

STATE-SUPPORTED REGIONAL WATER PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT WORK GROUP

DRAFT Meeting Summary

August 2, 2022 from 11:00am-3:30pm

Zoom Meeting

ACTION ITEMS:

ACTION	BY WHOM?	BY WHEN?
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Refine the ‘Assumptions’ section and offer it back to the Work Group.	OWRD	Before the next meeting
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Work with OWRD to develop straw proposal ideas and recommendations for the work group to consider at the next full meeting.	Potential Task Group(s)	Before the next meeting
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Suggestion to share an outline of the funding model used for Deschutes River Collaborative.	Kate Fitzpatrick	Before the next meeting
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Send an update with all upcoming Work Group, Coordinating Committee, or Task Group meetings	OC	Ongoing
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Determine a clear process for Work Group members who aren’t able to attend upcoming meetings to share ideas to be considered in product development and deliberation, in addition to an explicit ask for what feedback is needed on.	OC and OWRD	Before the next meeting

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 Prahl, 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 sunseting 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 sunseting 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)