

Reference/Tracking Tool: Summary of Feedback on Version 1 (8/24/22) Straw Draft Framework and Recommendations

Below is a summary of written comments submitted through the preliminary consensus check worksheet prior to the 9/6 meeting. Oregon Consensus received 14 written responses to the v1 straw draft. For each section of the straw draft, you will see the results of the written consensus check, along with any suggested revisions/questions provided by workgroup members. The drafting team has provided a response or described the action it took for the v2 draft for each comment in the tables below. See the accompanying redlined version of this document for specific Draft Version 2 (v2) red-lined revisions.

There is not an expectation for workgroup members to review this document. It is offered as a reference/tracking tool for anyone seeking to read worksheet feedback and/or understand how v2 revisions were informed/made.

Terms and Definitions

Consensus Check Responses: Average = 3

- WSC - 4
- LOC-4
- SDAO - 4
- CTUIR - 2
- OBC - 3
- Harney PBP - 2
- DBC – Mostly 1s; 4
- Curry- 2
- WW- 4
- OFB - 3
- AOC- 5
- LWV - 1
- OWRC - 4

| Terms and Definitions: Suggested Revisions/Questions from v1 worksheet | | Drafting Team Response/Action taken |
|--|--|---|
| GENERAL | | |
| GENERAL | <p><i>OFB</i></p> <p>Are these intended to go into statute, rules or guidance?</p> | <p>Language has been added to clarify that these definitions are offered as a way to clarify a common understanding of terms for a final workgroup report and are not intended to be translated directly into legislative language.</p> |

| Terms and Definitions: Suggested Revisions/Questions from v1 worksheet | | | Drafting Team Response/Action taken |
|--|----------|---|--|
| | WSC | Definitions only become meaningful in context, so will need to carve out time for workgroup to revisit these definitions as proposal continues to take shape. OC/OWRD should create running list of terms that need definition. | This has been noted, and definitions will be revisited. |
| | WSC | ADD: Definitions for “Integrated” and “Recognition” | “State Recognition” has been added as a term/definition in v2. Please provide a proposed definition for “integrated” for workgroup deliberation. |
| | LOC/SDAO | Clarify that this is for recommendations (to OWRC), not intended to be translated to a legislative concept. | Added in v2 |
| | OWRC | Almost every term needs further revision discussed individually with whole workgroup | Terms have been revised based on workgroup feedback to date. If more revisions are necessary, please indicate that in the v2 feedback worksheet. |
| BALANCED REPRESENTATION OF WATER INTERESTS | | | |
| BALANCED REPRESENTATION OF WATER INTERESTS | AOC (5) | <p>Local governments must be required to concur.</p> <p>See Washington State example: Must require concurrence of local governments. Suggested language: State of Washington’s model/language that connects local governments to water pre-planning & planning efforts.</p> <p>“RCW 90.82.060 Initiation of watershed planning—Scope of planning—Technical assistance from state agencies.(2)(a) Watershed planning under this chapter may be initiated for a WRIA only with the concurrence of: (i) All counties within the WRIA; (ii) the largest city or town within the WRIA unless the WRIA does not contain a city or town; and (iii) the water supply utility obtaining the largest quantity of water from the WRIA or, for a WRIA with lands within the Columbia Basin project, the water supply utility obtaining from the Columbia Basin project the largest quantity of water for the WRIA.”</p> | <p>This proposed revision was discussed and polled at the September 6 meeting.</p> <p>Consensus Poll question: “To apply for state funding to initiate Place based planning, local governments must be involved.”</p> <p>Consensus poll results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5’s = 11 members • 4’s = 2 members • 3’s = 2 members • 2’s = 4 members <p>Based on poll results, this was not added to v2. If workgroup members would like to revise the proposed change and bring it back for the workgroup to consider again, they should indicate that in the v2 worksheet.</p> |

| Terms and Definitions: Suggested Revisions/Questions from v1 worksheet | | Drafting Team Response/Action taken |
|--|---|--|
| <i>OFB</i> | <p>Re: “Remember that these needs encompass water quantity, water quality, and ecosystem needs, considering both surface water and groundwater resources.” I am not sure every place based plan does need to include all of these elements depending on what the local issues are and what's needed in planning. I think that it could bog down progress to require all elements in all plans.</p> <p>To my point above, I also think additional clarity is needed on water quality and ecosystem needs - we do not want communities to feel like they have to reinvent TMDL processes or ODFW programs, etc.</p> | <p>In an effort to simplify and remove prescription from the definitions, this language has been removed.</p> <p>A key principle of the current PBP pilot program is to build on and integrate existing studies and plans, which would include TMDL processes; ODFW programs, etc.</p> |
| <i>ODFW</i> | <p>Should provide more detail regarding what it means to have a “voice” in a process. Recommend including the requirement for ground rules to ensure equitable and meaningful opportunity to engage and provide feedback (not dominated by the most aggressive voices in the room, provide multiple avenues for sharing perspectives, encourage a safe and welcoming environment etc.)</p> | <p>Based on workgroup discussion to move away from prescription in the definitions, this has not been added to the definition, but is addressed in the Community Engagement guide and CE Recommendation C</p> |
| <i>WW (4)</i> | <p>EDIT: “Develop a structure” replaces “decide its own”, add ‘including statewide interests’. One of the issues WW raised in the assessment was ensuring that interested groups were included. State funds should not go to processes where local interests can shut out others who have an interest in the resource.</p> | <p>Based on comments at the workgroup meeting, the drafting team has removed any prescriptions about specific interest groups needing to be at the table in the definitions and terms section. See v2 CE Recommendation B for prescriptive language around this.</p> |
| <i>DBC (4)</i> | <p>Seems a little light (almost there but dancing around it a little) on ensuring there are both instream and out of stream interests. Seems to leave it up to the local community. In some communities, there may not be obvious instream advocates and that may be problematic but still important.</p> <p>ADD: “Most importantly, the structure needs to ensure that the planning body represents a balance of interests from different sectors, including instream and out of stream interests.”</p> | <p>This comment relates to the v2 CE Recommendation B</p> <p>As much as possible, prescriptive language has been removed from the definitions, but the baseline sideboards in v2 require plans to “balance current and future in-stream and out-of-stream needs”.</p> |

