

DRAFT

HB 5006 Draft Recommendations: Incorporating Lessons from the Place-Based Planning Independent Evaluation

The HB 5006 workgroup relied on many different sources as it drafted recommendations for the next generation of place-based planning, including the Place-Based Planning Independent Evaluation (McLain, et al., 2022). As the workgroup moves towards finalizing their recommendations, some workgroup members have expressed a desire to see a crosswalk between the lessons learned in the PBP Independent Evaluation and the draft recommendations in greater detail than appears in the Straw Draft v1 (8/24). The tables below were created as a tool to explicitly show where draft workgroup recommendations may address the Key Lesson's learned from the PBP Evaluation (p. 75-79, McLain, et al., 2022) and recommendations in the PBP Evaluation Fact Sheets (Downey, et al., 2022). If there are areas where existing draft recommendations do not adequately address the lessons/recommendations from the PBP evaluation, workgroup members are encouraged to propose new recommendations or revisions.

Table 1: Summary Table

This table summarizes the crosswalk detailed in Table 2. Use the embedded links to see full text of the lesson learned and related draft recommendations.

Key Lesson Learned (McLain, et al., 2022)		Related Draft Workgroup Recommendations (v2)
1	The state's place-based integrated water planning model can be a useful tool for water resources management in some places, but the state's guiding framework requires adjustment.	DTA Recommendations: A, B & C PP Recommendations: B, C, D, F, G, H, & I
2	In some places and situations, the state's model of place-based integrated water planning may not be appropriate, and consideration needs to be given to providing state support for other place-based planning models.	When the scope of the workgroup was narrowed in August to focus on the next generation of Place-Based Planning, exploring other place-based planning models seemed to fall outside of that scope. There is space to reintroduce this concept, and it is on the deliberative agenda for the October 20 th meeting.
3	When a planning group is established, participants need to be selected or recruited to include not just a balance of interests, but also individuals with the types of skills and capacities needed to accomplish the work.	PP Recommendation C
4	A situational assessment of prospective place-based planning areas needs to be done to scope out the prospective planning area's water situation as well as its collaborative and technical capacity.	DTA Recommendations: A, B & C PP Recommendations: B, C & D
5	Steady and adequate levels of state funding for both local planning groups and the core state agencies are critical for place-based planning.	DTA Recommendations: A, B & C CE Recommendations: A & H PP Recommendations A, B, C, E, F, G, H, I, & J SF Recommendations: A & B

DRAFT

Key Lesson Learned (McLain, et al., 2022)	Related Draft Workgroup Recommendations (v2)
6 State capacity to engage in place-based planning needs to be institutionalized.	DTA Recommendation B PP Recommendation F
7 Ensuring that place-based Action Plans adequately address the concerns of a balance of water interests, including instream and out of stream needs, requires paying careful attention to process design upfront and providing multiple ways for stakeholders to engage in planning.	CE Recommendations: A, B, & C PP Recommendations: B & F
8 The respective roles of the state and planning groups in the local-state planning partnership and the state’s expectations for what the groups should include in the Action Plans need to be clearly defined.	DTA Recommendations A, B & C CE Recommendations A, B, C, G, & H PP Recommendations A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, & L
9 Outside of the place-based planning venue, investigate the need and possibilities for water rights and regulatory reforms.	This is outside the scope of the workgroup.

DRAFT

Table 2. Full Text Table

This table contains full text from the Key Lessons Learned in the Evaluation and incorporates recommendations from the Evaluation Fact Sheets.

