the Work Group, a consensus check was conducted on the proposal that: The state should be required to participate in a specified role in Place-Based Planning processes. **There was a consensus support - with some 4's indicating a weak consensus- for this proposal to move forward (0: 5's, 2: 4's, 4: 3's, 11: 2's, 1: 1)**

Work Group member feedback included, but was not limited to:

- Jeff- Desire to hear from PBP participants about what the deficiencies might be with different roles of the state. Flexibility is not bad. Would have focus on an evaluatory tool.
- Mary Anne - Agree to better define the state role, how it works with different plans, and a clear role ahead of planning (delivering data, etc). There is a need for further conversation around where PBP should live (OWRD, OWEB, etc) given potential duplication with OWEB partnership funding. Is it just funding and coordination, or a regulatory management element too?
- Adam - state needs to continue to serve, potentially as a convener, in the process. Mid-Coast PBP would not have been as successful without the state support and partnership (e.g. data, facilitation, etc) and including various interests in the process.

- Kate- The basin has benefitted from more state involvement. Generation of technical data (groundwater studies, gaging, etc.) has been critical and invaluable. While the state wasn't set-up initially to provide process or policy, it is increasingly important moving forward. The new Basin Coordinator has been hugely helpful to create a bridge between the region and the state management framework.
- Peggy - *(In response to Mary Anne's comment)* Does not support moving PBP to OWEB. It makes sense to house this at OWRD. Remove the word "state leading/leadership" and emphasize the importance of state presence.
- Niki- Nuances between regulatory role vs convenor role.
- Oriana - Ensure state involvement and support in coordination, that is geared towards transparently identifying barriers, rules and regulations. The state may not need to be the convenor but should be an engaged guide throughout the process.
- Margaret - Remove "leading" and replace with "participating" and define those roles in a governance document.
- Kimberley—PBP does not replace basin planning (which is more regulatory) but state does manage and are the experts in their fields (ODA, ODFW, OWRD, DEQ, etc) so should be at table representing broad public interest. As far as leadership, it is our experience it would make things less frustrating and more streamlined with leadership from the state. This is a big topic that deserves more thought beyond today.
- Robin invited Work Group members to do a gut check on "the state should be required to play a specified role." Kimberley's response to this suggestion was to clarify that the desire is not to take away from existing language in IWRS, 100 Year Water Vision, and other long vetted documents which point to state leadership; this is a discussion that needs to be had as opposed to word smithing.

3. The planning body must represent a balance of in-stream and out of stream interests and including those from different sectors.

After discussion amongst the Work Group, it was generally agreed that this issue area was more about the checks and balances in practice, rather than the definition in the proposal and could instead be framed as a requirement in a recommendation, related to an update to the Place-Based Planning Guidelines and Community Engagement for ensuring more inclusive outreach and engagement in the process.

ACTION: This will be reflected in the v2 proposal.

Work Group member feedback included, but was not limited to:

- Caylin - Currently this is a "must" in ORS 536.220 (law that extended the PBP sunset): <https://olis.oregonlegislature.gov/liz/2015R1/Downloads/MeasureDocument/SB266>
- Oriana - The effort should focus on bringing people to the table or identifying alternative ways for engagement to address challenges with participation, capacity, timing, etc.
- Dan - Suggestion to add watershed councils and SWCDs on the list of who should be at the table. (Caylin echoed that she had recommended some additional categories. *These items will be reflected in v2 of the straw proposal.*)

- Kate- There is always a power imbalance when a collaborative involves water rights. Doesn't need "must" in the definitions, as long as there are assurances built in that instream and out of stream water needs will be met.
- Mary Anne—This definition needs to relate back to meeting water needs and really try to engage people if those interests are available. Support for 'may' but not 'must'.
- Kimberley—The problem is that the proposed definition is weak, but was pulled from existing PBP guidelines and in the context of that document is very clear that instream and out of stream needs must be met; so some of this might be worked out in a closer to a final document but want to put a pin in it so that if other strong PBP guidelines are not carried forward then the definition should be clear.

ACTION: Robin confirmed that this suggestion works and the group will revisit any flagged clarifications around carrying forward PBP guidelines, related to engagement and tracking different ways of bringing people to the table, even if they ultimately don't participate, to assure it's not for lack of opportunity or access.

ACTION: In the interest of time, the items related to defining "Community" and "Community-led" from the deliberative agenda were moved to the Community Engagement topic below.

PROCEDURAL RECOMMENDATION: Robin restated that the definitions are for work group members' own understanding in building recommendations and for clarifying the intent for those who will receive the recommendations. No concerns were raised with this. She shared that there will continue to be space for ongoing refinement related to recommendation development, and will tee-up two new terms to further define: (1) integrated and (2) recognized plan.

Data and Technical Assistance Recommendations

Robin shared that some Work Group members had inquired early on about the DEQ data project and given this and the potential relevance to regional water planning, wanted to follow-up and share a status on that effort. Jennifer Wigal, DEQ, provided an overview of the Oregon Water Data Portal project. She emphasized that it was intended to address needs identified in the 100-Year Water Vision and 2017 IWRS, and to improve availability and access of Oregon's water data in support of on-the-ground efforts, decision-making, and investments. With 2021 Legislative funding, DEQ is now beginning initial scoping and planning for the water data platform to identify the priority data and information needs and evaluate state agencies' existing data sets and IT infrastructure. The pilot will launch in July 2023 using available state agency data, while developing plans to address data quality and gaps and engage with local governments. Jennifer clarified that the portal is not intended to be a database for storing data, rather provide a means to enable users to access various data and analysis. Implementation is expected to follow in July 2025 and beyond. She reviewed the key parties engaged in this effort of project development, governance, workgroups, and stakeholders, with the first listening sessions scheduled for October 2022. ([PPT slides](#))

- A work group member offered the following link to another state's water data portal: <https://newmexicowaterdata.org/>

Robin shared that the Work Group has been grappling with data needs and the state's role in providing data to regional planning groups. If any recommendations from this Work Group link to the portal project, Work Group members were encouraged to highlight this.

Refinement to Recommendation A: The legislature should fund “situational assessments” for basins across the state to understand the basic data (and also data gaps) in each place; this would help the state and communities understand if there is a need for Place-Based Planning. The data would be useful for all sectors even if the place chose not to pursue planning.

After discussion amongst the Work Group, a consensus check was conducted on the refined proposed language in Recommendation A: **There was consensus-support for this proposal to move forward (0: 5's, 0: 4's, 0: 3's, 11: 2's, 3: 1)**

Work Group member feedback included, but was not limited to:

- Mary Ann and Kimberley proposed similar refinements to strawman recommendation A. They noted that the need for data to better understand readiness on the ground for planning is something that came up in the PBP assessment and that this group has also discussed. Mary Ann noted that this is also tied to the funding need for gathering data.
- Peggy - What's the difference between new A and B? We definitely need data. It's not fair to have planning groups begin without that data. If we need the data, we need staffing.
- Tom- There is data available, and work underway around HB 2018 to develop water budgets as a good platform for planning efforts. Consider whether it's about developing data, and/or interfacing with the community (for example the Harney PBP group routinely reviews data to develop trust and understanding). Not just having data, but how you go about collecting it and including the community along the way. Shouldn't halt the process because ALL data is not there.
- Chrysten- Supports situational data assessment so there is a good platform for each of the regional planning groups to build upon. General data is necessary but different basins, and the topics a group is working to address, might require different data too. Maintain flexibility for groups to identify what's needed to address challenges within their geography.
- Dan -There is a question of what data we have, what data we don't have (e.g. groundwater studies), and what data is out there but isn't willingly shared. This is a big issue, in the context of measurement and integrating into the system. Can we incentivize users to provide data, given some don't want to provide it but it is an important piece of the puzzle?
Support for creating a mechanism for the state and PBP groups to work together around data as part of a planning effort.
- Mary Anne- A community needs to demonstrate commitment and skin in the game before investing significant state resources (pre-planning consideration). Situational assessment and data providing can happen beforehand..
- JR- Social engagement without trusted data is dangerous when it comes to water management. This is a key piece in identifying whether basins are ready for planning.

There needs to be a level of audit upfront, establishment of trust around the data and gaps, otherwise it's a drain of resources.

- Caylin – Put in a budget for the state to do replicable assessments across all basins to provide understanding of overall condition and potential. The state agencies need to have a role in ensuring information can be useful in answering questions needed. Desire for acceptance of information being generated.
- April - Data and technical assistance is one of the lesser of things there will be controversy and disagreement. Data is important across a broad spectrum and agencies; that area has been underfunded. Hope that one thing we get from this effort is a list of recommendations specific to regional planning, one of those things should be showing strong support for the need for additional data across the agencies. While data is important and how it is used is critical, we need to recognize we are trying to fix a decade old problem of lack of funding for data.

Refinement to Recommendation B: Fund the appropriate level of agency staff needed for interagency data collection, analysis and technical support, and coordinated work-planning and budgeting to ensure robust participation from an interagency team.

After discussion amongst the Work Group, a consensus check was conducted on this recommendation. **There was consensus-support for this proposal to move forward (0: 5's, 1: 4's, 4: 3's, 3: 2's, 8: 1's)**

Work Group member feedback included, but was not limited to:

- Mary Anne - Support for the right training and support needed for agency staff to be effective and stay in their lanes.
- Kimberley - State agencies are there representing the broader public in whichever mission they are bringing (OWRD, DEQ, ODFW, ODA); from our perspective they need to be able to fully participate as agencies representing the public.
- Agencies could provide support as it relates to technical deliverables, but not to the degree of being a fulltime consultant. May need discretion when taking on technical support (more definition needed).
- Kelly - put a sentence in about 'sticking within mission'. Inherent that everyone should live within their mission and sideboards (this goes for Recommendation C)
- Oriana- also add that state agencies should communicate to the planning group what the bounds of their involvement may be in the process. Transparent communication about their role. Two way communication.

Re: Recommendation B: If the legislature does not fund agencies to develop/provide data and/or sit at the table as participants, then Place-Based Planning should not commence.

After discussion amongst the Work Group, a consensus check was conducted. **There was no consensus for this proposal to move forward (1: 5's, 5: 4's, 5: 3's, 5: 2's, 1: 1's)**

ACTION: Kimberley offered to consider refining this proposal further to make it less prescriptive.

Work Group member feedback included, but was not limited to:

- April - This is another discussion and topic area that has budget needs and interagency coordination that would be helpful beyond regional planning. Funding to support agency participation in regional planning should be a specific recommendation but should not be a requirement since such funding/agency capacity does not exist today.
- Donna - With Place-based planning there is staff specifically as support to each planning group. Each State agency does have missions and we appreciate that. The local staff and the state staff of those agencies need to be on the same page.
- If not a requirement, perhaps it could be conveyed that plans could be delayed on the back end as the agencies try to review/understand the plans that they have not had the capacity to engage on.
- A work group member provided a resource related to outreach and engagement around data:
<https://www.co.washington.or.us/Watermaster/SurfaceWater/tualatin-river-flow-technical-committee-annual-report.cfm>

NEW Proposed Recommendation: Implement [1998 Stewardship & Supply Initiative](#)

- Caylin proposed this recommendation, and during the course of the discussion today emphasized her desire to see basin assessments conducted across the state, given that many existing basin reports date from the 1960s and 1970s. As set forth in the 1998 Initiative, the envisioned basin assessments would collect, package and interpret core water resources data and make those data accessible to water users and public across the state. She said "core data "consists of information on basin conditions, surface and groundwater supply, water use and water rights by sector, instream flow needs as well as water conservation and stewardship as a component of future supply. Implementing the 1998 Initiative would be a prescribed version of this. She agreed that Recommendation "A" may be reflective of this recommendation so long as the intent is for the state to conduct situational assessments across the state, in every basin, and for the situational assessments to assess "core data" as defined in the 1998 Initiative.

Community Engagement

The Community Engagement Task Group (Ana Molina, April Snell, Adam Denlinger, Chrysten Rivard, Peggy Lynch, and Oriana Magnera) developed a draft guide which includes Principles and Best Practices, and a set of brainstormed ideas shared as nascent recommendations related to the state's roles and requirements for community engagement in PBP.

Task Group members April Snell and Oriana Magnera asked the work group specifically for feedback on the level of detail within the guide, whether there were any missing principles or best practices, and whether this spoke to the items the Work Group feels are important for meaningful community engagement in PBP.

Work Group member feedback included, but was not limited to:

- Jeff - Provide a checklist of helpful elements so individual communities can engage, not a prescribed standard.

- Kelly - Utilize existing programs and capitalize upon available funds. There needs to be resource support for continuation of outreach through the process.
- Oriana suggested F and G might be useful to align with the ideas developed in the Community Engagement task group. Oriana said she was hearing a number of comments that might be able to tie together in a next iteration of the Community Engagement guide and recommendations. She also noted that some refinements could be made to the draft Recommendations F and G as they relate to comments made previously by Mary Anne and Niki. Regarding potential funding concepts, Oriana flagged that the Dept. of Energy recently created a fund to support a navigator.
- Heather- How would place-based planning work in a basin where water rights have not been adjudicated?
 - Tom offered that not all basins have had surface water adjudication, and none of the state has adjudicated groundwater. There is not a way to short circuit the adjudication process, and it can be time consuming. This may be a gap as it relates to community engagement. However, perhaps PBP can proceed while acknowledging this gap.

Resources were offered by Work Group members:

- <https://sustainingcommunity.files.wordpress.com/2017/02/spectrum-of-public-participati-on-new.jpg>
- <https://movementstrategy.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/The-Spectrum-of-Community-Engagement-to-Ownership.pdf>

ACTION: The Community Engagement Task Group will meet again to discuss the feedback and make revisions to the Guide. They requested Work Group members to review the Guide again and offer any additional feedback that they can consider in the next draft.

Next Steps

- By Sept. 20: OC will provide notes from today's discussion and OWRD will incorporate consensus agreements or friendly amendments from the discussion (along with friendly amendments shared via the Worksheet responses) into the next draft (v2) of the straw proposal.
- Week of Sept 12: The CE Task Group will meet to refine the Community Engagement Guide, and invite work group feedback about anything missing or suggested refinements. By Sept. 29: Work Group members will review v2 and provide responses via the Worksheet. This will help set the deliberative agenda for the October 4th meeting.
- October 4 Work Group meeting: The Work Group will begin with the Process and Pathways and Funding and Sustaining sections.
- Since a handful of people raised concerns about the Guiding Principles section of the document, OC and OWRD will reach out to that subset and help determine how to address concerns, and will communicate back to the work group about this.
- Ad hoc ideas: Mary Anne flagged a substantive item she would like the Work Group to discuss at a future meeting - where should PBP live in the future?

October 4, 2022 from 11:00am-3:00pm

Meeting Attendees:

Work Group Members: Bob Rees, Heather Bartlett, Jeff Stone, Kimberley Priestley, Margaret Magruder, Daniel Newberry, Peggy Lynch, Mark Owens, Lauren Poor, Caylin Barter, Ana Molina, Calla Hagle, Chandra Ferrari, Adam Denlinger, Meg Reeves, Jennifer Wigal, April Snell, Niki Iverson, Kate Fitzpatrick, Ana Molina, Raquel Rancier, Lili Prah, Oriana Magnera, Bryn Hudson, Dan Thorndike, Kelly Timchak, Holly Mondo.

Staff: Lili Prah, OWRD

Facilitation Team: Robin Harkless and Jennah Stillman, Oregon Consensus

MEETING SUMMARY:

Welcome and Introductions

Facilitator, Robin Harkless, welcomed the Work Group and introduced Lauren Poor, Oregon Farm Bureau, who would be providing representation going forward in light of Mary Anne Cooper's transition from the organization. Robin then provided a review of the deliberative agenda topics constructed based on Work Group feedback, in continuing to discuss and further develop recommendations from the straw proposal. She reviewed the general areas of agreement reached during the last meeting related to data and technical assistance and noted that any topics or remaining issues not discussed during today's meeting would be addressed on October 20th. She clarified that there would be additional opportunities to revisit recommendations and definitions to make refinements and clarify levels of agreement before finalizing any consensus substance and moving it forward in a final report.