| Terms and Definitions: Suggested Revisions/Questions from v1 worksheet | | | Drafting Team Response/Action taken |
|--|----------------|--|---|
| | WSC (4) | ADD: add as examples “water-dependent recreation,” “anglers/hunters,” “tourism,” “rural domestic well users”; “agriculture” and “forestry” should aim for representation from large and small operations; | Added in v2 |
| | LOC/SDAO (4) | ADD: You might want to include a statement that some groups may represent multiple stakeholder categories. For instance, a city or district may also represent the local water utility. | Added in v2 |
| | OWRC (4) | Clarify that special districts are local governments | Added in v2 |
| COMMUNITY | | | |
| COMMUNITY | Harney PBP (4) | <p>I understand that this is trying to get at state agencies in Salem, etc. However this could be interpreted as any entity outside the basin/region having a say in how water is managed in that particular area. Folks in the Harney Basin would be uncomfortable with this part - can an organization from Portland decide how water is managed in the Harney Basin?</p> <p>EDIT: For “entities outside a region...” Perhaps this be deleted. We could say “and governments (federal, state, local, tribal). And entities with an obligation relative to water in the region”</p> | This comment relates to the v2 CE Recommendation B |
| | WW | ADD ‘and ecosystems’ to community definition. | This definition has been removed from the v2 draft. The community engagement task group has used these comments to refine its definition in the Community Engagement Guide. |
| | DBC | ADD “...relative to the water in the region or water impacted downstream of the region; people impacted by...” | |
| | OFB | If we are going to define community to include people outside the basin, I am not sure we need to say "community or public" elsewhere, because you have defined community in a way that includes the general public. | |

| Terms and Definitions: Suggested Revisions/Questions from v1 worksheet | | | Drafting Team Response/Action taken |
|--|--------------|---|---|
| | WSC | CHANGE: "Local community members" to "people who live within the planning area region" | |
| COMMUNITY-LED | | | |
| COMMUNITY LED | OFB | I feel as though this definition is so broad that it allows even state driven processes or processes driven from outside a region to be community led. I do not think that was the intent, and recommend narrowing. | This definition has been removed from the v2 draft. The community engagement task group has used these comments to refine its definition in the Community Engagement Guide. |
| | WSC (4) | CHANGE: "Stakeholders who represent both local and dispersed statewide communities impacted by a process" to "Community members" | |
| | LOC/SDAO (4) | EDIT: Different interest groups recommend a primary representative to participate that can keep the other interests updated. | |
| | WW | still the outstanding question about state leadership. | |
| FACILITATOR | | | |
| FACILITATOR | ODFW | "Facilitator" v. "Convenor": It would be useful, even if not here, to provide more detail on what specific roles fall to a facilitator versus the convenor(s) in the event of group conflict. Perhaps the facilitator definition should address needed qualifications to be considered for that position. The OC website has information regarding facilitator selection, including the following language, "They [facilitators] abide by professional standards and participate in formal evaluation of their work." | The definition of "facilitator" has been updated based on the revisions offered by workgroup members. More detailed role delineation could be appropriate in future PBP guidance or in governance documents developed by individual planning groups. |
| | Harney PBP | ADD: "neutral" and "diplomatic" to facilitator definition. | V2 replaces the v1 definition of facilitator with the definition offered by WSC. Comments from Harney PBP and |
| | WW | ADD: 'neutral' to facilitator. | |

| Terms and Definitions: Suggested Revisions/Questions from v1 worksheet | | Drafting Team Response/Action taken |
|--|--|--|
| | <p><i>WSC (4)</i></p> <p>EDIT: Too passive. Use definition from Wikipedia: "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 will try to assist the group in achieving a consensus on any disagreements that preexist or emerge in the meeting so that it has a solid basis for future action."</p> | <p>WaterWatch to add neutral to the definition were addressed with this new definition.</p> <p>It was difficult to figure out where to add "diplomatic" to the new definition.</p> |
| IMPLEMENTATION | | |
| | <p><i>OFB</i></p> <p>This is a very broad definition, where implementation could be very small (funding for continued conversations) or very large (money for projects). I think that's fine, but it will impact comments about how implementation occurs.</p> | <p>Additional prescriptive language around implementation can be found in PP Recommendation H.</p> |
| PLACE-BASED | | |
| | <p><i>DBC</i></p> <p>ADD: 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.</p> <p>Currently more focused on social over physical/hydrogeologic context and both are important.</p> | <p>Added to v2</p> |
| PARTNERSHIP WITH THE STATE | | |
| PARTNERSH | <p><i>ODFW</i></p> <p>State agencies "may" provide support (technical, program assistance etc.) as resources allow. I have a concern with setting up an expectation without proper recognition of the resource constraints that exist that could affect ability to fulfill expectations.</p> | <p>Added in v2</p> |