Key Lesson Learned (McClain, et al., 2022)	Related Draft Workgroup Recommendations (v2)
<p>1 The state’s place-based integrated water planning model can be a useful tool for water resources management in some places, but the state’s guiding framework requires adjustment.</p>	
<p>The participants’ critiques of the five-step guidance framework indicate that it needs to be adjusted to result in more efficient, effective, collaborative, and equitable planning processes. Chapter 5 provides a detailed description of suggestions for improving the state’s framework that guides its place-based planning process.</p> <p>Adapted from Chapter 5 and recommendations contained in Fact Sheet “Integrated Place-Based Water Resources Planning: Revising the Five-Step Planning Framework” (Downey, et al., 2022):</p>	
<p><i>Create a step 0: Laying a Foundation for Place-Based Planning</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spend time building trust among stakeholders and between planning groups and state agencies • Create pre-packaged sets of data and analyses for Steps 2 and 3 • Dispelling misconceptions about scientific data • Revise existing planning guidance with input from multiple state agencies 	<p>PP Recommendation B: The state should provide resources to build foundational trust with and among interested parties, planning groups, and state agencies prior to plan development and writing. This includes setting foundational norms for group engagement and developing and understanding foundational data.</p> <p>DTA Recommendation A: The state should commit to collecting, processing, interpreting, and distributing water data for effective water planning in Oregon. 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 PBP. The data would be useful for all sectors even if the place chose not to pursue planning.</p> <p>PP Recommendation D: The state should build on the guidance developed for the Place Based Planning Pilot, incorporating feedback and lessons learned to update guidelines and benchmarks for state</p>

DRAFT

Key Lesson Learned (McClain, et al., 2022)	Related Draft Workgroup Recommendations (v2)
	<p>recognition in Step 2: Plan Development. They should make this guidance available to the planning groups at the beginning of their planning processes.</p>
<p><i>Step 1</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide more training in how to conduct a multi-stakeholder process, community outreach, facilitation, consensus decision-making as well as trainings in water sciences and issues • Provide on-going cross-collaborative learning opportunities and opportunities for information-sharing between state agencies and planning groups 	<p>DTA Recommendation C: Within their mission and sideboards, state agencies should support planning groups by developing educational resources tailored to fill gaps in local capacity or knowledge/skillsets.</p> <p>PP Recommendation C: The state should provide support to local groups to help them prepare for and execute planning. At a minimum, this includes staff capacity and/or funding for professionals to help with governance agreements, DEIJ trainings, consensus decision making, project management, water science, ecology and biology, climate science, water law, and technical plan writing.</p>
<p><i>Steps 2 & 3 (combine)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide groups with pre-packaged data and data analyses, including assumptions underlying models • Provide training in data interpretation and building scenarios of alternative water futures • Where data credibility is contested, engage the planning groups in data production or analysis 	<p>DTA Recommendation A: The state should commit to collecting, processing, interpreting, and distributing water data for effective water planning in Oregon. 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 PBP. The data would be useful for all sectors even if the place chose not to pursue planning.</p> <p>DTA Recommendation C: Within their mission and sideboards, state agencies should support planning groups by developing educational resources tailored to fill gaps in local capacity or knowledge/skillsets.</p> <p>PP Recommendation B: The state should provide resources to build foundational trust with and among interested parties, planning groups, and state agencies prior to plan development and writing. This includes</p>

Key Lesson Learned (McClain, et al., 2022)	Related Draft Workgroup Recommendations (v2)
<p><i>Step 4:</i> Provide more guidance on prioritization of strategies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide training in the use of decision support tools for prioritizing strategies 	<p>setting foundational norms for group engagement and developing and understanding foundational data.</p> <p>PP Recommendation D: The state should build on the guidance developed for the Place Based Planning Pilot, incorporating feedback and lessons learned to update guidelines and benchmarks for state recognition in Step 2: Plan Development. They should make this guidance available to the planning groups at the beginning of their planning processes.</p> <p>PP Recommendation G: The state should provide resources to fund continued engagement of local groups and state partners to move a state-recognized plan into implementation. The outcomes of this continued engagement could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refinement and feasibility assessments of plan actions and strategies • Working to address any policy needs with the state • Preparation of projects to take advantage of implementation funding opportunities • Ensuring that the pursuit of strategies and actions continue to represent a balanced representation of water interests
<p><i>Step 5:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have Step 5 guidance ready at the beginning of the planning process to allow the groups to set appropriate and achievable goals • Provide clearer sideboards on state review criteria for the Action Plans 	<p>PP Recommendation D: The state should build on the guidance developed for the Place Based Planning Pilot, incorporating feedback and lessons learned to update guidelines and benchmarks for state recognition in Step 2: Plan Development. They should make this guidance available to the planning groups at the beginning of their planning processes.</p>