OWRD Updates

Racquel Rancier, OWRD, shared a brief update on the Department's relevant legislative concept development and explained that after a stakeholder meeting on Sept 30, this work is on pause while the HB 5006 Work Group finishes developing its recommendations. At that point, she shared that OWRD will consider any additional information and modify the legislative concept based on the direction from the Work Group. She clarified that the Department's priority is at a minimum to ensure that there is a vehicle to continue water planning while looking to dovetail the Work Group's and Department's efforts to best determine what that will look like in the future. Robin reminded the Work Group of their affirmation to focus on evolving the next generation of Place-Based Planning via a consensus check in August.

Lili Prah, OWRD, provided a brief review of the straw proposal development and refinement process based on Work Group input. She shared that the intent of the straw proposal was to create a framework for Place-Based Planning and recommendations to build a pathway for achieving desired outcomes identified by the Work Group. Lili added that the v3 straw proposal would be revised based on discussions from today's meeting and on October 20th, and reformatted to streamline any redundant information, include draft framing information that will go into the final report, and include clear crosswalks to the Place-Based Planning Evaluation. She said that while the Department has worked to link the group's recommendations with results

of the PBP pilot evaluation, she encouraged Work Group members to bring forward any additional substantive issues or remaining gaps they feel are important to address. She clarified that this straw proposal, which would become a final report, would ultimately be for decision-makers to carry information forward in subsequent legislation, but in and of itself, was not intended to be reflective of legislative language.

Kimberley Priestley, WaterWatch, raised a clarifying question about how the straw proposal content or Work Group product will connect to or inform the relevant pieces of foundational documents that are not currently included nor explicitly addressed (e.g., Place-Based Planning Guidelines, IWRS Guiding Principles, etc.) She shared that WaterWatch was interested just focusing on adjustments needed in the Place-Based Planning framework and preserving the foundational guidance established for the broader system, but noted that it was unclear about OWRD's intent and whether the whole Work Group was in agreement with this.

In response, Racquel shared that OWRD will review the Work Group's recommendations to integrate that information into legislation, rulemaking or updated guidance to inform the Place-Based Planning program and related work, as appropriate. She added that the previous documents and existing sideboards (IWRS Guiding Principles, PBP Guidelines, etc.) are not going away but do need to be updated and evolved overtime. She clarified that multiple inputs will be considered in informing how the state will move forward and further develop the Place-Based Planning program noting a caveat that full implementation of all recommendations (Place-Based Planning Evaluation, or otherwise) is not guaranteed.

Caylin Barter, Wild Salmon Center, shared a suggestion that the Work Group's final report could explicitly identify which recommendations from the evaluation were considered, agreed upon, rejected, or not considered at all. She added that to be responsive to the initiating legislation, it would be helpful to include an explanation of where the Work Group ultimately landed and why, if there was any deviation from the initial evaluation recommendations.

Following this, Robin noted that the group's final report would include a section for issues considered but not fully addressed or resolved and this might be a place to identify if any issues flagged in the PBP evaluation that fall into that category.

Place-Based Planning Program Value

Robin observed that in the review of the straw as well as some side conversations, perspectives about the value proposition of place-based planning, as well as concerns about right-sizing PBP in the system, had emerged. She invited Work Group members to reflect on the value and role of the Place-Based Planning program as a tool in the state's water planning and management system and to consider how this can help provide context for the recommendations, perhaps in the form of an introductory statement to the work group report.

Kate Fitzpatrick offered her perspective from the Deschutes Basin Collaborative's regional planning efforts over the past 25 years. She identified the Place-Based Planning program as an important foundation for connecting the state and regions to work together in solving problems on the ground and meeting state instream and out-of-stream goals, but also said this tool should

not replace other state processes. Given that each basin has a unique hydrogeologic situation and varying demands, she expressed her support for water planning and project implementation happening at the basin level, and the strength of local partnerships within that work. Kate added that the state has a critical role to provide data and help build a collective understanding of a basin's water budget, supplies, and demands, to support basin communities in the planning and implementation framework. Another important state role, she shared, was for the state to prioritize highest priority basins from the perspective of state goals, and hope for overlap with community's desire to engage.

Adam Denlinger added his perspective from experience with the Mid-Coast Water Planning Partnership. He shared that he saw the Place-Based Planning program as the most effective tool for solving unique basin issues, integrating diverse interests and expertise, and fostering the collaboration necessary to build consensus around shared water interests, both in and out of stream. Although he noted that Place-Based Planning may not be the right tool for every basin and does require a voluntary association, it can help communities struggling with various water issues by addressing those challenges in a basin-wide effort and enabling a competitive edge for funding. Reflecting on the emerging water crises around the country, Adam pointed to the opportunity for this Work Group to help the State of Oregon improve water management through the Place-Based Planning program going into the future.

Kimberley agreed that regional planning endeavors have value. That said, she reminded the group that in the PBP assessment there were a broad range of views on the value of PBP, from optimistic to qualified support to downright skepticism. She noted that WaterWatch was here working in good faith to try to make the Place-Based Planning program process better, but WW is uncomfortable with a document that tries to place a value statement on what this group was doing. Kimberley reflected that the group was not asked that at the outset, it was not in the operating protocols, and different groups likely had different input into the OC assessment on this point. She shared her thoughts around sending a report to the legislature that tries to represent a whole group position, and as such, felt it could get a little sticky. She shared her appreciation that different groups have different perspectives but cautioned against including a value statement in the report.

Jeff Stone, Oregon Nurseries Association, reflected on the importance of considering how to integrate the Place-Based Planning program in the broader state water management system beyond just extending and tweaking the authority. To better streamline the planning and project implementation continuum, he shared his thoughts on fundamental elements to include such as proper water allocation indicators to inform project feasibility; local community engagement and shared investment in projects; and the continued role of the state to help maintain consistency.

Caylin also agreed that state-supported regional planning is a valuable tool as it relates to building foundational understanding around data, supply and demand, and bridging gaps between current and future water use. She reiterated that the Place-Based Planning program is just one evaluated approach but may not be the best tool for all basins, nor the only option to pursue in the future. Recognizing that no projects identified from the four Place-Based Planning pilots have had feasibility studies and have not secured state funding for implementation, Caylin noted that there is still information to learn about this part of the process.

Dan Thorndike, Oregon Business Council, added his thoughts on the general importance of partnership between the state and local communities and the value of a structure and pipeline for the state to provide necessary supports (e.g., capacity funding to coordinate a collaborative effort; funding for data and analysis to address deficiencies; incentivizing group engagement). He also shared his thoughts on the overarching need for system-wide flexibility to respond to different issues and capacities, regardless of the program or process.

Robin summarized that she heard general agreement around the value of building collaborative capacity, engaging communities, and integrating data in water planning and that Place-Based Planning is a tool to do so. However, this should not be the only tool available within the broader system of statewide water planning and management and is not appropriate for all basins.

Straw Proposal (v2) Review and Deliberations

Community Engagement Guide

Ana Molina, Environmental Equity Committee, provided a review of the Community Engagement Task Group's work to develop the Community Engagement Guide. She explained the intention for it to be used as a tool to ensure that a diversity of voices are proactively and continuously included throughout a regional water planning effort. Peggy Lynch, League of Women Voters, added that the guide was structured as basic 'Principles' which were standards for how community engagement should happen and subsequent 'Best Practices' which were suggestions for how to address and achieve those principles. Peggy also explained the Task Group's intention for those practices to not be overly prescriptive by way of directive or statute, but instead focus on meeting outcomes and support different regions' capacities and needs.

- Kimberley raised a question about if, how, or where the Community Engagement Guide would be integrated into the group development process. She also flagged that some current pieces of the guide might be better suited for potential policy decisions in the broader straw proposal and recommendations (such as the 'Community-led' definition, discussed below).
- Adam shared his perspective that this guide would lay the groundwork for a collaborative group and help with how to begin the process of regional planning.
- Niki Iverson, League of Oregon Cities, shared her appreciation for the guide and reflected on the general importance of community engagement and specifically, communicating accessible and understandable information for the public. To that end, she supported integrating the guide to the straw proposal and also shared a suggestion for the state to fund and/or lead the engagement effort as needed in particular basins to ensure that the right capacity is appropriately provided.

In response to a question about the origin and intent of the principle, '*Regional Planning Should Sustain an Informed Public*' and the suggested practice '*Engage the public, when possible, in regional data gathering and analysis review to make information more digestible and trusted,*' Oriana Magnera, Verde, shared that by engaging local community members in information gathering and bringing in as much knowledge as possible (both technical and on-the-ground) it can enrich and contextualize data, and serve as a trust-building tool throughout a process. Robin

also confirmed that much of the substance in the guide was a reflection of the full Work Group’s input from past Work Group meetings.

Related to “Community-led”

- Peggy shared her thoughts about how the state can have a clear guiding role and provide oversight for legal compliance, while still being a community-organized planning process, done in partnership. She shared that local individuals need to feel ownership over the process, be part of decision-making, and possibly contribute funding, in order to support outcomes and meet goals.
- Adam affirmed that when a process is led and invested in by the community, it strengthens the community and builds the necessary consensus to reach decisions that will serve the community best. He noted that state partnership in providing funding, co-facilitation, data, clarity around sideboards, and supporting local capacity is critical. He also acknowledged the importance of bringing local water rights holders to the table but the potential challenge in doing so with the state being there too, given potential concerns about potentially losing water rights.
- Kimberley agreed that the community should be fully engaged, invested, and have a feedback loop into the planning process but pointed to outstanding tension and confusion around including the phrase ‘community-led’ in documents, given potential for different interpretations about what it actually means and how that manifested in different Place-Based Planning efforts. She suggested shifting the terminology to make this intent clearer and to maintain that water is a public resource.
- Oriana suggested that if not ‘community-led,’ to consider ‘community ownership’ in order to clearly signal a meaningful and accessible process with opportunity to influence outcomes within the bounds of state law. She explained that ‘engagement’ can also be perceived as checking a box and therefore people are often less willing to participate.
- Kimberley shared that she appreciated the insight around the word ‘engagement’, but remained concerned with the implications of ‘ownership’. What about ‘community collaboration’?
- Daniel Newberry, Johnson Creek Watershed Council, shared a suggestion to add to the definition of ‘community’ to include people who live or work in the basin.

ACTION: The Community Engagement Task Group will work with those who indicated willingness to assist (Kimberley, Jeff, and Kelly) to consider feedback from today’s discussion and continue refining wording for community leadership: *“Communities impacted by a process are engaged at the outset, asked to define values and outcomes for a process, and empowered to take ownership to shape the process and its ultimate outcomes.”*

PROPOSAL CONSENSUS CHECK

On describing community, Robin asked the group to gut-check their level of agreement or acceptance on the following description of community: “Community can be: People who work or live within the planning region; entities with an interest or obligation relative to water and ecosystems in the region; people or ecosystems impacted by water planning in the region or water impacted downstream of the region; and governments (federal, state, local, tribal).”

Consensus was reached.

- Mostly 1's, 2's, and 3's.
- One 4 (Margaret Magruder, AOC): Need to better understand how ecosystems would be represented. Support making the statement more active to “means.”
- Caylin suggested to change “Community can be” to “Community means” (this modification was generally accepted)

PROPOSAL CONSENSUS CHECK

Again, Robin asked for a group gut-check on the level of agreement for the description of community-led: “Community members who represent both local and dispersed statewide communities impacted by a process are engaged at the outset, asked to define values and outcomes for a process, and empowered to take ownership to shape the process and its ultimate outcomes.”

Weak consensus reached.

- Mostly 2's and 3's, and one 1.
- Two 4's: One from Margaret. Another from Caylin, who offered a reframe to remove “community members who represent both local and dispersed statewide communities” given that this is already included in the definition of community, discussed and consensus reached above. She also added that there may be planning processes that should include communities from outside Oregon depending on the down or upstream impacts.
- Jeff shared thoughts about the balance of local and statewide participation and the intent for planning to be done more locally to build local buy-in. Not wanting a process to be controlled from the top, he suggested that there be more central engagement from local participants at the table. To that point, Kate shared that she felt it was important for local individuals to build consensus with statewide entities during the process. Kimberley also referenced the intention behind the phrase ‘place-based’ which acknowledged the critical importance of local engagement and also recognized that other entities were connected to and interested in a place’s water resources. Dan added that each basin will have a unique set of players and interests, and would require flexibility to accommodate anyone who wants to be involved.
- Chandra Ferrari, ODFW, shared her support for Caylin’s suggested edit to start the definition with “communities impacted by a process are engaged at the outset...”

Related to Qualifying for Place-Based Planning

Refined Recommendation A (based on a mix of two responses to v2 Straw): “Establish a framework or prioritization protocol for the State to determine which basins qualify for place-based planning funding. The state should make these investments if PBP is identified as the best tool for addressing the water needs of that geography, and should not mandate support for any interested basin. The state should prioritize investment of these funds based on the level of need and opportunity for success using a PBP approach.”

Robin asked for Work Group member input on this recommendation.

- Dan shared a suggestion to include tiered levels of recognition with different types of assistance (e.g. technical assistance grants, capacity grants, project funding, etc.) to

encourage program participation, rather than a binary in or out/funded or not model. He added that not knowing how much interest there may be nor what the needs are, the state shouldn't create obstacles at the outset given that unknown.

- Kimberley shared that there should be a framework for prioritizing grant awards for Place-Based Planning given that the state doesn't have resources to support twenty efforts at once and not every region may be ready, want to participate, or have the same needs.
- Peggy agreed with Dan about the tiered and nuanced approach, given there is a range of needs for support. She added that OWRD needs guidance and criteria on how to allocate resources when available and suggested the high level considerations in the recommendation as written (level of need and opportunity for success) was a good level of specificity for this group's recommendations. She further offered that that level of need could include both 1) level of need to address a water crisis or 2) level of need to access resources/capacity.
- Caylin shared that she saw the situational assessment as a separate, but related process to funding prioritization and flagged concerns around a potential issue with the state evaluating and determining local readiness to engage in planning. She agreed that it was important to discuss the prioritization process and provide funds to places with a high likelihood of success, but was concerned about the reality of limited resources.
- Margaret shared that providing baseline funding for groups to begin the process is important, and added that it could be difficult to prioritize based on 'level of need'.
- Kate suggested that funding prioritization criteria could be built in based on a statewide situational assessment, particularly identifying issues of water scarcity and management issues to invest in that could then be layered with community interest rather than readiness. This could then be built into a funding program and the pot could continue to grow.
- Dan agreed that prioritization criteria could focus on level of need and opportunity for success.

PROPOSAL CONSENSUS CHECK

Robin offered a reframed proposal for Recommendation A based on the group's discussion: "Establish a framework or prioritization protocol - a 'situational assessment' related to readiness - for the State to determine which basins qualify for place-based planning funding. The state should make these investments if PBP is identified as an appropriate tool for addressing the water needs of that geography, and should not mandate support for any interested basin. The state should prioritize investment of these funds based on, including but not limited to, the level of need and opportunity for success using a PBP approach, using a tiered approach to allow for flexibility. (See: OWEB grant program approach as an example)."

- Two 5's and one 4
- One 5, Jeff explained that he supported there being a continuum of funding, but disagreed with the state determining whether a community is ready. He felt that it shouldn't be overly prescriptive or complicated for a community to come together to identify needs.
- Peggy responded that if the state is going to provide funding for planning, they should have some criteria for determining how to allocate those funds. Adam added that there does need to be a pre-qualification process, but it doesn't need to be a barrier. Oriana agreed and noted that any criteria put in place should be designed in an inclusive way to

enable access to support. She offered a reframed proposal to include “...or which may benefit from technical assistance.’