| Terms and Definitions: Suggested Revisions/Questions from v1 worksheet | | Drafting Team Response/Action taken |
|--|--|--|
| WSC | <p>This appears to be first use of phrase “regional integrated water resources planning and implementation” – is there supposed to be a linkback to “place-based planning” somewhere?</p> <p>Where is there a definition for “recognition” by Water Resources Commission?</p> <p>What is impact of agency not being identified as core agency, for example, Oregon Health Authority (drinking water), Department of Land Conservation & Development (land use, wetlands), Department of Forestry (source water protection), etc?</p> | <p>Updated the language in v2 to “place-based planning and implementation”</p> <p>State Recognition has been added as a definition; what happens after formal recognition is addressed in the recommendations section</p> <p>OHA has been added as a core agency. This mostly describes how the agency would be expected to engage in Place Based Planning, which is described more explicitly in DTA Recommendations B & C and PP Recommendation F.</p> |
| Harney PBP | <p>After “OWRC”... Suggest adding something here that describes what happens after formal recognition.</p> <p>After “Interagency Team”... What about OHA, etc?</p> | <p>State Recognition has been added as a definition; what happens after formal recognition is PP Recommendations G, H, I, and J.</p> <p>OHA has been added in v2</p> |
| WW | <p>Again, the larger question is whether the state should have a more active role in LEADING place based planning. We need something to capture that across the board, the PBP folks recommended that the state fund not just data gathering but participation of all relevant agencies.</p> | <p>This was discussed and polled at the September 6 meeting.</p> <p><i>Consensus Poll question:</i> “The state should be required to participate in a specified role in Place based planning processes.”</p> <p><i>Consensus Poll results:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5’s = 0 members • 4’s = 2 members • 3’s = 4 members • 2’s = 11 members • 1’s = 1 member <p>Based on poll results and clarification from WW, a recommendation around this has been added (PP Recommendation L).</p> |
| REGIONAL/WATERSHED OR BASIN SCALE | | |

| Terms and Definitions: Suggested Revisions/Questions from v1 worksheet | | | Drafting Team Response/Action taken |
|--|-----|---|---|
| | OFB | This makes it sound like a group can choose something other than basin or subbasin. Was that the intent? It seems more sideboards should exist on not being able to impact people outside your chosen space if the space can span water boundaries. | This definition has been removed as the group has chosen to focus on “place-based” instead of “regional” planning. Current place-based planning statute defines “place-based integrated water resources” as “waters that are from sources within a single drainage basin or within an area that is a subset of a single drainage basin”. Unless the group wants to evolve that definition, the assumption is that this definition remains and does not need to be articulated again in this document. |

Data and Technical Assistance Recommendations

Overall Section Responses: Average = 2.8

- WSC - 4
- LOC - 4
- SDAO - 4
- CTUIR - 2
- OBC - 3
- Harney PBP - 1
- DBC - 1
- Curry- 2
- WW - 2
- OFB- NA
- AOC- 5
- LWV - 2
- OWRC - 4

| DTA: Suggested Revisions/Questions from v1 worksheet | | | Drafting Team Response/Action taken |
|--|---------|--|--|
| DTA: GENERAL | | | |
| GEN | AOC (5) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Define guidance ● State shall or must rather than should provide capacity/funding | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● “Guidance” does not appear in this section |

| DTA: Suggested Revisions/Questions from v1 worksheet | | Drafting Team Response/Action taken |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> State shall or must provide data State shall or must provide assistance to fill data gaps Identify State Agencies that shall provide data | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> These recommendations are not written to be directly translated into legislative language, so the drafting team has left the language as is. At this point, changing to “shall” or “must” would confer authority that these recommendations do not have. This group has discussed the unique needs each basin has when it comes to data and analyses. The revised DTA Recommendation A would identify those available data and data gaps, which would then point to which agencies would provide data, while DTA Recommendation B recommends that agencies should have capacity to support these planning efforts and their data needs. |
| WSC | Where does Step 0 fit into all of this? | Step 0 from the PBP Evaluation includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trust building: PP Recommendation B Data and analysis preparation: DTA Recommendation A |
| OWRC | State agencies should provide data and technical support, but we need to parse out and focus on sections specific to regional planning and discuss each part as a workgroup before combining. | Revisions have been made in v2 to narrow the focus of these recommendations to PBP Efforts. |
| DTA RECOMMENDATION A | | |
| DTA RECOMMENDATION A | <i>ODFW</i> needs to be clearer regarding what constitutes “current” efforts. Is this recommendation requesting that the agencies compile an inventory of available water data and gaps? While there are ongoing discussions around a water data platform, compiling an inventory is not necessarily a “current” activity. Additionally, the language suggests that agencies should note data gaps and prioritize filling those. Is this intended to support the data gap filling effort (collecting information)? | Based on discussion at the September 6 th meeting, this language has been removed from Recommendation A. |