Key Lesson Learned (McClain, et al., 2022)	Related Draft Workgroup Recommendations (v2)
<p><i>Step 6:</i> Add a Step 6.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide guidance on implementation. • Incorporate monitoring and evaluation to increase accountability • Incorporate a requirement for a periodic plan update and state review 	<p>PP Recommendation G: The state should provide resources to fund continued engagement of local groups and state partners to move a state-recognized plan into implementation. The outcomes of this continued engagement could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refinement and feasibility assessments of plan actions and strategies • Working to address any policy needs with the state • Preparation of projects to take advantage of implementation funding opportunities • Ensuring that the pursuit of strategies and actions continue to represent a balanced representation of water interests <p>PP Recommendation H: The state should provide resources to fund implementation of strategies and projects that were developed as part of a state-recognized integrated water resources plan and are being deployed on behalf of a collaborative planning and implementation group.</p> <p>PP Recommendation I: The state should provide resources to local planning groups to update plans every 10 years to reflect changes in local conditions and/or updates to data availability or climate change information.</p>
<p>We highlight three critical modifications:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) A preliminary trust-building component to build more positive relationships between the state agencies and the communities in prospective planning areas, as well as to build trust among the stakeholders whose participation is necessary for developing implementable and inclusive water resources plans 	<p>PP Recommendation B: The state should provide resources to build foundational trust with and among interested parties, planning groups, and state agencies prior to plan development and writing. This includes setting foundational norms for group engagement and developing and understanding foundational data.</p>

DRAFT

Key Lesson Learned (McClain, et al., 2022)	Related Draft Workgroup Recommendations (v2)
<p>2) A component aimed at improving input from and coordination between OWRD and the other supporting agencies</p>	<p>DTA Recommendation B: The state should 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.</p> <p>PP Recommendation F: The state should support capacity for an interagency team that provides planning assistance throughout the process. At a minimum, this would include coordination and consultation with local groups along the way (e.g., offering training, participating in meetings, permit coordination, grant identification) and technical support, as described in Recommendation B of the Data and Technical Assistance above.</p>
<p>3) A component focused on compiling foundational data and analyses into packages that the groups will need to develop their plans.</p>	<p>DTA Recommendation A: The state should commit to collecting, processing, interpreting, and distributing water data for effective water planning in Oregon. 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 PBP. The data would be useful for all sectors even if the place chose not to pursue planning.</p>