- Niki suggested deleting “a situational assessment related to readiness” and that the rest of the recommendation sufficiently covered the intent; program criteria developed by the Department would help groups determine whether to pursue funds.
- Dan spoke again to his idea about tiered support based on level of readiness and need, suggesting different levels of prescription based on the tier of funding. He hoped this group would send the broader framework message that there should be funds to support regions get ready for planning as well as planning itself, and that the support should be broad and flexible and lead towards implementation.

In response to Robin’s question clarifying where there is alignment on this topic, the Work Group

generally agreed that there should be established criteria for accessing Place-Based Planning funds, and there should be tiered levels/different entry points and a spectrum of resources for different regions to support different needs.

ACTION: OWRD will draft a recommendation given this direction. The latest version posted for

discussion in the meeting was: “The State should establish criteria to prioritize which basins qualify for place-based planning funding. The state should make these investments if PBP is identified as an

appropriate tool for addressing the water needs of that geography, and should not mandate support for any interested basin. The state should prioritize investment of these funds based on, including but not limited to, the level of need and opportunity for success using a PBP approach, using a tiered approach to allow flexibility (see OWEB as an example grant program that provides for capacity building, technical assistance, implementation and other grant options).”

Related to Recognition of a Plan and Implementation

Robin reviewed the discussion point teed up on the deliberative agenda about the potential structured role(s) for the state to assist a place-based plan toward implementation once it is recognized which included but was not limited to, those inserted in the straw proposal under ‘Pathways and Process’ recommendations G-K:

- Ongoing coordination and technical assistance support for groups to refine and assess the feasibility of implementation activities identified in their plan.
- Working to address any policy needs that were identified in the plan
- Assisting place-based planning groups in identifying opportunities for funding (e.g. reviewing actions within a plan to determine which would qualify for existing funding programs)
- Funding support for implementation activities via place-based plan program grant.
- Commit to planning review and updates every 5-10 years

Work Group members provided initial input, but the because of time constraints the conversation was cut short and OC told the group the conversation would be carried forward to the October 20th meeting.

- Kimberley stated that before opining on the individual bullet points, she wanted to bring the group back to the PBP structure that was originally designed as a three-step process, where there are place-based plans that then give basins extra points going into funding pots that exist for feasibility (1069) and some projects (839). She noted it is not clear that that pathway is not working. She shared her appreciation that there probably a need to keep the groups together to some degree, but some of the things on the list go beyond that. She also asked for clarification before commenting on the substance. OWRD responded that the 1069 feasibility program’s current scope is limited to primarily funding reuse, conservation, or storage projects, not the full suite of potential projects that could come out of Place-Based Planning. Additionally, water project funds [which covers a range of water projects] does have preference points for projects developed as part of a collaborative. Also, those existing funds are not intended to be the only opportunities, nor the most appropriate mechanisms, for supporting projects and that other state agencies and entities could pertain (e.g., DEQ, OBC, etc.). OWRD has recognized that as groups go forward to plan for funding, there are coordination aspects needed even after a plan is adopted. Thus, the question is on the table- also reflective of a “gap” finding from the PBP pilot evaluation.
- Peggy suggested that the Work Group’s recommendations related to funding should not be limited to just OWRD funding programs.
- Caylin responded that as the Place-Based Planning pilots have just been recognized, it is not yet known how the progression to 1069 feasibility to 839 project funding will play out, with continued coordinating around implementation.
- Kate shared that the current pathway may be fine but needs to evolve and grow. She suggested that revisiting the 839 program with an evaluation and potential adjustment to ensure it adequately includes all potential projects, and acknowledgement that the availability of implementation funding would need to grow. She added that rather than limiting groups to a linear approach, a plan can be iteratively developed and implemented along the way.
- Adam agreed with Kate and added that the state needs mechanisms to fund planning and implementation at the same time.
- April Snell, Oregon Water Congress, shared her hope that OWRD and the legislature will take action to extend and build upon existing opportunities but thought this issue might need to be flagged for the parking lot.

Wrap-Up and Next Steps

Robin reviewed some of the remaining topics and issues for discussion during the October 20th meeting including implementation funding; checks and balances around conditions for state support for PBP; remaining process and pathways topics; sustaining effective planning; and potentially revisiting language for an introductory section for the PBP recommendations, to contextualize the group’s report. She reminded the group that the straw proposal is the deliberative substance under refinement and will eventually be migrated over to the group’s final report. She shared a review of the draft report outline and the general content that is intended to be included in that document, which will be reviewed at a future meeting.

ACTION: OC will send this draft report outline to the Work Group to better understand the intended approach to moving recommendations into a final report.

Robin invited members from Process Leadership to share closing remarks. Representative Owens reflected on the day's discussion topics and affirmed the intention for partnership between regional groups and the state. He shared a desire for the Work Group to further populate recommendations and the report as much as possible so that when that information moves to the legislators to bring forward and support, there is no confusion about the intent or direction. Representative Helm noted the topic of incentivizing basins to do this work and invited the Work Group's creative input on how to engage a community and how to help them pay for the planning, coordination, and implementation. Meg Reeves, OWRC Chair, shared her hope that the Work Group will reach more clarity on the following issues going forward, which she identified as current gaps in the system: 1) Determining the appropriate role and integration for the Place-Based Planning program in the broader water planning and management system, 2) Clarifying what recognition of a plan looks like, and 3) Assessing alignment (or lack of) between Place-Based Planning and the two current funding programs to ensure or evolve the appropriate pathway going forward.

In closing, Robin shared that the next Work Group meeting is October 20th via Zoom from 11am-3pm. The following meeting is scheduled for November 1st and will be held in-person in Salem with a hybrid participation option as needed. She shared her appreciation for the difficult and constructive conversation and offered her hope for the group to continue the momentum in further developing the final recommendations and report.

Meeting #9 Summary October 20, 2022 from 11:00am-3:00pm

Meeting Attendees:

Work Group Members: Anton Chiono, Adam Denlinger, April Snell, Bob Rees, Caylin Barter, Chandra Ferrari, Chrysten Rivard, Courtney Warner Crowel, Dan Thorndike, Daniel Newberry, Donna Beverage, Heather Bartlett, Illeana Alexander, Jennifer Wigal, JR Cook, Kate Fitzpatrick, Kelly Timchak, Kimberley Priestley, Lauren Poor, Margaret Magruder, Niki Iverson, Oriana Magnera, Peggy Lynch, Racquel Rancier,

Staff: Lili Prah, OWRD

Facilitation Team: Robin Harkless and Jennah Stillman, Oregon Consensus

MEETING SUMMARY:

Welcome and Introductions

Facilitator, Robin Harkless, welcomed the Work Group and opened the meeting with a reminder of the dwindling process time and finish on the horizon. She encouraged all members to continue

bringing their voices forward in support of a ‘no surprises’ principle for this collaborative work. In addition to the written worksheet feedback received on v1 and v2, she clarified that all of the discussions during Work Group meetings will also be considered as part of the deliberative inputs for iterative recommendation drafts, including suggestions for friendly amendments and additional details. She reviewed the focus topics for today’s meeting which included: a proposal regarding a tiered approach to Place-Based Planning grant funding; clarifying the state’s role and responsibilities in Place-Based Planning; reviewing the Community Engagement Guide and recommendations; and as time allows, reviewing the draft introduction language for the report. She shared that the November 1st meeting would focus on topics of implementation and recognition of a plan. OWRD would be prepared to share information regarding how these steps have played out with the Place-Based Planning pilots and evaluation, in order for the Work Group to be better informed to discuss and advise on this piece of the system.

Some Work Group members shared comments regarding clarification around consensus checks and deliberative topics, the final report format, and accessibility of materials on the public website. Peggy Lynch (League of Women Voters) suggested that the final report should speak to an overarching emphasis on the needs for state agency funding and staffing required to support regional water planning. Additional conversation around this reframing later ensued and is captured below in the summary. Kimberley Priestley (WaterWatch), April Snell (Oregon Water Congress), Caylin Barter (Wild Salmon Center), and Chrysten Rivard (Trout Unlimited) voiced concerns generally related to how the deliberative items, group conversations, feedback, and preliminary consensus checks are being woven together; and how outstanding topics will be addressed and/or incorporated in the report. Chrysten said she would follow-up with specifics about any substantive items that she feels have gotten dropped that she is most concerned about, but did not offer any specifics at the meeting. Oriana added a comment about the need to show how the work has evolved. Caylin shared that OWRD’s current webpage designated to this project was difficult to navigate and noted specific difficulty providing clarity for the public on how the group narrowed its focus on the next generation of Place-Based Planning. Oriana agreed about the desire to make information more accessible and added that it could be confusing for the public to know what to comment on and that perhaps there could be more specific framing for public input. Lili Prah (OWRD) shared that the structure of v3 straw proposal is intended to streamline and consolidate interconnected or overlapping recommendations, and integrate all feedback collected to date from worksheet responses and meeting discussions around deliberative topics. Robin added that this v3 structure will show the substantive evolution of topics, specifically where gut-checks were conducted along the way to signal levels of early agreement. She clarified that right now, tracking has occurred through the meeting summaries and the cross-walking work that OWRD has done to show the iterative changes from one version of the straw proposal to the next. Racquel Rancier (OWRD) added that their team will discuss the website format and work to get all documents in one place.

Facilitator’s note: Formal consensus checks will be conducted after v3 of the Straw is deliberated upon, following the November meeting(s) once the group has concluded its deliberate efforts in this process and the work pivots to report writing. Work Group members will be asked to offer their formal level of support on substantive recommendations; the range of responses (weak, strong, or no consensus with outlying concerns noted) will be inserted into the Work Group report.

Straw Proposal (v2) Review and Deliberations

Qualifying for Place-Based Planning Funding

Robin reviewed where the Work Group left off during their last meeting on October 4th related to this item. Although the Work Group did not reach early alignment around the Pathway and Process Recommendation A, there was general agreement around 1) having established criteria to access Place-Based Planning funds and 2) creating tiered entry points to support different groups and varying levels of need. OWRD followed up and worked with a small group to further this idea. Dan Thorndike (Oregon Business Council) shared an overview of the following proposal related to qualifying for Place-Based Planning funding and clarified that the small group had focused on what supports could be included in the various tiered options, rather than creating a binary threshold of ‘all in/out model’ that was less accessible and effective.

- **Augment Process & Pathway Recommendation A with:**

Part 1: The legislature should fund OWRD regional/basin outreach and engagement staff throughout the state to help facilitate and guide groups through the Place-Based Planning Process. At a minimum, these staff would:

1. Provide consultation to groups interested in undertaking PBP
2. Help identify the local leaders, key state and federal agencies, tribes, and stakeholders needed for a successful planning process
3. Coordinate interagency data collection, analysis, and technical support as needed by the planning group
4. Coordinate an interagency team to support and execute planning from consultation through implementation
5. Participate in the planning process and any continued processes associated with implementation

Part 2: OWRD should create easily accessible materials, including a pre-application checklist, for potential conveners and planning groups to preliminarily assess (1) whether Place-Based Planning is the best tool to meet their needs and (2) their initial capacity and readiness to engage in Place-Based Planning.

- **Replace Process & Pathway Recommendation J with:**

The Place-Based Planning grant program should be competitive and structured to provide onramps for groups with varying levels of capacity and resources. Specifically, the Place-Based Planning grant program should include:

1. Small Capacity Grants to help groups, especially those in underserved areas, prepare and assess their readiness to engage in the Place-Based Planning process. At a minimum, this would include scoping and convening of a group to (1) assess their needs and capacity, and (2) identify program design and cost of things like critical data, facilitation, and program administration (including report writing).
2. Planning Grants to support groups in following the Place-Based Planning guidelines to develop a plan and achieve state recognition.

3. Implementation Coordination Grants for groups with State Recognized Plans to continue collaboration and coordination as they implement their plans.
4. Grants for Plan Updates for groups to update their plans to reflect progress in implementation, changes in local conditions and/or updates to data availability or climate change information

Work Group member feedback included, but was not limited to:

- Peggy shared her appreciation for this recommendation and supported providing small capacity grants.
- Daniel Newberry (Johnson Creek Watershed Council) shared his support for this proposal and how the different points of access and need areas help address equity concerns and issues with capacity. He also urged OWRD to continue considering equity as part of the grant process going forward.
- Kimberley raised confusion regarding how this proposal related to the action item from the October 4th meeting, which was to address qualifying for Place-Based Planning funding in addition to the tiered options of support. Specifically, she raised outstanding questions about 1) criteria for being chosen to do Place-Based Planning, 2) what activities/actions ‘implementation’ should encompass, and 3) subsequent checks and balances around supporting implementation. It was clarified that this proposal was not intended to replace the recommendation around prioritization criteria, and Kimberley urged the Work Group to revisit that piece. Given the references to implementation, a topic not yet discussed, she was not comfortable offering her gut response on the idea today and requested a hold on doing any sort of consensus check on this item for today. She asked for clarification that specific tiers of the funding structure being presented were related to groups who had qualified for Place-Based Planning. (*NOTE: This clarification is still needed, the Work Group will need to revisit depending on if and how the tiered funding idea moves forward in this process.*)
 - In response, Dan shared that he felt it would be difficult for the Work Group to come up with meaningful recommendations around what qualification criteria should be. He assumed that if there was funding available to create this pot, the details would be sorted out in a rulemaking activity.
 - Racquel added that OWRD was preparing to put forward information during the November 1st meeting around what criteria was previously used for the Place-Based Planning pilots, which could help inform that forthcoming discussion.
 - Peggy added her perspective that the Work Group had agreed that implementation was intended to include a variety of actions to address water problems that might come with or from the plan (not just projects).
- Chrysten shared her support for the scoping component of the proposal. She reflected that taking the time upfront would help identify which issues and concerns were either appropriate for undertaking a Place-Based Planning process or identifying a different state tool that may be needed. She recommended building out another level of clarification in the recommendation as to what should happen in that first tier of scoping in a clear and coordinated way. She also shared that she felt it would be important for this

process to ensure that if there was a crisis in an area, addressing it would not be delayed, which she felt could potentially happen if there was a planning exercise underway.

- Caylin shared that she felt the proposal generally made sense, especially having a centralized coordination staff and data, but should be tied to broader needs to address funding and capacity issues. Reflecting on the Place-Based Planning pilots, she shared that it hurt the process when some agencies weren't allocated funding to participate, and that this barrier around funding agency support should be addressed going forward.
- Kelly shared her appreciation for the proposal and wondered how realistic that this would all get funded, citing current staff capacity limitations at OWRD. She offered a friendly amendment to reorganize the recommendations reflective of the actual sequence these actions would be in if implemented.
- Related to current basin and engagement coordinators, Racquel provided clarification about their purviews, in general and how they relate (or don't) to Place-Based Planning. With two Basin Coordinators, there is not currently enough staff to cover the state. From OWRD's perspective it would be helpful to have those positions in more places and connected to a broader suite of basin issues in order to help move work forward.
 - April shared concerns about budget realities and funding requests. She advised that the Work Group be strategic about what it prioritizes with respect to elevating funding requests to the legislature and next Governor. She said she supports funding complex basin positions to work with diverse interests and communities in water planning efforts, but these positions should address broader needs beyond just Place-Based Planning. She agreed that more coordination was needed around grants, data analysis and agency staff engagement.
 - Kate added that the Deschutes has a complex basin coordinator and this has been a significant value-add resource that she hoped all basins could have in some form in the future.

The Work Group members' discussion evolved, circling back around to a comment raised earlier in the meeting about broader, critical system-level needs that need to be addressed to enable successful regional water planning and management work. Building upon the conversation related to Place-Based Planning funding and supports, the group generally agreed that without first prioritizing and addressing the current overarching system-level need for funding related to ***state agency data collection and analysis, staffing, and interagency coordination***, then no program, Place-Based Planning or otherwise, can be successful.

Work Group members further discussed and generally confirmed that the fundamental needs noted above are worth articulating as a strong recommendation from the Work Group. After the break (see notes below), a small group volunteered to take this topic and develop it into a proposal - building off the prior agreed items related to Data and Technical Assistance, and the discussion around the proposal laid out today.

ACTION: Bob, Chrysten, Kate, Kelly and Peggy will work on a draft for the full Work Group to review at the next meeting.