| DTA: Suggested Revisions/Questions from v1 worksheet | | Drafting Team Response/Action taken | |
|--|----------|---|---|
| | WSC (4) | <p>must be about more than summarizing current work and commitments. Support a workgroup recommendation for systemic water data gap analysis.</p> | <p>This was discussed and polled at the September 6 workgroup meeting.</p> <p><i>Consensus Poll question:</i> Add 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 PBP. The data would be useful for all sectors even if the place chose not to pursue planning.</p> <p><i>Consensus Poll results:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2’s = 11 members • 1’s = 3 member <p>Based on poll results, the proposed language has been added to v1 language.</p> |
| | OWRC (4) | <p>Support concept of first sentence. Do not support 2nd sentence. This should not be specific to the regional planning workgroup—it’s a statewide issue and some efforts are already underway.</p> | <p>The second sentence has been removed and replaced with the proposed language introduced at the 9/6 workgroup meeting based on the results of a consensus poll.</p> |
| DTA RECOMMENDATION B | | | |
| DTA RECOMMENDATION B | ODFW | <p>Need greater specificity as to intended outcome. Are agency staff expected to inventory existing data sets (scope of this effort needs work), articulate data gaps (or is this responsibility of planning group) and train local groups on filling data gaps? Or are we training local groups to better understand and use the data we have? Note, we should expressly address situation where there are data gaps as that is common, so need to be realistic about “support...to fill gaps.” In general, this point will require significant discussion around expectations of State agencies and required resources to meet expectations.</p> <p>Additionally, we should address the scenario where the planning group does not “agree” with</p> | <p>Recommendations A and B have been revised based on consensus polling done during the September 6th meeting.</p> <p>A suggestion was made at the September 6th meeting for a workgroup member to</p> |

| DTA: Suggested Revisions/Questions from v1 worksheet | | Drafting Team Response/Action taken |
|--|---|--|
| | the data/analysis that is being shared by the agencies. | bring forward a specific recommendation around trust in data. For now, language around this has been added to PP Recommendation B. |
| <i>OFB</i> | Concerned that this could result in some state overreach into the groups unless they were strictly held to sharing data and not opening on what to do with the data or conclusions to be reached from it (same with C) | Recommendations A and B have been revised based on polling done during the September 6 th meeting. |
| <i>WSC (4)</i> | has additional language in the straw proposal – “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.” This language should be strengthened to recommend coordinated work-planning and budgeting to ensure robust participation from interagency team – see below | <p>This was discussed and polled at the September 6 workgroup meeting.</p> <p><i>Consensus Poll question: <u>Refine Recommendation B</u>: Specific recommendation for funding 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 interagency team.</i></p> <p><i>Consensus Poll results:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 5’s = 0 members ● 4’s = 1 member ● 3’s = 4 members ● 2’s = 4 members ● 1’s = 8 members |
| <i>WW</i> | While we support this, this should not be the sum total of agency work in PBP. The state needs to fund agencies to sit at the table. If the legislature refuses to do that, then PBP should not commence. | <p>This was discussed and polled at the September 6 workgroup meeting.</p> <p><i>Consensus Poll question: <u>Stronger Prescription to Recommendation B</u>: If the legislature does not fund agencies to develop/provide data and/or sit at the table as participants, then PBP should not commence.</i></p> <p><i>Consensus Poll results:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 5’s = 1 member ● 4’s = 5 members ● 3’s = 5 members |

| DTA: Suggested Revisions/Questions from v1 worksheet | | Drafting Team Response/Action taken |
|--|--------------|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2's = 5 members • 1's = 1 member <p>Other comments: Budgeting is its own thing; still need clarity as to which staff for which work: data gathering and which for participating; 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.</p> |
| | OWRC (4) | <p>Agree with first sentence. Do not agree with second sentence, suggest deletion.</p> <p>Recommendation B has been revised based on consensus polling from the workgroup.</p> |
| DTA RECOMMENDATION C | | |
| DTA RECOMMENDATION C | ODFW | <p>Same as B (above)</p> <p>Based on workgroup discussion on 9/6; "Within mission and sideboards" has been added to this recommendation.</p> |
| | WW (4) | <p>EDIT: The state should fund State agencies to provide support and technical data to planning groups that are tailored to fill data gaps needed for planning. The state should also fund participation of relevant state agencies including but not limited to OWRD, ODFW, DEQ and ODA.</p> <p>The legislature should give \$\$ to state agencies to fill data gaps and participate, but I don't think the state should be in the business of funding agencies to train folks in certain skill sets.</p> <p>These edits make this recommendation very similar to the revised v2 DTA Recommendation B, so they were not included in the v2 draft.</p> <p>Revised language added in v2.</p> |
| | LOC/SDAO (4) | <p>very broad, and I wouldn't want participants to have expectations of extensive trainings such as you would obtain through a college or technical program. Consider revising "to provide technical presentations and information" instead of "technical training"</p> <p>Revised language added in v2.</p> |