Key Lesson Learned (McClain, et al., 2022)	Related Draft Workgroup Recommendations (v2)
<p>Suggestions for the data and information packages include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) involve all relevant state agencies in compiling the information and data, and 2) provide explanations of the data and models, including assumptions underlying them. <p>Including explanations and assumptions about pre-packaged data and analyses is critical so that the planning groups have a better understanding of how the results were reached and their limitations. However, it is also useful for the state agencies to work with the planning groups to develop the municipal, agricultural, and ecosystem water demand estimates during later phases of planning so that the stakeholders became familiar with how demand estimates are made, and the data and models involved in developing them.</p>	<p>DTA Recommendation B: The state should 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.</p> <p>DTA Recommendation C: Within their mission and sideboards, state agencies should support planning groups by developing educational resources tailored to fill gaps in local capacity or knowledge/skillsets.</p> <p>PP Recommendation B: The state should provide resources to build foundational trust with and among interested parties, planning groups, and state agencies prior to plan development and writing. This includes setting foundational norms for group engagement and developing and understanding foundational data.</p>
<p>2 In some places and situations, the state’s model of place-based integrated water planning may not be appropriate, and consideration needs to be given to providing state support for other place-based planning models.</p>	
<p>The Harney Basin case suggests that the state’s place-based integrated water planning model may not fit some water resource situations, notably those areas that are already experiencing serious water resources challenges. It is important to recognize that other place-based and community-based planning models exist in Oregon and other states and have been documented as being successful approaches for resolving water and other resource issues. A comparison of lessons from the OWRD place-based planning model with those learned from other models would provide a strong foundation for future state-supported place-based planning in Oregon. Both OWRD and the local planning groups need to reflect upfront on and discuss with each other what they want water planning in a prospective project area to accomplish. Once the water planning objectives are identified, then a suite of place-based approaches can</p>	<p>When the scope of the workgroup was narrowed in August to focus on the next generation of Place-Based Planning, exploring other place-based planning models seemed to fall outside of that scope. There is space to reintroduce this concept, and it is on the deliberative agenda for the October 20th meeting.</p>

Key Lesson Learned (McClain, et al., 2022)	Related Draft Workgroup Recommendations (v2)
<p>be explored, so that the planning group can select an approach that is appropriate for achieving the desired objectives.</p> <p>Also found in Recommendation #4 “Place-Based Integrated Water Resources Planning: Pilot Program and Recommendations” (Downey, et al., 2022): <i>Develop alternative approaches for areas experiencing a chronic water crisis:</i> The pilot place-based planning program was not designed to address situations in which water is already seriously overallocated. The pilot program shows that project areas with existing water challenges, such as the Harney Basin, need a different place-based approach than areas with little or no apparent water resources challenges. Upfront discussion between OWRD and planning groups is needed to identify the goals the planning groups hope to accomplish and the expectations of the state so that an appropriate approach can be identified</p>	
<p>3 When a planning group is established, participants need to be selected or recruited to include not just a balance of interests, but also individuals with the types of skills and capacities needed to accomplish the work.</p>	
<p>Oregon’s pilot place-based integrated water planning proved to require a wide range of collaboration and partnership skills on the part of local planning groups, as well as considerable technical knowledge and skills. The pilot program evaluation suggests that the state overestimated the capacity of the local groups to carry out the variety of tasks associated with place-based planning. At the same time, the planning groups overestimated the state’s capacity to assist with key planning tasks. <i>If place-based planning is to be both efficient and effective, the skills and capacities within the local planning group need to align with place-based integrated water planning needs. At a minimum, the skills and knowledge required to do this type of planning include project management, community engagement, facilitation, water science, ecology or biology, water law, and technical plan writing. Given the likely significant impacts of climate</i></p>	<p>PP Recommendation C: The state should provide support to local groups to help them prepare for and execute planning. At a minimum, this includes staff capacity and/or funding for professionals to help with governance agreements, DEIJ trainings, consensus decision making, project management, water science, ecology and biology, climate science, water law, and technical plan writing.</p>

DRAFT

Key Lesson Learned (McClain, et al., 2022)	Related Draft Workgroup Recommendations (v2)
<p><i>change on Oregon’s water resources systems, someone with skills in running and/or interpreting climate change scenarios would also be an asset. Where core technical skills are absent, groups may need to seek outside partners to fill the gaps.</i> For example, the Mid-Coast group worked with the US Army Corps of Engineers to obtain a hydro-climate vulnerability assessment and with the Oregon Climate Change Research Institute to get projections of the impacts of climate change on the Mid-Coast’s water supply.</p>	
<p>4 A situational assessment of prospective place-based planning areas needs to be done to scope out the prospective planning area’s water situation as well as its collaborative and technical capacity.</p> <p><i>Also found in Recommendation #2 “Place-Based Integrated Water Resources Planning: Pilot Program and Recommendations” (Downey, et al., 2022)</i></p>	
<p>The results of a situational assessment in prospective planning areas would enable OWRD to lay a solid foundation for place-based planning before the planning begins. The foundational work would include, at a minimum:</p> <p>a) building or strengthening of trust relationships between the state agencies and communities in the planning area</p>	<p>PP Recommendation B: The state should provide resources to build foundational trust with and among interested parties, planning groups, and state agencies prior to plan development and writing. This includes setting foundational norms for group engagement and developing and understanding foundational data.</p>
<p>b) identifying strategies for filling gaps in local and state agency core competencies,</p>	<p>DTA Recommendation B: The state should 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.</p>
<p>c) developing data and associated analyses tailored to the planning area’s needs,</p>	<p>DTA Recommendation A: The state should commit to collecting, processing, interpreting, and distributing water data for effective water planning in Oregon. 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</p>