Work Group member feedback included, but was not limited to:

- Dan shared that if the state is serious about addressing integrated water issues across the state (e.g., quality, quantity, etc.), all relevant state natural resources agencies need to be connected, coordinated and funded to work meaningfully and effectively moving forward. Having only OWRD liaising with water planning and management hinders the process.
- Caylin suggested to clearly call out and prioritize the recommendations around expanding the state's data access and technical assistance, where the group had landed on general agreement that it was important to underpin not just Place-Based Planning, but all other water planning and management work. She offered an articulation of potential top recommendations as to imperatives: 1) Fund water data (collection and analysis) and 2) Fund staff across all water agencies.
- Kate Fitzpatrick (Deschutes Basin Collaborative) agreed that to reflect the bigger picture needs of the system, an overarching recommendation should stand on its own related to prioritizing funding for data, staffing for agencies, and interagency coordination.
- Chrysten agreed that this overarching recommendation should be separate and not specifically tied to Place-Based Planning, given that it was relevant to the success of *all* water planning in Oregon. She expressed her perspective on the need for a state-level process for strategically coordinating and investing in priority areas of concern.
- Ileana Alexander (CTCLUSI) added that in addition to starting with a baseline of data, staff, and funding, there should also be flexibility in how places build on that and start planning and/or projects.
- Donna Beverage (Union County Commissioner) affirmed that she felt interagency coordination is a high priority in general, and specifically with providing data to planning groups and making that information public.
- Kimberley shared that she generally agreed with prioritizing bigger system issue recommendations for funding data and agency staff, as discussed in early meetings, but was concerned about suggesting funding for any and all water planning without sideboards or standards in place.
- Donna and Chrysten both suggested that the state should identify priorities and then align those with different basin needs (related to water crisis issues of concern, separate from a group's readiness for planning) to strategically invest resources and proactively address issues.
- Daniel asked if funding is just dependent on who is ready/capacity or does the state also prioritize grants based on other criteria?
 - Peggy expressed that if we have the data, staffing & coordination, *then* who gets grants is a secondary issue. First, the state needs the overall information and capacity before deciding which planning should be prioritized.
- Margaret added that planning groups, counties, and cities also need capacity and should be considered.
- Niki agreed with the original, broad focus on helping inform the state on how to better do water planning and management. She shared that ideally, every basin would have a coordinator, and that the state should be doing this but is challenged for funding.

Robin summarized the discussion up to this point that the group generally desired to establish a fundamental recommendation and advice to the state about foundational items for effective water planning and management. She noted the group can also hold space for specifically looking at

how to optimize the PBP tool, as has been the focus of work and deliberations since August. These items could be captured in distinct sections of the report. She also acknowledged comments that were shared about keeping Place-Based Planning simple and making sure it continues; and to be strategic about what the Work Group intends to ask the legislature to fund.

Further comments are bulleted below for more context on the topics:

- Kimberley specifically called out an important nuance around the difference between funding staff capacity on ALL planning efforts versus efforts and issues that are deemed priority by the state.
- Illeana shared that it would help small governments, including Tribal Governments, participate more readily if there was a guarantee that there will be available baseline data and staff for maintaining that data. This will be helpful in getting people to the table. Beyond that, competitive grants should take a case by case approach.
- Adam reflected that although planning is important, funding seems to stand alone in this conversation and that lawmakers need to look at this issue and agree that funding is the most fundamental aspect of what we are doing here, with respect to planning for water in the future.
- April suggested that the recommendation should be specifically tied to “regional planning and management” and distinguish recommendations between funding and policy, and perhaps even further delineate those that the Work Group feels are generally important considerations and those that are essential/critical elements related to regional water planning.
- Dan added that Place-Based Planning can be a great tool when properly designed and supported; but without data, agency funding and interagency coordination, it won’t go anywhere and no tool can be successful. He noted that “staff capacity” may be a confusing framing given that it’s really about sufficiency. He asked how the state can fund *all* natural resources agencies so they can effectively do what they need to do?
 - Caylin suggested a broader definition of ‘agency capacity’ that would include both full-time agency staff *and* enable the ability to contract for the service supports, recognizing that this work can’t be done within just the agencies involved with water planning and management.
- Caylin also suggested that this recommendation, and planning efforts, be directly tied to be of service to the IWRS and clarify that the planning frameworks (Place-Based Planning and other tools) are holistic to meet instream and out of stream needs. She added that based on today’s conversation and the group’s energy around foundational priorities, she wasn’t sure if this needed to be tied back to Place-Based Planning, as to focus on bigger issues and barriers to effective regional water planning and management.
- Chrysten suggested that framing should highlight “foundational informational needs for effective planning and management.”

Community Engagement Guide

The Community Engagement Task Group members, plus Kimberley and Kelly shared an update on the changes reflected in the Draft Community Engagement Guide that was based on discussion during the last Work Group meeting and continued in a small group meeting to reach resolution around specific definitions and reflected intent.

Robin added that the Task Group had previously offered a proposal that the high-level principles described in the Community Engagement Guide could be used as a basis for standardizing requirements for a state to provide funding for regional water planning and management. Taking a next step beyond friendly suggestions, this would be part of program standardization going forward. The Community Engagement Principles in current form are as follows:

- A. Regional Planning Should be a Collaborative
- B. Participation in Regional Planning Should be Balanced and Inclusive, and Should Include both Instream and Out of Stream Interests
- C. Regional Planning Should Be Transparent and Accessible for All
- D. Regional Planning Should Recognize that Tribal Engagement is Unique and Layered
- E. Regional Planning Should Foster Public Input Early in the Process and Ongoing
- F. Regional Planning Should Sustain an Informed Public
- G. Regional Planning Should Support Trust Building Between All Participants, Community Members, and the State
- H. Regional Planning Should Demonstrate Accountability

There was a brief discussion around the word “layered” as it relates to the Community Engagement Principle for Tribal participation. Some weren’t clear on what it meant exactly. Illeana offered framing in the chat (that built off a previous comment from Kelly) and suggested the intent of “layered” was to reflect the different levels of Tribal Council, Natural Resource staff, and tribal community members; similar to the federal government. Recognizing that not every tribe will have the same position, interests or ability to engage at the same level, this should be taken into consideration when approaching Tribes to bring them to the table.

ACTION: Illeana (with possible input from other tribal representatives) offered to consider reframing and offer revisions for this principle.

OC polled the group on: #1: Do you endorse the Community Engagement Guide for use in future place-based planning (with the caveat of potential refined language for tribal engagement principle)? Poll #2: Recommendation that a clear set of standards for engagement should be tied to accessing state funding for regional planning, based on the high-level principles from the Community Engagement Guide.

Some group members weighed in with comments (Caylin, April) that they would like to see a Purpose of the Guide statement before they can be asked to endorse it. There was a quick reflection from the 10/4 meeting at which Ana described the purpose as such: *To be used as a tool to ensure that a diversity of voices are proactively and continuously included throughout a regional water planning effort.*

ACTION: This statement or a similar purpose will be included in the Community Engagement Guide and the group will revisit the question of endorsing this guide and /or elevating the Community Engagement Principles for use in determining funding access for Place-Based Planning.

Clarifying State’s Role and Responsibilities for Place-Based Planning

- **The state should assess and develop a full suite of water planning tools and identify which tools or approaches will lead to the most successful outcomes in various basins given geography, community, hydrology, and magnitude of water crisis.** (Chrysten)
 - Chrysten shared that she felt this proposal would be addressed in the fundamental, overarching system recommendation discussed earlier in the meeting. As clarification, she explained that she felt it was essential for this Work Group to convey that water planning and management is important *and* there are multiple ways to go about it to address different situations.

- **Require the state to provide data interpretation, establish planning scope and sideboards within the law, paying for neutral professional facilitation, providing professional SME technical writing services, and having state agency staff participate as group members. Agencies may elect to not provide technical assistance or other means of support to Place-Based Planning efforts if staff resources are not available.** (Kimberley)
 - Kimberley shared her perspective that the state role and framework is critical for Place-Based Planning. Agencies are there representing the public under various missions and need to weigh in on those things at the table. The recommendation should provide both directives *and* an off ramp for agencies, so as not to create any unfunded mandates nor required prioritization of support to PBP over other existing work. She shared that these directives related to the state’s role should be more clearly stated and would like the group to discuss where that should be reflected in the documents and/or report.
 - Robin invited the Work Group members to share their thoughts on directing requirements for the state’s role in Place-Based Planning.
 - Adam agreed that for Place-Based Planning to be successful, it will take leadership and engagement from state agencies. He also highlighted the reality that many communities might not have the capacity in place to take on this work and that having a structure of state-support to uplift those places is important.
 - Need for smaller entities to get baseline data, data interpretation, and
 - Oriana suggested a friendly amendment for the recommendation to specifically address the state’s role around data support for smaller groups or communities that may lack capacity (e.g. staff for gathering baseline data, interpreting, and maintaining data), given the alignment of the group around that topic and its importance in helping groups get started and make informed decisions. Kimberley agreed.

ACTION: Kimberley will prepare an updated draft proposal related to the State’s roles in PBP, and incorporate the suggestion from Oriana.

There was no public comment.

Wrap Up and Next Steps

Robin reflected on the major themes that had emerged during the meeting, including specific Place-Based Planning programmatic recommendations and separate, foundational overarching statewide system recommendations, which she noted would be reflected and tied together in the

v3 straw proposal to show a more cohesive structure around the deliberative issues and hopefully, the Work Group's ability to see the full picture.

November 1 meeting:

- Plan recognition and implementation - information sharing from OWRD as well as Work Group discussion about options for defining or structuring this piece. Implementation was a concern voiced from Work Group members throughout the process; there are clear ties to PBP findings; and based on remarks from OWRC Chair Reeves that plan recognition is ill-defined and the Commission would benefit from advice on ways to provide more structure to this as it relates to PBP recognition.
- Some work group members had expressed, via worksheet responses on v1 of the straw proposal, a desire to revisit the Guiding Principles for effective water planning and management that were included in v1 of the straw. These will be brought back to the group for consideration potentially for inclusion in the introduction of the Report. Kate and Kimberley also drafted an introduction statement related to the Place-Based Planning tool in the system.
- Work group members not in attendance will have an opportunity to weigh in on substantive items discussed at this meeting. (*Facilitator's note: The facilitation team is exploring options for a separate, 2-3 hour virtual meeting in mid-November to provide more space for deliberations. In addition, OWRD will consider ways to gather feedback on the v3 straw document that is both accessible and efficient for work group member input as we near the end of the process.*)
- The meeting was adjourned.

Meeting #10 Summary **November 1, 2022 from 11:00am-4:00pm**

Meeting Attendees:

Work Group Members: Anton Chiono, Adam Denlinger, Bob Rees, Chandra Ferrari, Chrysten Rivard (via Zoom), Courtney Warner Crowell (via Zoom), Dan Thorndike (via Zoom), Daniel Newberry (via Zoom), Donna Beverage (via Zoom), Heather Bartlett, Illeana Alexander (via Zoom), Jason Fenton (via Zoom), Jennifer Wigal, JR Cook (via Zoom), Kate Fitzpatrick (via Zoom), Kathleen George (via Zoom), Kelly Timchak, Kimberley Priestley, Lauren Poor, Margaret Magruder, Oriana Magnera (via Zoom), Peggy Lynch, Racquel Rancier

Staff: Lili Prah, OWRD

Facilitation Team: Robin Harkless and Jennah Stillman, Oregon Consensus

MEETING SUMMARY:

Welcome and Introductions

Facilitator, Robin Harkless, welcomed the Work Group to the second in-person meeting and shared her appreciation for those who were able to gather together and those joining via Zoom.

She then reviewed the main topics for the meeting which included: recognition and implementation of a plan for evolving the next generation of the Place-Based Planning program, revisiting the tiered structure for program funding and support, and a review of an updated system-level proposal developed by a volunteer subset of Work Group members. She noted that as time permits, there were a handful of outstanding issues and updates to address and were still being tracked, as all of the work to date that would move forward in the v3 straw proposal. Regarding the tracking table that had been sent out with pre-meeting materials, she clarified that it was not a reflection of consensus around recommendations but was a tracking tool of the substantive topics at play. Robin then invited Meg Reeves, Oregon Water Resources Commission Chair to share opening remarks.

Meg Reeves thanked the Work Group members for taking on this effort for the benefit of the state. Reflecting on the challenges and recent progress made, on behalf of the Process Leadership Team, she reminded the group about the charge that had been directed in August by the Process Leadership team and confirmed by the group to focus on improvements to the Place-Based Planning program. She acknowledged the recommendations related to system-wide concerns and urged the group to use their remaining time to focus on providing additional detail, clarification and cohesiveness for the Place-Based Planning recommendations. She also highlighted the state's role in recognizing a plan, the significance of having a recognized plan for local communities, and the implementation of a recognized plan as key areas needing more direction.

Some Work Group members shared their initial thoughts regarding the topics that Meg had raised. Peggy Lynch (League of Women Voters) stated that there has to be a more explicit process of connection from OWRC's recognition to the multiple agencies that may be responsible for enacting the plan. Daniel Newberry (Johnson Creek Watershed Council) added that Place-Based Planning pilots' plans underwent a multi-state agency review process before being put forward to OWRC, but clarified that he felt that recognition itself comes down to access to state funding and should include implementation support. He added his hope that there would be a recommendation that addresses what the recognition process means if there is no funding, given potential crises and funding needs for the state in the future. Donna Beverage (Union County Commissioner) shared her perspective on recognition from when the Upper Grand Ronde pilot plan was recognized, and in addition to what Adam had shared, she noted that there was direction that the information contained in the plan would inform future updates to the IWRS. Kimberley Priestley (WaterWatch) raised a process question regarding how the Work Group's recommendations with regards to Place-Based Planning would potentially connect to legislative concepts, either OWRD's or the placeholder from Representatives Owens and Helm. Racquel Rancier (OWRD) responded that it would depend on the final recommendations and a forthcoming analysis to determine what avenue made the most sense and might be subject to change.

ACTION: Oregon Consensus will reach out to Representatives Owens and Helm to ask for clarity on their intentions for connecting their placeholder legislative concept and the report of this Work Group, and relay any relevant information to the Work Group either via email or during the next meeting's opening remarks.

Place-Based Planning Grant Program

Robin shared a review of the discussion from the last Work Group meeting and the general early alignment that had emerged around the proposal for a tiered grant structure with different support offerings and access points. She noted that in addition to the structure of the grant program, there was a second proposed component put forward about being competitive with established criteria that had not yet been fully discussed. She reflected that both items seemed to have early alignment, but they were also acknowledged as distinct proposals. To that end, Robin asked the group if there was basic alignment around these two components and whether the group wanted to put additional details forward:

The Place-Based Planning grant program should be competitive with established criteria for accessing Place-Based Planning funds.

The grant should be tiered with different qualifications to provide different onramps for groups with varying levels of capacity and resources.

Work Group member feedback included, but was not limited to:

- Dan Thorndike (Oregon Business Council) shared that he did not think the Work Group should go into further detail around the criteria, which would be better addressed in rulemaking. He emphasized that he felt the most important thing for this grant program was to be broad based, representative for all areas, and provide different access points for groups with varying capacities and in different phases of the planning process. He added that ideally there would be flexibility with the general application process and possibly a rolling grant program, or multiple open periods. He clarified that he felt that “competitive” meant that there wasn’t an unlimited amount of money or resources available within
- Kimberley shared her perspective that there would be one overarching threshold to enter the Place-Based Planning program through one open application, with a selection process from the state, and then those designated as Place-Based Planning efforts would have access to the tiered supports within the grant program. She clarified that she felt the grant program should not be open to just anyone, given the limited funding available and desire to enable groups chosen to do planning to see that work all the way through with continuous state support (funding and general resources).
- Margaret Magruder (Association of Oregon Counties) shared that she supported having established criteria for accessing grants and added that “competitive” might be too daunting of a word without clear understanding and that maybe a different word would be better.
- Daniel referenced the OWEB FIP grant program as a two tiered model to consider.
 - Chrysten Rivard (Trout Unlimited) provided additional information about OWEB’s program, which she shared has two decision-making criteria embedded to 1) assess if a group is eligible and ready and 2) prioritize efforts that align with OWEB’s priorities around greatest issues of concern, ecological focus, and resource allocation. She felt that a tiered approach for the Place-Based Planning grant program should have both of these considerations, for prioritization both among applicants and statewide issues to invest in. She clarified that she didn’t think the Work Group had time to tackle criteria details, but that they *could*

suggest general areas of prioritization for consideration moving forward, and that it would be important to clarify how and where prioritization happens.