| DTA: Suggested Revisions/Questions from v1 worksheet | | Drafting Team Response/Action taken | |
|--|----------|---|--|
| | OWRC (4) | State agencies should provide support and technical training upon request to planning groups that are tailored to fill gaps in local capacity or knowledge/skillsets. | Revised language added in v2. |
| DTA NEW PROPOSALS | | | |
| NEW RECOMMENDATIONS | ODFW | These recommendations are focused on what the state or state agencies should do. Perhaps there should be a recommendation that also addresses responsibilities of the Planning Groups (e.g., trainings to move forward with uncertainty in scientific data/lack of perfect data, etc.). | Recommend specific language to be proposed by workgroup member to be considered by the workgroup. |
| | WW | If the legislature does not fund agencies to develop/provide data and/or sit at the table as PARTICIPANTS then PBP should not commence. | <p>This was discussed and polled at the September 6 workgroup meeting.</p> <p><i>Consensus Poll question: <u>Stronger Prescription to Recommendation B</u>: If the legislature does not fund agencies to develop/provide data and/or sit at the table as participants, then PBP should not commence.</i></p> <p><i>Consensus Poll results:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 5's = 1 member ● 4's = 5 members ● 3's = 5 members ● 2's = 5 members ● 1's = 1 member <p>Other comments: Budgeting is its own thing; still need clarity as to which staff for which work: data gathering and which for participating; 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.</p> |

| DTA: Suggested Revisions/Questions from v1 worksheet | | Drafting Team Response/Action taken |
|--|---|---|
| | | Based on consensus poll results, WW offered to consider refining this proposal further. |
| WW | 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. Regardless, the data would be useful for all sectors eve if the place chose not to pursue planning. | This was discussed and polled at the September 6 workgroup meeting. <i>Consensus Poll question: <u>Add to Recommendation A</u>: 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.</i> |
| OFB | I think there should be a proposal where the state develops additional information prior to a basin being chosen, prepares what data is known and what is unknown, and gives that to the planning group to work with. | <i>Consensus Poll results:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5’s = 0 members • 4’s = 2 members • 3’s = 4 members • 2’s = 11 members • 1’s = 1 member |
| WSC | Must be about more than summarizing current work and commitments. Support a workgroup recommendation for systemic water data gap analysis. | Based on poll results, the proposed language has replaced v1 language. |
| WSC | Recommend implementation of 1998 Stewardship & Supply Initiative: https://digital.osl.state.or.us/islandora/object/osl%3A14710/datastream/OBJ/view | This was discussed at the 9/6 workgroup meeting, but no poll was taken. Caylin agreed that v2 DTA Recommendation A might be reflective of this recommendation, but also might want to refine it further at a future date to clarify intent. |

Community Engagement

The community engagement task group has taken the feedback below and revised its recommendations as reflected in the v2 draft.

Overall Section Responses: AVERAGE: 2.5

- WSC - 3
- LOC-3
- SDAO - 3
- CTUIR - 2
- OBC - 3
- Harney PBP - 1
- DBC - 1
- Curry - 1
- WW- 2
- OFB - 4
- AOC- 5
- LWV - 1
- OWRC - 4

| Community Engagement: Suggested Revisions/Questions from v1 worksheet | | |
|---|-----------------|--|
| GENERAL | | |
| CE GENERAL | <i>ODFW</i> | it is not clear who is supposed to be performing these actions. Please clarify which actors are responsible (WRD? Core agencies? Convener(s)? Planning group?) |
| | <i>AOC (5)</i> | Who is the body referenced in each recommendation that takes the recommended action? Provide funding for capacity |
| | <i>WSC</i> | interested in lessons from other states' models |
| | <i>OWRC (4)</i> | This section is premature to seek agreement on given that the related subcommittee's proposal has not been discussed by full workgroup. Revisit after discussion. |
| RECOMMENDATION A | | |
| CE RECOMMENDATION A | <i>OFB</i> | Is this a separate fund from actually doing the planning? Or is it part of their PBP work? Why are we pulling community engagement funding out when it's part of the plan? |
| | <i>LOC/SDAO</i> | Cities strongly support community engagement efforts, but the State should determine the level of effort requirement for their funding initiatives. However, it may be challenging to obtain sufficient funding through the legislature for this entire concept. |
| | <i>WW</i> | More detail needed on what it would fund |

Community Engagement: Suggested Revisions/Questions from v1 worksheet

CE RECOMMENDATION B

| | | |
|----------------------------|------------|--|
| CE RECOMMENDATION B | <i>OFB</i> | I think that outreach is an important part of community engagement, so would recommend building on this. My members primary complaints through the process was that it was SO TIME INTENSIVE that they fell off attending or couldn't keep up. They do not get paid for this work and have more than full time work on their farms. And it meant that the paid people who were participating for orgs where that was their job had a better mechanism to have their voices heard. This could be addressed somewhat with dedicated outreach as part of the plan so people have a chance to have their voices heard even when they miss meetings are do not have time to devote to a subgroup. |
| | <i>WSC</i> | Minimums (website or listserv) are too low. Community members should be on equal footing in planning process. No one community member or type of community member should be able to torpedo state-supported regional water planning. |

CE RECOMMENDATION D

| | | |
|----------------------------|------------|---|
| CE Recommendation D | <i>WW</i> | Provide staff support to regional groups for trust building and closing gaps on information, monitoring, legal guidance. |
| | <i>OFB</i> | State staff? I need A LOT more clarification on this one...if the state is staffing and providing legal guidance, etc that needs to have clear sideboards. If it's funding for the group to hire staff, that also warrants much more clarification - how will these people be hired? Are these groups collecting their own data/doing their own monitoring? That seems like it needs more conversation too. |