DRAFT

Key Lesson Learned (McClain, et al., 2022)	Related Draft Workgroup Recommendations (v2)
	<p>communities understand if there is a need for PBP. The data would be useful for all sectors even if the place chose not to pursue planning.</p>
<p>d) developing context-appropriate planning guidance, and</p>	<p>PP Recommendation D: The state should build on the guidance developed for the Place Based Planning Pilot, incorporating feedback and lessons learned to update guidelines and benchmarks for state recognition in Step 2: Plan Development. They should make this guidance available to the planning groups at the beginning of their planning processes.</p>
<p>e) creating training materials tailored to fill gaps in local capacity or knowledge/skill sets.</p> <p>Aside from having a basic introduction to water sciences and data, a foundational training program for planning group members should include introductory background information on agency missions and support and background on water rights, prior appropriation, and how errors occur in estimating quantities of water available for appropriation.</p>	<p>DTA Recommendation C: Within their mission and sideboards, state agencies should support planning groups by developing educational resources tailored to fill gaps in local capacity or knowledge/skillsets.</p> <p>PP Recommendation C: The state should provide support to local groups to help them prepare for and execute planning. At a minimum, this includes staff capacity and/or funding for professionals to help with governance agreements, DEIJ trainings, consensus decision making, project management, water science, ecology and biology, climate science, water law, and technical plan writing.</p>
<p>5 Steady and adequate levels of state funding for both local planning groups and the core state agencies are critical for place-based planning.</p>	
<p>Inconsistent and insufficient funding caused the Mid-Coast and Harney Basin groups to divert their attention away from planning to raise additional funds. And all the groups except the UGR group suffered from lack of funding to hire dedicated staff or consultants to carry out core activities such as project management, planning group coordination, facilitation, and technical report writing. OWRD had sufficient funding to support two program coordinators, but lacked the resources needed to deliver technical assistance at the level required or support consistent field staff engagement in the planning groups. The three other core supporting agencies likewise lacked the resources needed to meet the planning groups’ technical assistance needs and</p>	<p>Data and Technical Assistance Recommendations (all)</p> <p>CE Recommendation A: Place-Based Planning funding should include 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.</p>