- Heather Bartlett (Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Indians) agreed with tiered access and referred to EPA wetland program development grants - one tier for groups that don't have a plan and another tier for those who do have a plan and can apply for on the ground support.
- Kelly Timchak (Curry Watersheds Partnership) agreed that criteria should be based on the state's needs and priorities. She also emphasized that just one Place-Based Planning grant or program cannot realistically cover all of the work and as such, matching funds will realistically come into play, but that the state could provide support in helping groups identify other funding sources.
- Dan shared that grant program priorities and allocation decisions need to be integrated and coordinated amongst all state agencies, not just driven by OWRD and quantity issues. He also raised caution around the Work Group putting in too much detail around criteria or priorities.
- Peggy raised a consideration that while she generally supports OWRD housing the Place-Based Planning program, there are challenges given that the program, criteria, needs and selection are broader than OWRD's purview, i.e. not limited to water quantity. She suggested that there should be interagency coordination around the front-end of the process in developing grant criteria, selecting applications, and coordinating priorities.
- Anton Chiono (Confederated Tribe of the Umatilla Indian Reservation) noted that the original Place-Based Planning pilot grants were provided in lump sums and as such, wondered if basins could present a budget of *all* anticipated needs in an application. He suggested considering gap funding to support varying needs to promote planning that meets criteria, but that doesn't penalize those who aren't as far along. A question was then raised about whether the intent of the Place-Based Planning grant program was simply to provide gap funding vs. support for the full effort. If so, this needed to be clarified.
 - OWRD responded that the Place-Based Planning pilots had to propose a budget but didn't know what it was going to take, and received allocations within the budget at hand. Additionally, the Place-Based Planning program funding was not included in the OWRD General Fund base budget and was not run as gap funding. They asked that if gap funding was the intent going forward, what was the subsequent expectation for the state being at the table?
- Margaret shared that the state should not be expected to fund Place-Based Planning in entirety, but that it will be important for the state to provide adequate initial funding for groups to get going, build capacity, and then support them to seek funds elsewhere; emphasizing that funds shouldn't be distributed too slowly.
- Adam Denlinger (SDAO) suggested that the state should introduce a consultation process for all basins to understand their qualification eligibility upfront. Also, that there should be a commitment for funding to complete the process even if it comes from different avenues, partnership funding, etc.
- Bob Rees (NW Guides and Anglers Association) agreed that there has to be a commitment from basin stakeholders to do the work and create a product, and that if accountability is not met, there be repercussions with regard to those funding allocations.

Robin summarized the discussion up to this point and that the group generally agreed that 1) There should be a grant program structured with different tiers of grants and flexible access points to meet communities where they are at with their needs and opportunities; 2) There should be qualifications for grants with strategic priorities established by the state to determine those qualifications, as well as accountable commitments around community partnership with the state; and 3) This grant program should be tied to other grant programs and funding opportunities related to planning and implementation.

Place-Based Planning: Recognition of a Plan

Lili Prah (OWRD) provided a brief review of the high-level takeaways from the background materials provided in advance of the meeting related to the current status and process for recognition and implementation, based on the learnings from the Place-Based Planning pilots and independent evaluation. Materials can be found [here](#). Robin then asked the Work Group to share their thoughts on whether or how to build in clarity and structure around recognition and value of a plan that leads to implementation.

Work Group member feedback included, but was not limited to:

- Adam shared that he felt ‘the value of a plan’ was multifaceted - conveying upfront to partners and stakeholders for buy-in, helping build a more widespread understanding of how water is managed and the impacts of implementing solutions, and after recognition, having the credibility and documentation to better qualify for more grant funding to do work and address larger problems. However, not everyone in the planning process saw or understood the inherent value of the plan.
 - Anton agreed and suggested that the inherent value needs to be made more clear and communicated for internal participants and broader stakeholder groups throughout the planning process.
 - Kimberley agreed that having a plan gives groups a leg up with grant funding and added that this should be highlighted for grantees upfront, maybe in the Place-Based Planning Guidelines.
- Kelly asked, given that is not currently required for a plan to be recognized by OWRC, if it was ok for each group to decide whether to pursue recognition or not? If so, she suggested that there should be a statement included to clarify this flexibility and individual choice.
- Chandra Ferrari (ODFW) acknowledged that there is not a lot of integrated agency coordination around recognition of a plan and that although the agencies are trying to build one voice around recommendations, OWRD is the ultimate decision maker and has the ability to move forward despite different agency perspectives. Noting that if all agencies have resources to bring to bear for all steps of the process, she suggested that this Work Group should explicitly outline guidance for agency involvement along the way in the planning process, from consulting on criteria and selection all the way to support toward implementation.
- Peggy added that the IWRS had to be approved by all four of the agency commissions and that there was a process that recognized the integrated nature of this work and the necessary contributions from all agencies. Although supportive of the importance of other state agencies fully recognizing a plan and connecting various programs and resources for

implementation, she also cautioned about the ‘urgency of now’ and the need to move important work forward.

Place-Based Planning: Implementation

Racquel reviewed the criteria for OWRD’s existing grant programs - one for feasibility studies and one for specific types of water projects. She shared that the range of actions identified out of the four Place-Based Planning pilots did not all fit the criteria for these grants even though there is some overlap with categories and collaborative preference points. (Racquel also shared at the 10/4 meeting that the pilot program was not designed to limit Place-Based Plans or subsequent actions solely to these two implementation funds.)

Work Group member feedback regarding implementation funding included, but was not limited to:

- Chandra highlighted that Place-Based Planning is not explicitly referenced in ODFW funding criteria and could be more direct, although the agency has broadened in scope to include water planning. She suggested the Work Group include a recommendation to direct an interagency coordination team to develop an implementation funds toolkit and process for groups to help identify existing funding sources, where plan actions would fall, and some level of gap analysis to ensure that needs are covered.
 - Peggy agreed and added that housing the Place-Based Planning program at one agency creates an inherent problem and felt that it was important for groups to know where to go to implement that work and have access to any solutions identified in a plan.
- Kimberley clarified that just because an action is listed in a plan doesn’t mean that funding or resources are guaranteed.
- Lauren Poor (Oregon Farm Bureau) shared that groups shouldn’t be forced to write plans geared towards existing grant programs, given the changing nature of funding programs and resources and that plans should be relevant for years. Her recommendation was that future plans should be written to meet the water needs of a region and then secondarily, there would be a toolkit analysis of all current grants that could suit the needs for the plan.

Work Group member feedback regarding updating a plan and state support included, but was not limited to:

- Jeff Stone (Oregon Association of Nurseries) suggested that rather than mandate a marker of time, there could be various triggers (both internal and external factors) that would initiate a plan update.
- Daniel noted that to keep plans from sitting on the shelf, it is important to build in periodic evaluations and recommended once per biennium. He suggested this could be part of the state recognition process, in evaluating what progress has been made, helping determine whether larger updates are needed, and driving future decisions.
- JR Cook (NE Oregon Water Association) also nodded to the reality of biennial budgets and the time it takes to do the work. He suggested linking progress reports, budgeting and implementing legislation in order to act upon plans effectively and urgently address water

problems. He felt that ten years was too long for plans to undergo updates, and noted the time commitment to do full plan updates.

- Adam added that most regional plans have built-in quarterly check-ins with stakeholders.
- Peggy suggested that since it sounded like reporting activity was already built in, submitting a biennial report to the legislature (or agencies who recognize the plan) would be an efficient means to demonstrate the value of the plan.
- Dan emphasized the need for an ongoing, living document that is updated and adjusted as needed to be responsive. To Peggy's comment, he suggested that these reports be sent to an interagency body or agency commissions, so as to not get lost in the legislature.

Work Group member feedback regarding implementation coordination and project implementation included, but was not limited to:

- Jennifer Wigal (DEQ) clarified that OWRD currently 'owns' the recognition and implementation support process for Place-Based Planning and suggested that the Work Group should recommend formalizing interagency commitments if that is the direction they want to go.
 - Kelly added that she thought that OWRD should not lead implementation and that it should be a local role, but recognized that it depends on the planning and the place.
 - Racquel agreed that there was a need for a formal process to involve state agencies on the progress and priorities of the planning groups, and would require funding for both implementation coordination and implementation work itself.
- Kelly shared her support for the three implementation strategy options to enable tiered support for general implementation and some technical assistance, recognizing that the current funding for Place-Based Planning is only for planning and doesn't include implementation.
- Kimberley shared that WaterWatch had concerns about developing a new, separate fund for Place-Based Planning project implementation and wanted to clarify that this was not intended to create a specific fund for implementation. She also shared that she felt the group didn't have time to deal with the details around how to do it, but that it was important to ensure overall balance with instream and out of stream objectives.
 - Chandra added that given the state agencies' role in ensuring balanced in and out of stream work is occurring, she suggested including clarifying details in the recommendation about *how* this should occur overtime and keep momentum for implementation.
 - Chrysten suggested including a question in the annual reporting and/or from funding reviewers that asks groups to demonstrate the effort of moving forward with all objectives, and ensure checks and balances as a condition of renewing implementation support. She added that although an important accountability mechanism, it would be important to maintain flexibility for the pace of implementing some objectives (e.g. 1-2 years) and not block groups from accessing any funds.
 - Anton added that this balance question/progress accountability could be connected to progress updates / evaluations developed with the planning groups every 2 years.

- Peggy agreed that there did not necessarily need to be a separate, new fund for implementation but that it would be critical to make sure that there is funding available for this work. She also agreed that the biennial reports would provide the opportunity to outline what’s missing and what’s been successful.
- Jeff agreed that this balance check-in question should provide a more supportive pathway to determining the right route for the region and issues at hand, and not be an institutionalized barrier.
- Dan suggested that this should be a specific recommendation, a funded mandate directing the state agencies to provide implementation support as well as accountability (e.g. metrics and monitoring) over time. He also added a suggestion to reframe the state’s role in “advocating” for funding rather than a stronger mandate to ‘fund implementation.’

In summary, Robin shared that she heard the emerging recommendation is about guaranteeing some support for these plans from the gateway to implementation, which is not currently structured in the program. This would include a structured interagency component, partnership between planning groups and the state, and an implementation funding opportunities toolkit.

System-Level Recommendations

Robin reviewed the discussion and direction from the 10/20 Work Group meeting regarding the broader system-wide needs to support all statewide water planning and management including but also beyond just Place-Based Planning. She shared that since the last meeting, a small group of volunteers (Bob, Chrysten, Kate, and Peggy) met to develop a proposal to reflect the direction of the Work Group, and their offering included a background context statement along with three specific recommendations. Peggy shared a review of the proposal (in **bold** below) and clarified that while the group wants to make sure that Place-Based Planning continues, the critical first step is to ensure that foundational pieces, captured in the recommendations, are addressed in order for all water planning and management to be effective.

“To meet statewide goals and mandates for managing instream and out-of-stream water needs with a changing climate, Oregon needs to make significant investments in water planning. Any state-supported regional water planning and management must be underpinned with the budgets and capacity needed to do this work at the state level. To meet this need, state leadership must prioritize and address the current overarching system-level need for funding related to state agency data collection and analysis, agency capacity, and interagency coordination. Specifically:

1. **The Legislature should fund data inventories across the state to understand foundational informational needs in each basin. Data inventories would inform strategic and effective water planning and management and help prioritize state-supported regional water planning throughout the state with a focus on areas of scarcity.**
2. **The Legislature should fund the appropriate level of agency capacity needed for interagency data collection and analysis, technical support, and coordinated work-planning and budgeting to ensure robust cooperation and engagement by and between agencies in support of water planning and management efforts that seek to meet both instream and out of stream water needs.**

- 3. The Legislature should fund climate-informed water budgets for basins across the state to better understand current and future hydrologic conditions. This work would lead to better informed water planning and management. However, given the critical need for water planning and the long-term nature of this type of commitment, having climate-informed water budgets should not be a prerequisite for regional water planning to begin.**

Another important component of any state-supported regional water planning and management work is community engagement and collaboration. The workgroup has created a Community Engagement Guide with guidelines and best practices for how to meaningfully engage communities in regional water planning (Appendix X). This is intended to be accessible to and used by everyone involved in building a successful regional water planning and management collaborative (e.g., state agency staff involved with regional water planning, communities, etc.) The guide is intended to be a tool to ensure that a diversity of voices are proactively and continuously included throughout a water planning effort and in ongoing management. It is intended to be accessible, flexible, and inclusive in order to support diverse regions and communities. The hope is that by providing this guide to regional water planning and management groups, it will provide support to ensure that no one is left out of the process.”

Work Group members generally agreed with the intent behind this proposal and offered additional feedback that included, but was not limited to:

- Kelly suggested emphasizing “foundational informational needs,” including a statement about prioritizing data collection to address any critical needs, and making a clear tie between recommendation 1 and 2 *informing* recommendation 3.
- Jennifer suggested restructuring and rewording the recommendations to clarify the baseline data and information needed, as it relates to legislation for all state agencies to make datasets publicly available and the DEQ-led development of a water data portal - which she clarified was not about collecting data, rather about coordinating data and making it accessible to end users.
- Anton added that “data inventory” might be too broad and should focus on clarifying the intent (and effectively directing resources) to proactively gather basic, useful data necessary to form a basin’s water budget. He conveyed that not all data needs to be gathered to the highest, publishable degree and that at a minimum, there should be a stream gauging network in all basins and a process to identify what data, or data quality, is needed to answer particular questions.
 - Kate added that ideally every basin would have a current water budget and data inventory but that there should be a prioritization process. To that end, she suggested combining the data inventory and water budget pieces so that priority basins have a budget to work from and in the absence of those, a general understanding of the data that does exist.
 - Bob agreed that prioritized data will vary from basin to basin and leaving it broad enough for that to happen is important, and to consider direction from basin stakeholders on what information may be needed.

- Racquel clarified what she was hearing, that the recommendations should emphasize usable data that doesn't require layers of technical analysis.
- Kimberley offered a friendly amendment to include 'instream and out of stream' in each recommendation, assuming that they will translate to funding requests. She also suggested that in addition to understanding data gaps, it was important to add direction to identify a path to filling those gaps.
- Peggy suggested updating the recommendation to include "essential data and data gaps" to direct the state to take a more active role in addressing instream and out of stream crises statewide.
- Heather added that data can also be used to show how effective a plan or projects are, which would be helpful tying back to the reporting and accountability discussion previously. She also raised caution about how data gathering can slow down a process, if critical information is needed and not on hand before a process starts (e.g. Harney County groundwater data).

Robin shared that she had heard that these recommendations were intended to be broader than Place-Based Planning, in directing the state to do an inventory of critical water budget information for every basin, that would then lead to informing strategic investments and more effective planning and management across the state as well as inform Place-Based Planning efforts. She also reflected the Group's sentiment that significant investment was needed for state agency coordination to integrate across silos, address data gaps, and support better planning and management.

ACTION: Friendly amendment suggestions will be reflected into the v3 straw proposal. Any additional wordsmithing could be done by the small group.

Public Comment

Harmony Burrigh shared that she was a former OWRD staff member involved with the Place-Based Planning pilot program development and coordination. Acknowledging that she had not heard the Work Group's discussion on this topic today, she shared that recognition and the value of a plan was a recurring theme of interest and concern that surfaced during the Place-Based Planning pilots process. She noted that all the internal work developed on this topic had not necessarily been provided and suggested the Work Group review additional materials that had been prepared around this topic to continue building upon previous work done.