CE RECOMMENDATION E

| | | |
|----------------------------|------------|---|
| CE RECOMMENDATION E | <i>OFB</i> | This seems like a staff training conversation that should live somewhere else in OWRD and not part of PBP recommendations - they need to be training all staff to deal with conversations they're in locally, whether PBP or not. |
|----------------------------|------------|---|

Pathways and Process

Overall Section Responses: **AVERAGE: 2.4**

- WSC - 4
- LOC-2
- SDAO - 2
- CTUIR - 2
- OBC - 3
- Harney PBP - 1
- DBC- 1
- Curry - 1
- WW - 2
- OFB- 3
- AOC- 5
- LWV - 2
- OWRC - 4

| Pathways and Process: Suggested Revisions/Questions from v1 worksheet | | Drafting Team Response/Action taken | |
|---|---------|---|--|
| PP GENERAL | | | |
| PP GENERAL | ODFW | More specificity needed on “support” | Some revisions have been made in v2; further revisions expected based on workgroup deliberation in October. |
| | LWV | Is important for the local groups to have some “skin in the game”. Also, funding for implementation may come from sources other than the state. Help from the state in finding other resources might be reasonable. | Some revisions have been made in v2; further revisions expected based on workgroup deliberation in October. |
| | AOC (5) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● State will rather than should ● Support should cover all aspects of planning ● Support should be defined as funding, data, technology, etc, not direction and control of process ● Define interagency team and their role ● Address local policy in addition to state policy ● Who creates benchmarks? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● These recommendations are not written to be directly translated into legislative language, so the drafting team has left the language as is. At this point, changing to “will” would confer authority that these recommendations do not have. ● Some revisions have been made in v2; further revisions expected based on workgroup deliberation in October. ● Interagency Team is defined in definitions; their role is more defined in DTA Recommendations B & C and PP Recommendation F. |

| Pathways and Process: Suggested Revisions/Questions from v1 worksheet | | Drafting Team Response/Action taken | |
|---|--------------|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommend workgroup member including a specific proposal around local policy in next feedback worksheet. Benchmark language has been removed and replaced with state recognition | |
| | OWRC (3.5-5) | All recs (other than D, E, F) need further discussion with workgroup and revisions | |
| PP Recommendation A | | | |
| PP Recommendation A | DBC | QUESTION: What does "community building" look like specifically? | Community building was removed as its meaning was redundant with other items listed. |
| | OFB | QUESTION: Is this once they're selected for funding? Or is this before? It sounds like before, in which case I do not think it's appropriate. Once they are selected, the state should provide support, but I am not sure it should look like this...we need to discuss further. | The intent would be that this support would be provided to potential groups to ensure that they are set up to be successful in the PBP process before significant time and resources were spent. It wouldn't be an additional grant program. |
| PP Recommendation B | | | |
| PP Recommendation B | DBC | What activities does this fund? Meetings? Socials? | Clarifying language has been added in v2. The PBP evaluation lists examples of this, including "OWRD coming out to the basin ...talking and building relationships with community members"; "getting to know agency staff, learning who experts are on water issues, finding what tools are available for them to work with"; "various water interests getting to know each other" before putting together a planning group with a balance of interests and developing a governance agreement. |
| | OFB | Again, need clarification. What resources? Building trust seems like a community led exercise. | Clarifying language has been added in v2. The PBP evaluation emphasizes the importance of building trust both within a community and with state agencies. "Resources" could include |

| Pathways and Process: Suggested Revisions/Questions from v1 worksheet | | | Drafting Team Response/Action taken |
|---|-------------------------|--|---|
| | | | agency staff time to engage in trust building, understanding foundational data, educational resources, etc. |
| PP Recommendation C | | | |
| PP Recommendation C | <i>ODFW</i> | EDIT: include DEIJ trainings in the “at a minimum” section. | Added in v2 |
| | <i>DBC</i> | Is this through state staff? State manuals/guidance? Both and other? | Clarified in v2 |
| | <i>OFB</i> | These seem redundant and confusing. Again, need clarification and more conversation about the community role vs. state role. | Some clarifying language was added in v2. |
| | <i>WW (potential 4)</i> | EDIT: Remove “and training options” Clarify if this means providing funding to fund professionals, e.g. a professional neutral facilitator, professional report writer, state agencies for technical/scientific data, etc. We oppose spending state money to train non professionals to serve in functions that should be led by the state or a neutral professional facilitator. | Removed in v2 Clarified in v2 |
| PP Recommendation D | | | |
| | <i>LWV</i> | Needs more detail from work group | Many of the draft recommendations are building on the guidance developed for the PBP pilot. This recommendation refers to the details of program guidance that are beyond the altitude of recommendations this group is focused on. |
| | <i>WW</i> | this should be part of what we are building NOW not in the future | |
| PP Recommendation F | | | |
| PP | <i>ODFW</i> | Seems to suggest that agency support will come from re-organization or better use of existing resources. It should be clear that accomplishing the level of State support that is anticipated in the strawman will require new resources as well. | On the Deliberative Agenda for October 4 th workgroup meeting. |