Key Lesson Learned (McClain, et al., 2022)	Related Draft Workgroup Recommendations (v2)
<p>support field staff engagement in the planning groups throughout the planning process. Higher levels of funding during the pilot program for ODA, ODEQ, and ODFW would have enabled them to respond more quickly to requests for technical assistance and would have allowed them to be more engaged as members of the planning groups</p> <p>Also found in Recommendation #1 “Place-Based Integrated Water Resources Planning: Pilot Program and Recommendations” (Downey, et al., 2022):</p> <p>The planning groups identified a need for secure state funding to allow them to stay focused on plan development, instead of having to periodically divert their energy toward fundraising. The groups emphasized the importance of adequate funding to hire staff or consultants to address critical gaps in local skills and knowledge.</p> <p>The core state agencies (i.e., OWRD, ODA, ODEQ, ODFW) lacked the resources needed to respond to technical assistance requests in a timely manner, and many had insufficient staff to engage fully as planning group members. Planning groups emphasized that involvement of all four agencies as stakeholders during planning meetings is critical since each has a distinct role to play in water management</p>	<p>CE Recommendation H: The State should provide capacity support specifically to tribal and other under-represented or marginalized communities for meaningful engagement in place-based planning.</p> <p>Pathway and Process Recommendations A, B, C, E, F, G, H, I, & J</p> <p>SF Recommendation A: The state should create a fund for regional integrated water resources planning and implementation that provides consistent and sufficient funding to local groups throughout the planning and implementation process.</p> <p>SF Recommendation B: Given the nature and scale of investment required by regional integrated water resources planning and implementation, the legislature should create a workgroup to explore alternative revenue sources that would allow the state to make this significant, high priority investment.</p>
<p>6 State capacity to engage in place-based planning needs to be institutionalized.</p>	
<p>The pilot program evaluation identified several areas where OWRD’s and its sister agencies’ capacity to provide adequate support for place-based planning fell short. The agencies have already taken steps to address some of these deficiencies, such as timely data provision and adequate field-level staffing. However, the structure and operation of some state agencies renders them less effective as partners in locally led planning processes. To improve their effectiveness in local-state planning partnerships, the organizational cultures and knowledge and skill sets of the supporting agencies will need to change. Such change will require support from mid and upper-level leadership in the core</p>	<p>DTA Recommendation B: The state should 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.</p> <p>PP Recommendation F: The state should support capacity for an interagency team that provides planning assistance throughout the process. At a minimum, this would include coordination and consultation with local groups along the way (e.g., offering training,</p>

Key Lesson Learned (McClain, et al., 2022)	Related Draft Workgroup Recommendations (v2)
<p>state agencies, greater vertical integration within agencies, and alignment of work plan priorities across the agencies. Agency staff will need to acquire new skill sets, such as how to engage with communities in place-based planning and how to build trust between state agencies and community members</p> <p>Also found in Recommendation #3 “Place-Based Integrated Water Resources Planning: Pilot Program and Recommendations” (Downey, et al., 2022):</p> <p>The state agencies involved in place-based planning are structured and operate in ways that are not consistently conducive to working as partners in locally led planning processes and agency priorities do not always align with place-based planning needs.</p> <p>Addressing these impediments to place-based planning requires a) support from mid and upper-level leadership in the core state agencies, b) greater vertical integration within agencies, and c) alignment of work plan priorities across the agencies. Place-based planning needs to be part of agency staff’s job descriptions to ensure clear understanding of their responsibilities in the program. Agency staff will need to acquire new skill sets, such as how to engage with communities in place-based planning and how to build trust between state agencies and community members</p>	<p>participating in meetings, permit coordination, grant identification) and technical support, as described in Recommendation B of the Data and Technical Assistance above.</p> <p>Support for an interagency team could include a) support from mid and upper-level leadership in the core state agencies, b) greater vertical integration within agencies, and/or c) alignment of work plan priorities across the agencies.</p>
<p>7 Ensuring that place-based Action Plans adequately address the concerns of a balance of water interests, including instream and out of stream needs, requires paying careful attention to process design upfront and providing multiple ways for stakeholders to engage in planning.</p>	