Robin shared her appreciation for the group's progress and focus today. She then briefly reviewed the tracking document and highlighted some topics that had evolved based on discussions today, as well as remaining issues not discussed (e.g. Community Engagement guide, the use of Community Engagement principles as considerations for grant criteria, and any explicit recommendation or advice around sustaining the Place-Based Planning program). She asked the Work Group to review the tracking document and flag any major conceptual ideas not reflected in the tracking tool right away. She shared that the v3 straw proposal of updated recommendations would be sent no later than November 7th and that OC would follow-up with a communication about how to review and respond to v3, as well as next steps and expectations

for the remaining meetings (November 14th and December 6th, both virtual). The meeting then adjourned.

Meeting #11 Summary November 14, 2022 from 9:00am-12:00pm

Meeting Attendees:

Work Group Members: Anton Chiono, April Snell, Bob Rees, Caylin Barter, Chandra Ferrari, Chrysten Rivard, Courtney Warner Crowel, Daniel Newberry, Donna Beverage, Heather Bartlett, Holly Mondo, Jason Fenton, Jeff Stone, Jennifer Wigal, Kate Fitzpatrick, Kathleen George, Kelly Timchak, Kimberley Priestley, Lauren Poor, Margaret Magruder, Niki Iverson, Peggy Lynch, Racquel Rancier.

Staff: Lili Prah, OWRD

Facilitation Team: Robin Harkless and Jennah Stillman, Oregon Consensus

MEETING SUMMARY:

Welcome and Introductions

Facilitator, Robin Harkless, welcomed the group and reviewed that the focus of the meeting was to review the v3 straw proposal, deliberate on outstanding substantive topics, and conduct a gut check poll on each recommendation. She shared that it was important for members to weigh-in with their strong sentiments either in support of certain ideas moving forward or serious concerns (along with alternative proposals) in order to help the group understand where their work is heading with trending areas or alignment or divergence. Noting that this was the second to last meeting of the process, Robin clarified that it was not the final consensus check. She reminded the group about the direction from Process Leadership regarding the intent for the recommendations to inform future policy, reiterating that today's discussion was not about wordsmithing. Today, she clarified, was the final opportunity to flag major concerns (and offer a proposed approach that would yield a higher level of agreement) that OWRD would integrate into v4 to reflect the group's idea development and general alignment. On December 6th, workgroup members would provide their final, formal consensus check, discuss where else they feel the results of this effort should go, and clarify the intended audience(s) for each recommendation. To that end, she shared that there would be an opportunity for a small group of interested volunteers to help OWRD with light wordsmithing for formatting and consistency purposes, but would not change the report's content from what the group had agreed to.

Straw Proposal Recommendations v3

Lili Prah, OWRD, shared a high-level review of the workgroup's concept development from the inception of the process to today. This focused specifically on how the v3 straw proposal recommendations had evolved from previous iterations and were refined or streamlined at various steps along the way, based on workgroup direction. She noted that more in-depth

tracking documentation had been provided in advance of the meeting for those that were interested in specific details. Robin shared that the facilitation team had heard from a few workgroup members who were not able to attend the meeting, who indicated their support for both the straw proposal v3 and Community Engagement Guide. She added that Kimberley had put forward a proposal about the state's role around Place-Based Planning, which she noted was not currently explicitly in v3, but will be discussed later today. *Workgroup member feedback included, but was not limited to:*

Opening Language

- Kimberley Priestley (WaterWatch) requested to change this language and simply state the charge of the group and the process, given concerns about conveying the intent to inform legislation along the way and not wanting to signal alignment from every workgroup member about forthcoming legislation.
 - Niki Iverson (League of Oregon Cities) shared that she felt it was important to convey that the report is a high-level conceptual document about the value of topics to move forward, and that the group is not reaching full consensus on all recommendations. She suggested including a caveat at the beginning of the report to reflect that the group as a whole is not signing off on every recommendation as a top priority, given that there has not been a ranking exercise. She also provided an alternative suggestion to Kimberley's point to replace "legislation" with "policy development and guidance around water planning..."
 - Both Niki and Kimberley agreed that it would be helpful to include a disclaimer in this opening section that communicates individual work group members are not necessarily signing off on specific legislation.

Recommendation A

- Kimberley suggested that it would be helpful to include "basin assessments" to know what data is there and chart a future pathway to identifying data gaps and filling them before planning takes place, related to past conversations amongst the workgroup and not wanting to undermine the legislative direction with the note that was included with the recommendation.
 - Kelly Timchak (Curry Watersheds Partnership) voiced that the recommendation should clearly convey that groups can continue to move forward with planning even if every piece of data is not on hand at the start. She suggested that the note could be removed or moved in order to clarify the recommendation's intent, as long as the note's intent was addressed elsewhere.
 - Niki suggested keeping Section I recommendations solely to funding, but to reference the tie between Recommendation A to Recommendation I, which can then be more specifically detailed in Section II.
 - Kate Fitzpatrick (Deschutes River Conservancy) agreed that Recommendation A leads logically to Recommendation I, and emphasized that it is important for basins to have access to vital data but should not need to have all of it at once in order to proceed.
 - Peggy Lynch (League of Women Voters) suggested that the detail from Recommendation I (related to Place-Based Planning) should be included in Recommendation A as well, given that it relates to all kinds of regional planning

and wants to ensure that all planning has the same opportunities as outlined for Place-Based Planning.

Robin summarized that she had heard people express it was important for Recommendation A to emphasize that the data collection itself is important to fund and prioritize, and should apply to all types of water data and planning that the state should do. She added that the note would be removed or shifted, as to not dilute the intent of the funding recommendation but to ensure that it was clear that planning groups would not be required to have all data on hand in order to proceed with planning efforts.

Recommendation B

- Kimberley made a suggestion to change “cooperation” to “participation” to reflect the intent behind agency roles in any planning group, to be active participants not just technical experts/advisors. She felt that stronger language was needed to bring them to the table to have a voice in water planning.
 - Chandra Ferrari (ODFW) shared that she felt the word “engagement” currently reflects the intent behind active participation.
 - Jennifer Wigal (DEQ) added that it would be important to bring relevant regulatory framework into the process in order to figure out what each effort may need from agencies to bring to the table, but not be construed as needing agency buy-in.
 - Peggy suggested removing “cooperation and...” but keeping “robust engagement...” recognizing that the state agencies have a role related to statutes, mission and rules - but need to ensure that there is funding for them to do it and work together in order to address critical issues around water.
 - Anton Chiono (Confederated Tribe of the Umatilla Indians) shared his perspective based on past processes that there needs to be an explicit space for agencies to engage, and to have the latitude to freely advocate for and fulfill their missions, not just provide technical assistance. He also added that this was important to ensuring state recognition of a plan.

Recommendation C

- Caylin Barter (Wild Salmon Center) noted that the recommendation was framed in negative language and offered a friendly amendment that references the positive framing from the context section to maintain consistency and impact.
- Kate offered a friendly amendment to change the language to “regional water planning and management efforts”

Section II: Context

- Peggy asked a clarifying question about the definition of “watershed or basin scale” and expressed a desire to ensure that smaller efforts can be included within Place-Based Planning.
 - Daniel Newberry (Johnson Creek Watershed Council) responded with a caution that if many small planning efforts want funds from the program, there may not be enough resources to make a substantial impact at scale. He suggested considering a minimum size of a watershed and potentially adding a

recommendation to provide clarification around this, given that he felt it could mean different things to different people.

- Kate agreed with the desire to focus on a large enough scale that could create a meaningful impact and added that maybe the term “watershed” already encompassed enough flexibility.
- Anton shared his support for maintaining some level of flexibility and self-determination by the planning groups themselves within the guidance of the watershed scale. He also offered a request to explicitly reference that watersheds should be based on geologic boundaries, not political ones.
- Kimberley shared a suggestion to delete “implementation” in (7) given that it is unclear what is expected of state agencies.
 - Peggy and Donna Beverage (Union County Commissioner) both shared that they felt “implementation” was important to include given that there is an expectation that the state will help implement the plans.

Recommendations D

- Kimberley expressed her concern about the lack of clarity in this recognition around what the state agencies would be directed and required to do related to implementation support for a recognized plan, and not wanting to create an unfunded mandate.
 - Peggy clarified that this recommendation should hold space for different implementation support needs based on all things that might potentially come out of a planning effort, not just about projects and not just focused on water supply. She felt that it was ok to keep it vague in order to maintain that flexibility to support a diversity of future outcomes.
 - Chandra shared her perspective about state agency support for implementation that could include formal state agency coordination (‘one-stop shop’ toolkit) to provide assistance to groups to navigate existing funding sources and connect information related to implementation and moving the plan forward. She also added that having a Basin Coordinator available to work with groups while navigating the actual grant applications would be helpful.
 - Caylin agreed that the current recommendation language around state recognition and agency implementation support was too vague, and noted that more clarification around this topic was highlighted as a need from the Place-Based Planning pilots. She clarified that providing support and providing funding for actions identified within a plan are two different things and should be clarified. She shared her perspective that if a plan was recognized then that group or effort should be first in line to receive funding for implementation; should receive continuous support to continue convening and coordinating a group after a plan is completed. To that end, she also suggested including more clarification around what the actual requirements for recognition are and calling out this definition.
 - Kate agreed that based on the pilots’ experience, it would be important to call out what state recognition of a plan actually means and what the benefits are to a group. She also referenced a previous document that had been developed by OWRD staff during the pilot phase that compiled various resources that

Place-Based Planning groups could access, and suggested that this be considered in further developing the recommendation.

- April also felt the incentives around recognition should be more explicitly conveyed at the outset, and could include receiving funding that supports water planning, receiving funding that supports feasibility to take ideas to the next phase, and receiving funding to support implementation (e.g. storage, piping, and all other multipurpose projects). She added that groups could receive extra points that go through each phase to have a greater chance to receive funding in the next phase.
- Anton added that this recommendation could be further clarified by outlining 1) what planning groups get from having a recognized plan, 2) what the state agencies' requirements should be around recognition and implementation supports, 3) what conditions may be needed to access that at various steps along the way.

Hearing general alignment amongst the group to further flesh out details for Recommendation D (and remove the first bullet point to Recommendation G), Robin invited a small group of volunteers to develop an updated proposal to clarify what state recognition means and what it gets a group. Volunteers included Anton, Kimberley, April, Chandra, and Peggy.

Recommendation E

- Kimberley expressed concern about the potential for 'grandfathered' recognition, given that some plans were previously recognized that may not have the same sideboards in place as current or future ones. She suggested that there be a process in place to ensure that all plans move forward with the same criteria.
 - Anton agreed that it was important to clarify that recognition would not be a one-time thing, in order to ensure that basins continue to meet criteria and demonstrate commitment to collaboration and have conditions that enable access to that ongoing support.
 - Chandra added that related to maintaining state recognition and interagency support, there could be a formal process in place that enables a conversation around implementation progression, evaluation of balancing priorities, and the state's role as it relates to the agencies' missions and priorities.

Recommendation G

- Multiple workgroup members (Chandra, Peggy, and Kimberley) made a suggestion to add a clarifying statement about "within the agency's existing mission and authorities."
- Peggy and Caylin suggested that DSL and DLCD be added to the agency list.
- Kimberley suggested that the word "participation" be exchanged for "engagement" so as to not construe intent.
- Dan Thorndike (Oregon Business Council) shared a concern that as written, interagency consultation and support would only happen if a plan was recognized. To that end, he made a suggestion to drop "state recognized plans" given that this could be an important step for a group in exploring whether to pursue this path and in meeting the missions of state agencies, that this engagement should be available to all. Recommends making this available to all.

Recommendation H

- Kimberley asked for clarification around what the definition of “implementation” was in this section and shared her concerns about potentially burdening agencies with undefined work, given optics and expectations. She felt that there was agreement around the first section but should be qualified with a statement so as to not create unfunded mandates.
 - Kelly added a suggestion to include direction and/or a disclaimer within the agency directives/mission/priorities section.
 - Donna expressed caution around expressing contingencies directly related to Place-Based Planning, so as to not signal any uncertainty around its importance going forward.

Recommendation L

- Kimberley shared her concern about this recommendation potentially being interpreted differently by workgroup members. She conveyed that her perspective and preference was for different groups to access different levels of support at different points in the process, but those tiered options would only be available to those that were chosen to participate in the Place-Based Planning program, as an initial threshold for overall access. She added that if this was not the rest of the group’s interpretation, and that small capacity grants were intended to be accessible to any group, then she felt that it had more narrowed criteria than the other tiers of support. Additionally, she did not want to include the suggested examples of tiers.
 - Others (Kelly, Peggy, Jeff, and Kate) weighed in and shared that they felt it was important to include the examples. Kelly shared that she felt the recommendation was good as written, given that she saw small capacity grants as a way for groups to explore the possibility of pursuing Place-Based Planning and was an important way to get a foot in the door, and therefore should not have overarching program criteria associated with that first step and tier.
 - Although recognizing Kimberley’s concerns, there was general agreement amongst the majority of the group to keep the examples and maintain small capacity grants as a general, accessible option to groups in and outside of the official Place-Based Planning program.
- Anton asked a clarifying question about whether these tiered grants were intended to be new planning and capacity grant programs and if yes, how they would intersect with existing ones (e.g. OWEB). He shared a suggestion to keep grant criteria congruent between that which governs the Place-Based Planning program and processes.

Recommendation T

- Niki shared her support for creating and sustaining more Regional Basin Coordinator positions to help groups and efforts find funding for all water planning and management work, not just specific to Place-Based Planning (referring to a model put forward by OBC), in order to support higher-level issues. She clarified that this would be a different focus than watermasters, in order to emphasize more focused work in planning, facilitating, etc. She also suggested prioritizing Regional Basin Coordinator position requests based on the prioritization of basin needs, after the water budgets are finalized.

- Peggy agreed that Regional Basin Coordinators’ scope should cover all regional water planning and management efforts, not just Place-Based Planning and not just within OWRD’s purview. She suggested the concept of the Regional Solutions Teams that bring all agencies together to discuss regional issues.
- Peggy shared that she did not support (3), directing a process to explore revenue sources, and shared her concerns about the critical and urgent need to fund and address state water issues, without competition from non-water interests, and without creating any extra fees on water utility bills.
 - Jeff generally agreed, recognizing both the aspirational approach of the draft language and the actual reality of the current structural process (e.g. authorization and appropriations). He noted that it would be important to clearly signal the desire for funding continuity that is not currently in place.
 - Daniel added his thoughts on the proposed language to “explore revenue sources,” and shared that he did not necessarily know what that meant as written, but assumed it indicated something other than General Funds. He stated that this should be made more explicit, and then shared an example of California where a bond measure was passed to support their regional water planning program.
 - Niki shared her perspective that the state has not sufficiently funded water-related programs to date and that given General Funds are a public resource, the state should step up and use these to invest in natural resources moving forward. She added that any revenue sources should be applied equitably across the board, and not targeted to one group or interest area.
 - Bob shared that he felt all stakeholders and Oregonians should have some degree of financial commitment to improving the funding process, but noted that he respects the opinions of others that participate directly in state budgeting processes to help inform this approach.
 - There was general agreement to remove (3) from Recommendation T.

Wrap up and Next Steps

In closing, Robin reflected on the input and evolution generated in today’s discussion around these recommendations that will be adopted in v4 moving forward. As for the next steps, she shared that the small group of volunteers would meet to develop an updated proposal around the recognition of a plan, as well as clarification around the incentives for groups, and as it relates to interagency implementation support. Having heard from only two workgroup members (April and Kimberley) that they may have additional comments on v3 that were not discussed today, Robin shared that she would follow up with them (and the full workgroup) with an approach to review and suggest edits to help bring these concepts forward for the full workgroup’s review and determination.