| Pathways and Process: Suggested Revisions/Questions from v1 worksheet | | | Drafting Team Response/Action taken |
|---|--------|---|---|
| | WW | Address role of state in leading efforts, participating in efforts. Agencies should have active roles as participants, in addition to providing technical data as needed. These are state resources, state agencies that are representing the public as a whole need to be able to help shape water plans specific to a place. | |
| | DBC | The more agency structure around this the better as it could be very variable by local agency staff person/interest. | |
| | WSC | must be about more than summarizing current work and commitments. Support a workgroup recommendation for systemic water data gap analysis. | |
| PP Recommendation G | | | |
| | WW (4) | Propose revision to remove bullet about 'working to address any policy needs with the state'. | On the Deliberative Agenda for October 4 th workgroup meeting. |
| | DBC | ADD: Also occurs in Step 1 | Language has been added to clarify that this recommendation is focused on groups with state recognized plans. |
| PP Recommendation H | | | |
| PP Recommendation H | ODFW | Include language that considers whether the implementation of plan strategies is proceeding in an equitable manner as it relates to instream and out of stream outcomes (achieving benefits at similar pace and scale). This should be a prerequisite to securing State funds. | On the Deliberative Agenda for October 4 th workgroup meeting. |
| | WW (5) | Cannot support this. Suggest cutting this recommendation. SB 839 grants extra points for projects coming out of collaborative processes such as PBP; projects coming out of these plans should just use existing processes. To allow this would allow project proponents to skip the requirement that all projects have social, economic and environmental benefits (which is NOT a requirement of PBP) It would also provide | |

| Pathways and Process: Suggested Revisions/Questions from v1 worksheet | | Drafting Team Response/Action taken |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| | disproportionate access to state funds to areas who have done PBB; potentially denying funding of win win projects in basins that have not done this larger planning. | |
| <i>DBC (4)</i> | <p>EDIT: 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, are being deployed on behalf of a collaborative planning and implementation group, and meet public benefit/multi-benefit criteria as described in the 839 grant program.</p> <p>I wouldn't underestimate what effective robust engagement at the state level – all agencies but especially OWRD entails. Our new Deschutes basin coordinator is a gamechanger but/and it's her full time job. And it often necessitates a different skill set than more typical agency jobs. In a perfect world every basin has its own coordinator skilled in both technical/policy issues and collaboration/planning/conflict resolution/policy development.</p> | |
| <i>OFB</i> | I support there being points or some priority in project funding for place based planning, but we need to have the conversation about what that looks like. This is unclear. | |
| <i>WSC (4)</i> | Just because a strategy or action is included in a placebased plan does not mean that implementation of that strategy or action should automatically be eligible for state funding. Need sideboards here –public funds should generate public benefits. Also significant equity considerations here in terms of places that lack capacity to initiate placebased planning; they risk being left even further behind as better resourced regions secure planning grants and become eligible for implementation funding available only to places with a place-based plan. | |
| <i>PP Recommendation I</i> | | |
| <i>ODFW</i> | Specifically reference updated climate change information | Added in v2 |

| Pathways and Process: Suggested Revisions/Questions from v1 worksheet | | | Drafting Team Response/Action taken |
|---|------------|--|---|
| | WW | Doesn't seem necessary | Added to October 4 th deliberative agenda. |
| | LOC/SDAO | I am not sure that we can commit to funding plans to be updated every 10 years, and think that the applicants should reapply for that funding if needed. The concept is sound, but it may be hard to justify to obtain funding from the legislature. | |
| | AOC | Annual review, 5 year update | |
| PP Recommendation J | | | |
| Recommendation J | WW | Not Clear | This recommendation was edited for clarity in v2. |
| | OFB | These seem at odds with each other, but there is no "or" in them. Seems like completing a plan should prioritize you for funding or give you extra points, but the sideboards of the granting program still must be met. | |
| | WSC | Define "integrated" (as above in the definitions section) | Please provide a proposed definition for "integrated" for workgroup deliberation. |
| PP Recommendation K | | | |
| | WW (5) | These are local plans geared at meeting instream and out-of-stream needs in a specific place. While some things might warrant inclusion in the updated IWRS, this should not be assumed. We suggest CUTTING. | On the Deliberative Agenda for October 4 th workgroup meeting. |
| | DBC | Not against, but not exactly envisioning what this could look like. | |
| PP NEW PROPOSALS | | | |
| | WSC | Recommend implementation of 1998 Stewardship & Supply Initiative: https://digital.osl.state.or.us/islandora/object/osl%3A14710/datastream/OBJ/view | This was discussed at the 9/6 workgroup meeting, but no poll was taken. Caylin agreed that v2 DTA Recommendation A might be reflective of this recommendation, but also |

| Pathways and Process: Suggested Revisions/Questions from v1 worksheet | | Drafting Team Response/Action taken |
|---|--|---|
| | | might want to refine it further at a future date to clarify intent. |