Key Lesson Learned (McClain, et al., 2022)	Related Draft Workgroup Recommendations (v2)
<p>Incorporating multiple water interests in a way that balances instream and out of stream needs, and water quality as well as water quantity proved to be one of the most challenging aspects of the state’s pilot place-based planning program. Planning processes that are structured in ways that encourage participants to provide input, offer multiple ways for participants to engage, and incorporate strong and on-going community engagement are more likely to achieve the goal of incorporating the water needs of a broad range of interests.</p> <p>Our evaluation highlights the importance of skilled facilitation and the presence of paid staff with community engagement skills in bringing in a broad and balanced set of water interests.</p> <p>To address the issue of data skepticism, which can lead to planning groups ignoring relevant data and thus the concerns of some water interests, the state agencies and planning groups should consider integrating coproduction of knowledge about locale-specific water systems</p>	<p>CE Recommendation A: Place-Based Planning funding should include 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.</p> <p>CE Recommendation B: Establish a clear set of standards for engagement tied to accessing state funding for regional planning, based on the high-level principles from the Community Engagement Guide. These principles should be considered criteria for grant funding.</p> <p>CE Recommendation C: Offer a best practices guide to regional planning groups to assist them in engagement efforts (see: Community Engagement Guide developed and endorsed by the HB 5006 Work Group).</p> <p>PP Recommendation E: The state should provide resources to planning groups to fund professional independent third-party facilitation.</p> <p>PP Recommendation B: The state should provide resources to build foundational trust with and among interested parties, planning groups, and state agencies prior to plan development and writing. This includes setting foundational norms for group engagement and developing and understanding foundational data.</p>
<p>8 The respective roles of the state and planning groups in the local-state planning partnership and the state’s expectations for what the groups should include in the Action Plans need to be clearly defined.</p>	

DRAFT

Key Lesson Learned (McClain, et al., 2022)	Related Draft Workgroup Recommendations (v2)
<p>When the pilot program began, OWRD staff had not had time to develop a clear sense for what the agency’s roles in the planning process should be, nor had they had time to develop detailed guidelines for what the step reports leading up to the Action Plans, and the Action Plans themselves should include. The lack of clear sideboards for where OWRD should have an overriding say regarding Action Plan content, together with differences between the planning groups and OWRD (and other state agencies) expectations as to the agency’s data provision and planning group engagement roles, was a source of much frustration and tension. In the workshop discussions, this tension manifested itself in the planning groups’ seemingly contradictory desire for both greater flexibility and more structure. Over the course of the pilot program, OWRD’s expectations for the plans have become clearer, as have its roles and authority in the local-state partnerships. To reduce frustration in future efforts, the supporting state agencies and planning groups need to devote time upfront to a) defining what is meant by consultation with the state, b) defining what the planning group members mean when they say they need flexibility, and c) identifying and clearly articulating the expectations and roles of all parties in the partnership</p>	<p>Data and Technical Assistance Recommendations (all)</p> <p>Community Engagement Recommendations (all)</p> <p>Pathway and Process Recommendations (all)</p>
<p>9 Outside of the place-based planning venue, investigate the need and possibilities for water rights and regulatory reforms.</p>	<p>This is outside the scope of the workgroup.</p>
<p>In all the pilot planning groups, some participants voiced concerns that Oregon’s legal framework, which enables water overallocation, does not support the state’s goals of meeting current and future instream and out of stream water needs while also addressing water quantity, water quality, and ecosystem needs. Consequently, they believe that implementing the place-based Action Plans is unlikely to achieve more resilient water resource systems. Indeed, the evidence suggests that overallocation of water resources is already happening or about to happen in many parts of the state. In such circumstances, it is prudent for the state to explore in venues other than place-based water planning, whether, where, and under what circumstances regulatory</p>	

DRAFT

Key Lesson Learned (McClain, et al., 2022)	Related Draft Workgroup Recommendations (v2)
or water rights reforms might be necessary for achieving sustainable and resilient water systems.	

References

- McLain, Rebecca, et al. Place-Based Integrated Water Resources Planning: A Participatory Evaluation. National Policy Consensus Center, Oregon State University Cooperative Extension, 2022.
- Downey, J., R. McLain, S. Boyers, and E.J. Davis. Integrated Place-Based Water Resources Planning: Revising the Five-Step Planning Framework. May 4, 2022., National Policy Consensus Center and Oregon State University Extension Service
- Downey, J., R. McLain, S. Boyers, and E.J. Davis. Place-Based Integrated Water Resources Planning: Pilot Program and Recommendations. May 4, 2022. National Policy Consensus Center and Oregon State University Extension Service.