She clarified that after v4 is shared (no later than November 23), this is largely the final version that will move into the final report. The December 6th meeting will conclude with a final, formal consensus check and the approach would not be based on consensus/no consensus, but rather capture the high-level alignment and spectrum of support. Robin added that if an issue is not fully reflected in the report nor is representative of the full group, but rather an individual interest/entity, there will be an option to include this nuance in the report in order to provide

clarity for audiences. The final report has always been intended to go to the legislature, as well as OWRC, OWRD, and the Governor's Office, which reflects the Process Leadership Team - who has signaled from the start of the process that they would be the recipients of whatever comes forward from this effort. Workgroup members will have an opportunity to share their thoughts on where else they feel this work should go, and important next steps, during the December 6th meeting closing.

Meeting #12 Summary

December 6, 2022 from 11:00a.m. - 3:00p.m.

Meeting Attendees:

Work Group Members: Adam Denlinger, April Snell, Bob Rees, Caylin Barter, Chandra Ferrari, Chrysten Rivard, Dan Thorndike, Daniel Newberry, Donna Beverage, Holly Mondo, Illeana Alexander, Jason Fenton, Jeff Stone, Jennifer Wigal, JR Cook, Kate Fitzpatrick, Kelly Timchak, Kimberley Priestley, Margaret Magruder, Niki Iverson, Oriana Magnera, Peggy Lynch, and Racquel Rancier

Process Leadership Team: Representative Reardon, Representative Helm, Meg Reeves and Morgan Gratz-Weiser

Staff: Lili Prah, OWRD

Facilitation Team: Robin Harkless and Jennah Stillman, Oregon Consensus

MEETING SUMMARY:

Welcome, Introductions, and Housekeeping

Robin welcomed everyone to the final meeting of the HB 5006 Work Group, noting that today would conclude the process with a formal alignment check on the final version of the recommendations from v4 of the Straw proposal shared by OWRD including some work done by small groups. She clarified that the group had discussed and evolved these recommendations over the past few months and that no further refinement or negotiations would be made. To clarify how the recommendations and alignment check results would move forward, Robin explained that they would be inserted into a simple, final report that would also include a brief introduction about the legislation that directed this process, general information about the Work Group, and an appendix with all supporting materials (e.g., meeting summaries, etc.) Additional agenda items included addressing an outstanding question about whether or not to include the Terms & Definitions in the report, discussion time for the Work Group members to share how the final recommendations had landed for them along with any closing remarks about hopes for the

work moving forward. Finally, the group would hear closing remarks from the Process Leadership Team.

Lili Prah, OWRD, then shared a high-level overview of how the final recommendations had been refined since the previous version (v3) which included integrating workgroup member discussion and feedback from meetings, development on state recognition recommendations from a small group of volunteer workgroup members, and additional email input from the full workgroup on the neutral facilitation recommendation. Also, she noted that two workgroup members had volunteered to review the recommendations for clarity and consistency, and those edits were integrated into the final version. All changes were reflected in a redline version which had been shared in advance.

Work Group Final Discussion on Final Recommendations in v4

Robin then invited every workgroup member to share their perspective on how they viewed the recommendations and anything else that they might want the full workgroup to be aware of going into the final alignment check. She clarified that this would not be the time to make further refinements.

- Jeff Stone (Oregon Association of Nurseries) shared that although the planning process is important, he doesn't want the process to be the product. He added that local initiation and support are essential and done in relationship with state agencies, and flagged some outstanding uncertainty about how the consultation process would engage other state agencies besides OWRD.
- Kimberley Priestley (WaterWatch) shared that she saw alignment around themes of data and agency capacity and has seen this in other forums, and felt it would be important to elevate state investment.
- Niki Iverson (LOC) pointed out that the reality of getting all of the recommendations funded will be challenging and that prioritization is likely to play out in the legislative session.
- Daniel Newberry (Johnson Creek Watershed) highlighted a desire to see the balance between funding both data inventories and group functions in legislative allocations, cautioning that there will always be more data needed and therefore must also enable groups to operate while that collection happens.
- Bob Rees (NW Guides and Anglers Association) shared that it had been helpful to learn more about water policy throughout the process and appreciated the space to do so.
- Jennifer Wigal (DEQ) shared her perspective on how water quality interfaces with this process, in bringing together both political and hydrological boundaries in future projects. She recognized the constrained role of agencies and noted that DEQ doesn't currently have the desired capacity to participate in planning discussions and hoped that the recommendations, along with the thoughtful community engagement conversations, would change that in the future.

- Kate Fitzpatrick (Deschutes River Conservancy) shared her appreciation for this group's opportunity to think aspirationally about water management in a way that was different than lobbying for interests. She also shared her hope for every basin to have access to specific resources (e.g., Basin Coordinator, etc.) and for the conversation to continue beyond this forum in addressing tensions between state and local management in order to be prepared with data, agency capacity, and regionally appropriate solutions for when water crisis may occur.
- Illeana Alexander (Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua & Siuslaw Indians) spoke about tribal capacity challenges, hopes for implementing all of the recommendations, and appreciation for the shared learning process to help get everyone up to speed.
- Adam Denlinger (SDAO) reflected on the short amount of time the group had at hand, but nonetheless was able to build a successful document that the state can use to move forward.
- Kelly Timchak (Curry Watershed Partnership) noted that it would be important to continue learning from the Place-Based Planning pilots going forward, in hopes of implementing these recommendations and continuing improvement.
- Peggy Lynch (League of Women Voters) shared that she appreciated this work's broader messaging around state agency funding needs, the connection to IWRS, and the need for collaboration among various water agencies. She noted that it was not yet clear what a formalized state agency coordination would look like, and also wanted to emphasize that the lack of data should not hinder planning in working towards abundant clean water for all Oregonians.
- JR Cook (NE Oregon Water Association) shared that he felt the group did the best they could with the charge they were given, but still saw outstanding needs around state agency education and garnering on-the-ground regional perspectives for water policy. He also felt that it was important to continue balancing support for efforts that were in place before the Place-Based Planning program that may not be able or want to comply with new program sideboards.
- Holly Mondo (Harney Community Water Collaborative) shared that they felt this process was important to continue building trust and cooperation, and hopefully bring increased funding for agency capacity and data.
- Chandra Ferrari (ODFW) appreciated the opportunity for the state agencies to have a voice in this process, despite having a different role in the workgroup, and the recommendations' direction to improve the state's water planning and management tools through sufficient investment in data, agency capacity, thoughtful implementation, and trust and partnership between state and local entities. She added that long-term efforts will require significant investment and suggested that Recommendation V would be specifically helpful to state agencies to have resources in base budgets with carryover funding.

- Caylin Barter (Wild Salmon Center) shared her appreciation for the funding call-outs, who the workgroup is looking to make those decisions, and the direction to the agencies to implement those recommendations. She had hoped that some elements could have been addressed earlier in the process so that more details could have gone further. She also expressed her hope to engage with the future phases of this work moving forward.
- Margaret Magruder (Association of Oregon Counties) expressed her enthusiastic support for water planning but also expressed nervousness about the lack of specificity around some of the funding called for.
- Dan Thorndike (Oregon Business Council) emphasized the need for the state to take water seriously and shift resources accordingly to actively invest in proactive water actions across all agencies and address/improve implementation and permitting delays. He also shared his perspective that OWRD should not be the smallest generally funded agency, and the importance of Recommendation V. He shared his hope that the work group's effort will be used to inform forthcoming processes (e.g., rulemaking, etc.) and noted that one piece of legislation won't encompass all of the recommendations.
- Chrysten Rivard (Trout Unlimited) highlighted the importance of convening groups like this one to focus on addressing holistic water challenges ahead. She shared her excitement about the Section I overarching system recommendations to provide resources and information necessary to make good decisions for the best outcomes and hopes that the challenge of limited resources can be addressed.
- Donna Beverage (Union County Commissioner) shared that she felt it was important for all basins to have the same opportunity and success that the Upper Grande Ronde had in the Place-Based Planning pilot, and also noted the challenge of maintaining a statewide program that meaningfully supports all basins. She indicated an interest in the forthcoming DEQ Water Data Portal project as an asset for groups going forward. Other important considerations she highlighted were to continue including local and agricultural representation in planning groups, encouraging federal agency partnerships (for permitting support, etc.), and the desire to let the local group choose their facilitator even if it was someone from within the local watershed.
- Jason Fenton (Burns Paiute Tribe) shared his appreciation for everyone's hard work in this process.
- Racquel Rancier (OWRD) spoke about the next steps following this work and the Department's intention to take the recommendations from this report to build capacity, support basins across the state, and include all voices along the way.
- April Snell (Oregon Water Resources Congress) shared her hope that the relationships developed in this workgroup can translate into successful legislative advocacy, and the need to continue working together to implement these recommendations. She felt that although the charge was vague, this group had tackled one of the least controversial and complex issues within the realm of water topics.

- Oriana Magnera (Verde) reflected on the idea of community as it relates to water both in a local connection context and as a public statewide resource and shared her appreciation for the productive conversations around this in order to ensure that all voices are included and that this community building effort can continue.
- Morgan Gratz-Weiser (Governor’s Office) shared her hope and commitment to supporting this conversation continuing in the next Governor’s administration and the upcoming session.

Formal Alignment Check on Final Recommendations in v4

Robin then invited all workgroup members to submit their final, formal alignment check on each recommendation. She acknowledged that some workgroup members were not at the meeting and that OC would follow up to obtain their responses as soon as possible so that accurate final results could be shared. Some workgroup members (Kimberley, Caylin, Donna, Peggy, and JR) requested that the voting spreadsheet not be included in the final report, so as to not misconstrue a numeric vote on a recommendation concept for legislative support where the details will be worked out. The workgroup generally agreed that it would be preferable to show the level of alignment for each recommendation without tagging individual names in a vote. Robin affirmed that the voting spreadsheet would be used as a tracking tool but would not be included in the final report. She also clarified that as per the Operating Protocols, the state agencies and Governor’s Office were not official voting members of the workgroup. For reference, the “1-5” alignment check key is listed below.

- *"1" Enthusiastic support - I would be a champion for this recommendation*
- *"2" Support - I support this recommendation*
- *"3" Neutral, on the fence, no concerns or very mild concerns with this recommendation*
- *"4" Serious concerns or questions and will continue to raise them if this recommendation advances*
- *"5" No way - will actively seek to block this recommendation from moving forward*

ACTION: OC will follow-up with Anton Chiono, Kathleen George, Bobby Brunoe, Heather Bartlett, Ana Molina, and Lauren Poor for their responses.

Final Alignment Check Results

- Recommendation A results: (All 1-3) 1’s = 17, 2’s = 2, 3’s = 1, 4’s = 0, 5’s = 0
- Recommendation B results: (All 1-3) 1’s = 14, 2’s = 5, 3’s = 1, 4’s = 0, 5’s = 0
- Recommendation C results: 1’s = 7, 2’s = 12, 3’s = 0, 4’s = 1, 5’s = 0
- Recommendation D results: (All 1-3) 1’s = 10, 2’s = 3, 3’s = 7, 4’s = 0, 5’s = 0
- Recommendation E results: 1’s = 7, 2’s = 6, 3’s = 6, 4’s = 1, 5’s = 0
- Recommendation F results: (All 1-3) 1’s = 11, 2’s = 2, 3’s = 7, 4’s = 0, 5’s = 0
- Recommendation G results: (All 1-3) 1’s = 6, 2’s = 11, 3’s = 3, 4’s = 0, 5’s = 0

- Recommendation H results: 1's = 6, 2's = 11, 3's = 1, 4's = 2, 5's = 0
- Recommendation I results: 1's = 10, 2's = 3, 3's = 5, 4's = 2, 5's = 0
- Recommendation J results: (All 1-3) 1's = 8, 2's = 6, 3's = 6, 4's = 0, 5's = 0
- Recommendation K results: 1's = 6, 2's = 8, 3's = 3, 4's = 3, 5's = 0
- Recommendation L results: 1's = 10, 2's = 6, 3's = 3, 4's = 1, 5's = 0
- Recommendation M results: 1's = 5, 2's = 11, 3's = 1, 4's = 3, 5's = 0
- Recommendation N results: 1's = 3, 2's = 8, 3's = 4, 4's = 3, 5's = 2
- Recommendation O results: 1's = 4, 2's = 11, 3's = 4, 4's = 1, 5's = 0
- Recommendation P results: (All 1-3) 1's = 5, 2's = 7, 3's = 8, 4's = 0, 5's = 0
- Recommendation Q results: 1's = 11, 2's = 7, 3's = 1, 4's = 1, 5's = 0
- Recommendation R results: 1's = 7, 2's = 10, 3's = 2, 4's = 1, 5's = 0
- Recommendation S results: 1's = 2, 2's = 10, 3's = 7, 4's = 1, 5's = 0
- Recommendation T results: (All 1-3) 1's = 1, 2's = 12, 3's = 7, 4's = 0, 5's = 0
- Recommendation U results: 1's = 5, 2's = 9, 3's = 3, 4's = 3, 5's = 0
- Recommendation V results: 1's = 7, 2's = 5, 3's = 4, 4's = 4, 5's = 0

After reviewing where the workgroup members present had landed on the final recommendations, there was a brief discussion about what was considered a 'consensus agreement,' to which Robin responded it was ultimately up to the group to articulate. Some workgroup members felt that any results with a "4" or "5" should not be considered a 'consensus.' Ultimately there was agreement amongst the workgroup to include the "1-5" reference scale in the report and not label the results as 'strong, weak, etc' with the intention to let the data speak for itself. Also, there was an agreement to not attribute specific organizations to specific votes, unless someone specifically chose to do so for themselves.

Final Comments on the Final Recommendations and Alignment Check Results

- Peggy shared that she felt that some of the "4's" could have possibly been addressed by having more time to work through details given the complicated issues and limited amount of time.
- Kelly suggested highlighting any results that had "1-3" responses to help signal where support was garnered from the whole group. Others agreed that it would be worth highlighting concepts that have real support for them.
- Caylin shared she was glad to see such strong alignment around the Section I recommendations and noted that some of the recommendations with the lowest levels of consensus were N (which she felt the group didn't have much time to discuss-recognition) and U (which she was not sure why there was not as much consensus about the need for neutral facilitation).

There was a discussion about Recommendation U and a minor, proposed change that was identified would help some people get to a stronger level of support. Jeff felt that including

OWRD in the recommendation was problematic and felt the group agreed on the emphasis of choice is up to the local group. Others (Caylin, Oriana, Kelly, and Holly) agreed with the suggestion to remove “OWRD” from the language. Kimberley shared that she felt comfortable with the proposed change given that OWRD facilitation would still remain an option if a local group wanted to choose them.

Dan expressed concern about this recommendation potentially being too prescriptive and hoped that neutral facilitation is something that would be built into the whole process already.

Kimberley shared her perspective that from some past efforts explicitly having a neutral facilitator is not assumed and needs to be standardized going forward for accountability and importance to the state. The workgroup agreed that just including “neutral facilitation” was sufficient and that the proposed minor change could be reflected in the final report.

ACTION: “OWRD” will be removed from Recommendation U so the final language can be reflected as:

Planning groups that receive funding from the PBP grant program should be required to (1) be facilitated by a neutral professional facilitator with subject matter expertise (with the choice being the planning groups) and (2) document the plan utilizing the services of a professional technical writer with subject matter expertise.

There was also discussion about the delineation of Section I and Section II recommendations, the first of which was intended to address the broader statewide system and the second which was focused specifically on the Place-Based Planning program and associated concerns about Recommendation N (*The PBP grant should be structured to ensure planning groups that continue to meet criteria in planning and implementation guidance and are consistent with statewide IWRS principles are given priority to receive funding for continued planning and implementation coordination.*)

- JR shared that he was concerned about Place-Based Planning potentially being given priority over existing efforts given the way this recommendation is written.
- Chrysten added that given the group didn’t have much time to dive into the recognition and funding recommendations as much as may have been needed, that could be where some of the lack of clarity and concerns are coming from. She felt that this was too strong of a recommendation given the reality of the state budget cycle, resource scarcity, and the need to make critical decisions in order to support groups and see the efforts through. With more time to vet different language and explore the process, she felt that it could have gotten further.
- Dan shared that he felt some recommendations seemed too directive and narrowly focused, but didn’t want to stand in the way of them going forward.
- Peggy clarified the difference between the two sets of recommendations and noted that Section II was intended to shift the pilot into an actual program and not to be in competition with existing efforts, but to potentially support them.