Sustaining and Funding

Overall Section Responses: AVERAGE: 2.6

- WSC - 5
- LOC - 2
- SDAO - 2
- CTUIR - 2
- OBC - 2
- Harney PBP - 1
- DBC- 1
- Curry - 1
- WW- 2
- OFB - 4
- AOC- 5
- LWV - 3
- OWRC- 4.5

| Sustaining and Funding: SUGGESTED REVISIONS/QUESTIONS FROM V1 WORKSHEET | | Drafting Team RESPONSE/ACTION TAKEN |
|---|--|---|
| SF RECOMMENDATION A | | |
| WW | It depends on what is meant. We are okay with \$\$ to continue efforts; not okay with creating a fund that will automatically fund projects outside of SB 839 and other established grant funds that require a public benefit. | On the Deliberative Agenda for October 4 th workgroup meeting. |
| ODFW | Should “agencies” be a potential beneficiary of the fund also? | |
| AOC (5) | What is consistent and sufficient? Who administers? Define regional. | |
| WSC (5) | See concerns above regarding inequitable access to implementation funds. | |
| OWRC (4) | Needs discussion and refinement | |
| SF RECOMMENDATION B | | |

| | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| SF RECOMMENDATION B | <i>DBC</i> | EDIT: Given the nature and scale of investment required by regional integrated water resources planning and implementation, the legislature should commit to securing alternative revenue sources that would allow the state to make this significant, high priority investment. | On the Deliberative Agenda for October 4 th workgroup meeting. |
| | <i>OFB (4)</i> | This always seems to mean new business taxes in Oregon. I have serious concerns about new tax conversations. | |
| | <i>LWV</i> | Am not sure I'm ready to have a workgroup find "alternative revenue sources". There are limited "other sources" and many needs across the state—even within WRD. | |
| | <i>WSC (5)</i> | The proposed scope of work is entirely unsuited to a workgroup. Consider task force, or recommend RFP for assessment & recommendations to be completed by qualified outside expert. | |
| | <i>OWRC (5)</i> | There are several other much higher priority funding needs and I do not support creating a workgroup under this narrow charge and do not support language about "alternative" revenue sources as that often means fees and taxes. | |
| SF NEW PROPOSALS | | | |
| | <i>WSC</i> | Is there consensus in HB 5006 workgroup that every basin should have an integrated regional water plan that 1) assesses current and future water supply and demand and 2) proposes strategies and actions to bridge the gap if one exists? If yes, on what time scale? If no, why not? | On the Deliberative Agenda for October 4 th workgroup meeting. |

Guiding Principles

Discussion around the guiding principles was brought up during the September 6th workgroup meeting and several workgroup members provided ad hoc written feedback (below). Based on that discussion and feedback, along with the narrowed scope of the next generation of place-based planning, the drafting team has removed guiding principles in from the framework in v2 and replaced it with the current sideboards as defined for the PBP Pilot. This is offered to streamline the process and make it easier for any changes to be discussed in the context of specific recommendations.

| | |
|----------------|---|
| <i>OFB (4)</i> | I did not see any opportunity for comment on the Framework and guiding principles. That section would be a "4" for me in that I do not think we've had a conversation about those and I have some changes or discussion I would like to have about that those mean to people, and they differ from the sideboards in existing statute. Particularly, I have major concerns with "Recognizes the public interest |
|----------------|---|

| | |
|---------|---|
| | <p>in water” without the corresponding “Recognizes water as a property right” that is also true and essential for planning to acknowledge (I am guessing that “does not jeopardize existing water rights” was intended to get at this issue, but I think that’s a separate, but important recognition). I also have concern about the addition of the climate change reference without discussion, as well as the inclusion of water quality and ecosystem needs without any caveats because those are major topics that I think should be addressed and further refined from the current process. In all places where it deviates from the existing processes, I do not appreciate the addition of this section without any group discussion or opportunity for feedback, and I do not agree with it.</p> |
| WW | <p>Do think some of the guiding principles need further discussion. I see Lily made some changes, but the issues we flagged were not noted. Also, we have concerns with the language that emerged from Mary Ann’s comments (a similar concept was worded differently in the past, the past language is okay the current we have concerns with). Just wanted to flag.</p> |
| AOC (5) | <p>SEE AUGUST SUMMARY</p> |
| WSC | <p>Is there opportunity to provide feedback on Guiding Principles, not included in this worksheet, and which deviate from elements currently in ORS 536.220? “Place-based integrated water resources strategies described in subsections (2) and (3) of this section must: (a) Be developed in collaboration with a balanced representation of interests; (b) Balance current and future in-stream and out-of-stream needs; (c) Include the development of actions that are consistent with the existing state laws concerning the water resources of this state and state water resources policy; (d) Facilitate implementation of local solutions; (e) Be developed utilizing an open and transparent process that fosters public participation; and (f) Be developed in consultation with the department.”</p> |
| OWRC | <p>Pages 1-2 of the strawman, containing “Framework” and “Pathway” should also be gut-checked, I am a 4 on that section as it needs further discussion with the workgroup, so we have a shared understanding of what we are supporting. While based on previous discussions, from my perspective the verbiage needs to be adjusted and I suspect I am not alone in seeing omissions or other adjustments in terminology before I would be comfortable with it moving forward. Some areas need may warrant mild revision, but it is important to balance the various viewpoints and reflect that back in the words used. This comment also applies to the whole document. I also feel we have not been asked more basic questions that would help inform further workgroup discussions, such as “What is your level of support for continuing the existing place-based planning program or something similar? What changes are needed to the existing guidelines?” These and other questions could greatly narrow the scope and enhance the efficiency of what the workgroup is discussing, developing, and/or supporting.</p> |