- Caylin added that her hope around the intent was that those who had done the planning, regardless of when, would be able to access the funding needed and enable OWRD to respond to shifting planning needs across the state, without dictating a prioritization.
- Per comments from the Work Group, the facilitation team will make sure Section 1 (systemwide to water planning and management) and Section 2 (specifically focused on evolving the PBP tool) will be clearly delineated in the Report.

Process Next Steps: Final Report Writing

Robin provided an overview of the next steps for the final report, and reiterated the streamlined formatting approach that she had reviewed earlier in the meeting. The workgroup agreed to move the Terms & Definitions to the appendix of the final report, given that it was not a consensus vote section but was something that the workgroup put time and effort into clarifying as it related to interpreting the recommendations. She shared that the report would be submitted on the work group's behalf before the end of the calendar year to the entities represented in the Process Leadership Team (OWRC, OWRD, State Legislators, and Governor's Office), along with the members of the Work Group. There will be a small window for the workgroup to do a final, courtesy review of the Final Report before it is finalized and submitted.

Work Group Closing Remarks

Robin invited any final closing thoughts from the workgroup members and the Process Leadership team. Some spoke about the reality of resource constraints on the state's horizon and the desire to elevate and reiterate this work going forward. Others shared suggestions about ideas to put these recommendations in front of the OWRC, legislative committees, and other relevant forums with presentations and outreach.

Some shared their hopes for workgroup members to have a role in supporting and maintaining the work going forward, given the shared learning process and relationship-building that this workgroup went through. Racquel offered anyone interested in joining the OWRD policy engagement distribution list to let her know so they could be added and stay up-to-date with legislative session communications. Another suggestion was made about specifically educating new legislators, and helping connect local legislators to better understand water issues and the importance of this work.

ACTION: OC and OWRD will share some key date information about upcoming forums.

Robin expressed her appreciation to everyone for putting in the time and contributing insight to this process to reach this suite of ideas that the workgroup can collectively recommend and advise to future decision-makers. Although she noted some details may not be there, she felt encouraged hearing the commitments from many to stay engaged, support, and promote ideas

from this group in a genuine way as part of a longer-term endeavor. Turning to the members of the Process Leadership team, she noted that Representative Owens had an unavoidable conflict and could not be present for today's meeting and that Representative Helm had been on the call but had something come up and had to drop from the meeting, but would relay any further reflections if they arise. She then invited the present members of the Process Leadership team to share their final remarks.

Representative Reardon shared his satisfaction with what sounded like very positive outcomes and expressed his hope for the workgroup to stay connected and maintain positive momentum in working together, and for the work developed in this process to have lasting value. He reflected on the policy and budget work ahead, recognizing that the funding area would need a lot of support, but that it was time. This being one of his final meetings after a decade of serving as a state legislator, he expressed his gratitude for all and his genuine hope for this work to move forward for Oregon.

OWRC Chair, Meg Reeves, extended her thanks on behalf of the OWRC. She appreciated Tom Byler for his early work on this project, Lili for staff work, Racquel for stepping in halfway, Robin for facilitating and managing many interests, and Jennah for coordination. She recognized the challenge of starting with a broad charge and everyone's willingness to take on and persevere through challenges. With a hope that the substance of the group's recommendations will be used as a springboard for statewide activity, she emphasized the hope that the Place-Based Planning program requirements don't outweigh the benefits, which may be a potential subject for more conversation. In the meantime, she shared that she looks forward to cheering the work on and seeing where the recommendations could inform future efforts.

Racquel Rancier, OWRD, acknowledged that water policy is not easy and appreciated everyone digging into the work, and says she sees the recommendations as helpful guidance for the Department.

With gratitude, Robin then adjourned the final workgroup meeting.

Appendix F. Coordinating Committee Meeting Summaries

- [March 18, 2022](#)
- [April 22, 2022](#)
- [May 9, 2022](#)
- [June 21, 2022](#)
- [July 1, 2022](#)
- [July 22, 2022](#)

Appendix G. Work Group Supporting Materials

- State Presentation: [Regional Water Planning and Implementation in Oregon: The Current System](#)
- [Sticky Note Activity](#)
- [Regional Planning Efforts Presentations, Questions, and FAQ](#)
- [Proposed Work Group Plan](#)
- [Workgroup Survey Results: Priority Issues and Tasks](#)
- [Small Group Flipchart Notes](#)
- [Water Supply Planning Typology](#)
- [Essential Elements Reference Materials](#)
- [Framing for State-supported Regional Water Planning and Management in Oregon Draft for Work Group Discussion](#)
- [Deliberative Agenda \(9-6-2022\)](#)
- [Oregon Water Data Portal Presentation](#)
- [Straw Draft: Version 1: Framework and Recommendations](#)
- [Draft Community Engagement Guide \(8-29-22\)](#)
- [Deliberative Agenda \(10-20-2022 and 11-1-2022\)](#)
- [Version 2: Draft Framework and Recommendations: Worksheet Responses](#)
- [DRAFT_HB 5006 v2 Draft Recommendations: Incorporating Lessons from the Place-Based Planning Independent Evaluation](#)
- [Place-Based Planning Independent Evaluation Fact Sheet #2 - Planning Framework May 4 2022](#)
- [Timeline for Decision-Making August through December 2022](#)
- [Straw Draft: Version 1: Framework and Recommendations: Worksheet Responses](#)
- [Version 2: Draft Framing and Recommendations \(9/20/22\)](#)
- [Version 2: Draft Framing and Recommendations: Summary of Revisions](#)
- [Version 2: Draft Framing and Recommendations: Red-Lined Draft](#)
- [Draft Community Engagement Guide \(9/19/22\)](#)
- [Version 3: Draft Framing and Recommendations \(11/07/22\)](#)
- [Draft Community Engagement Guide \(11/1/22\)](#)
- [Draft Version Tracking \(Recommendations, Principles, & Terms\)](#)
- [Current Substantive Topics and Status \(11-3-22\)](#)
- [Small Group System Level Recommendations \(10/27/22\)](#)
- [Workgroup Current Substantive Topics and Status \(11/1/22\)](#)
- [Oregon's Place-Based Integrated Water Resources Planning Program: A Participatory Evaluation](#)
- Implementation Discussion: [PBP Value of a Plan](#), [PBP State Recognition](#), [PBP Pilot Examples of Implementation Strategies](#), [PBP Plan Updates](#)
- [Version 4: Draft Framing and Recommendations \(12/2/22\)](#)

- [Version 4 \(REDLINED\): Draft Framing and Recommendations \(11/23/22\)](#)

Appendix H. Additional Sources Provided for Work Group Members

These resources have been collectively and voluntarily contributed by work group members and members of the public, but are not necessarily reflective of the views of the work group. It is up to the work group to determine if/how to engage with these resources.

Resource	Topic/Context Provided	PDF/Links
WRC April 30 1993 Minutes	Reports regarding Basin Plans and Programs, including reflections on past planning and recommendations for future planning	https://drive.google.com/file/d/11OqCRstE1EVqqwj2-wCDa9lzpYgCmotg/view?usp=sharing
WRC March 11 1993 Minutes	Reports regarding Basin Plans and Programs, including reflections on past planning and recommendations for future planning	https://drive.google.com/file/d/1lpRyvmos09W7hpttbCn1dwEn3mZjU-pv/view?usp=sharing
WRC Meeting April 30 1993 Memo	Request for Approval of a Workplan for Resolution of Basin Program Issues	https://drive.google.com/file/d/1pdGAAU78OyxKD4X78gYN06r_KOFaLlW/view?usp=sharing
WRC Meeting March 11-12 1993 Memo	Informational Report on Postponing the Proposed Basin Program Revision Process	https://drive.google.com/file/d/1btLXtHPaYxWL0Pku5RFOP5dFAOGIHLXm/view?usp=sharing
Oregon Joint Task Force on Water Supply and Conservation	Final recommendations from the 2003 Joint Task Force on Water Supply and Conservation	https://drive.google.com/file/d/1WH9bf0d28R1blgpL2OLF0HpU9V-5T9nm/view?usp=sharing
Resources about state-supported water planning and management	Public assembled information and resources about state and regional water planning, including comparative analyses and resources from other states	https://padlet.com/saltandfresh/m5tj2rbyq115vbms
Integrated Water Resources Planning in Oregon (Full Version)	Timeline of past conversations about	https://www.sutori.com/en/story/integrated-water-resources-planning-in-oreg

	regional/basin/place-based/local planning	on-full-version--wFd5VceCyQGgKwBdNGHFnO6m
UN Water Security Poster		https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Vau5ZqTdm01sw3L-VsB3Y8eetL20Tdl/vi...ew?usp=sharing
OECD Water Governance Indicator Framework	Synthesised version of the OECD Water Governance Indicator Framework. It is a tool supporting the implementation of the OECD Principles on Water Governance, adopted by the OECD Regional Development Committee in 2015.	https://drive.google.com/file/d/1PjgrH2iCihX6GLK7UIRC_yoR2UMGfPIL/view?usp=sharing
Comparative Analysis OWRD Past Current Planning		https://drive.google.com/file/d/1yS4JyqfG3wH1DF-j9ScxT7U17ndu_1fF/vi...w?usp=sharing
Water Resource Planning Assessment Element A.1		https://drive.google.com/file/d/1qxJeN6qhpM2twiJMTCzyjYFa0pBfCjKn/vi...ew?usp=sharing
Comparative Analysis of Past and Current Department Supported Planning: Key Findings		https://drive.google.com/file/d/1ojIOHg83ZgKDApBWAmmrE8DT-eHPO8gR/view?usp=sharing
Planning Timeline		https://drive.google.com/file/d/1EoruPu9wcUuD8z02oGPZA18sL5e4lSKI/vi...ew?usp=sharing
Department Planning Roles and Responsibilities: Key Findings	This document outlines the results of a content analysis of the Oregon Water Resources Department's guiding documents to better understand the Department's roles and responsibilities related to planning. It was developed to support the 2020-2021 Planning Assessment, specifically Element A.1: Review OWRD planning roles and responsibilities.	https://drive.google.com/file/d/1CRQIgJO4-k8HO0o31KldrMGjRX_-aFok/vi...iew?usp=sharing
Water Supply Planning Typology		https://drive.google.com/file/d/1kOWxCDCoLhwuQFhvOr3sej1vamSCZQE/_view?usp=sharing
Port Orford Watershed- This is your drinking water video	The City of Port Orford's Watershed	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ycN_FcKqHM&t=208s

Article	"Our view: Compromise key to reaching shared goals"	https://www.lagrandeobserver.com/opinion/editorials/our-view-compromise-key-to-reaching-shared-goals/article_108db4ba-b388-11ec-ae64-2f09f744054a.html
American Water Resources Association publication	Monographs of 17 state water plans, all in various stages of development	https://www.awra.org/Members/Publications/AWRA_Reports.aspx
Forests to Faucets 2.0	USDA - Connecting Forests, Water, and Communities	https://storymaps.arcgis.com/collections/4e450a6c7ed24f0cbae4abc1c07843b7?item=1
Letter to the House Interim Water Committee March 2022	"A farmer's plea for a change to water law"	https://www.boundlessfarmstead.com/farmstead-blog
100 Year Water Vision		https://www.oregon.gov/oweb/Documents/OWV-Full-Report.pdf
IWRS	A framework for better understanding and meeting instream and out-of-stream water needs, including water quantity, water quality, and ecosystem needs.	https://www.oregon.gov/owrd/planning/iwrs/pages/default.aspx
Aquabook	High level descriptions of some of the regional management tools	https://www.oregon.gov/owrd/WRDPublications1/aquabook.pdf
Joint Legislative Committee on Water Supply During Drought- Office of Columbia River	Presentation by Tom Tebb (Office of Columbia River Director) that shows their progress to date and how that progress enabled them to be resilient to this years drought	https://www.dropbox.com/sh/21cnul76kur649m/AAApDCkERAPiQuBdhNrB4faoa?dl=0&preview=Joint+Legislative+Committee+on+Water+Supply+During+Drought+Presentation_Tebb.pptx
Lake Abert: House Ag Presentation	A "basin" issue that takes collaboration and data and an understanding of roles of each agency tribes, etc.	https://olis.oregonlegislature.gov/liz/2022R1/Downloads/CommitteeMeetingDocument/253884
NE OR Water Association Presentation	Compare and contrast between CRUST/Deschutes efforts and WA	https://www.dropbox.com/sh/21cnul76kur649m/AAApDCkERAPiQuBdhNrB4faoa?dl=0&preview=NOWA_Deschutes_2021.pptx
NE OR Water Association Presentation	Water 101	https://www.dropbox.com/sh/21cnul76kur649m/AAApDCkERAPiQuBdhNrB4faoa?dl=0&preview=NOWA_2021_Revised.pptx
ODA and DEQ Water Roles and Responsibilities	Note that DEQ/ODF MOU has since been updated	https://www.oregon.gov/deq/EOCdocs/09262019_WaterQualityRolesResponsibilities.pdf

Oregon Measurement & Reporting	WSC and OFB co-presented the final report on the Water Measurement & Reporting Legislative Workgroup to the House Water Committee on June 3, highlighting the lack of consensus despite nearly a year of work	https://olis.oregonlegislature.gov/liz/2021R1/Downloads/CommitteeMeetingDocument/244434
Oregon Place-Based Planning Learning Partnership conversation with key members of Texas Regional Water Planning team, including Temple McKinnon	model to consider from other states	https://www.wevideo.com/view/2263580488
OWRD Groundwater Administrative Areas	List of groundwater restricted areas	https://www.oregon.gov/owrd/programs/GWWL/GW/Documents/GWAdminAreasMap.pdf
Regional Water Management Authorities	a document that outlines a number of existing authorities that allow for management on a regional scale	https://drive.google.com/file/d/1vvmXyA9O9XEA-39C4NxFwDKfM7LrPkJa/view?usp=sharing
Securing Oregon's Water Future - Oregon Business Council Water Task Force		https://orbusinesscouncil.org/docs/archive/FINAL_Water_Paper_4.13.pdf
Texas State Water Plan	model to consider from other states	https://www.twdb.texas.gov/waterplanning/swp/index.asp
U.S. Geological Survey study to better understand water supply and demand in the Willamette Basin	To identify gaps in water availability, the agency is undertaking a series of 10 Integrated Water Science studies in basins across the country, meeting with stakeholders and monitoring interactions among climate, human consumption and hydrology.	https://www.capitalpress.com/ag_sectors/water/usgs-to-study-water-priorities-for-willamette-basin/article_a5a8382e-a0a3-11ec-8bd1-df6e101ef2f9.html?utm_medium=social&utm_source=email&utm_campaign=user-share
Water Futures Project	beginning to break down barriers to meaningful participation of affected stakeholders in water decisions	https://www.oregonwaterfutures.org/
Water in Oregon: Not a Drop to Waste	Part 1 LWVOR water studies links: a concise review of the current Oregon laws and regulations for water resources and water quality.	Part 1: Regulating Water in Oregon Water in Oregon Part 1 Part 1: Executive Summary Part 1: Printable Slideshow
Water in Oregon: Not a Drop to Waste	Part 2 LWVOR water studies links: covers current issues facing water quality and quantity from the perspectives of stakeholder groups throughout the state (2010)	Part 2: Issues and Perspectives Water in Oregon Part II Part 2: Executive Summary Part 2: Printable Slideshow

Watershed Results Initiative White Paper		https://drive.google.com/file/d/1ttwr4X11Wq67ZxF4UBUzm_WGuN3_ifDh/view?usp=sharing
Withdrawn Sources	List of withdrawn areas	https://docs.google.com/document/d/1RZqaUDSdq-w_tz9tJHzFyOalls3yOXfJ/edit