

Deliberative Topics for September 6th Work Group Meeting

Identified from worksheet responses received as of 5:00pm on 9/2

1) Terms and Definitions (45 minutes)

- NEW Recommendations for Balanced Representation of Water Interests definition:
Who should be at the table? Who must be at the table? Who can be at the table?
 - Related to requirements around state and local levels of government participation:
 - **Require concurrence of local governments (including special districts).** Proposed language adapted from the State of Washington (RCW 90.82.060): “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].”
 - **Require an active role for the State in leading the planning effort, in addition to technical support and guidance.**
 - Related to language requiring balanced representation:
 - **Require 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.)
 - **The planning body must represent a balance of in-stream and out of stream interests and including those from different sectors.**
 - Related to statewide interest participation:
 - **Statewide interests must be allowed at the table:** Add that a group will “Develop a structure...including statewide interests”

rather than “decide its own.” If statewide interests are left out intentionally, PBP should not proceed.

- Related to ‘community’ and ‘community-led’:
 - This could be interpreted as any entity outside the basin/region having a say in how water is managed in that particular area. Can an organization from Portland decide how water is managed in the Harney Basin?
 - This definition is so broad that it allows even state driven processes or processes driven from outside a region to be community led.
Recommend narrowing.
- Procedural clarification - Work Group member proposal: These terms and definitions are meant to help clarify the Work Group recommendations and offered as guidance to the Oregon Water Resources Commission to inform future place-based planning program. These are not intended to be recommendations for legislation.
- Procedural suggestion: Revisit all terms once the recommendations are fully reviewed and vetted.
- NEW Term Recommendation: Create a definition for ‘**recognition of a plan.**’ (Related to Pathway and Process recommendations G, H, I, J, K.)
- NEW Term Recommendation: Create a definition for ‘**integrated.**’

2) Data and Technical Assistance Recommendations (45 minutes)

- Informational Update: DEQ on Data Portal Project.
- Replace 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.
- Refine Recommendation B: 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.

- Stronger Prescription to Recommendation B: If the legislature does not fund agencies to develop/provide data and/or sit at the table as participants, then PBP should not commence.
- Proposed revisions to Recommendation C: 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.* State agencies should provide support and technical training *upon request* to planning groups...
- NEW Proposed Recommendation: Implement [1998 Stewardship & Supply Initiative](#) (basin assessments).

(BREAK- 30 minutes)

3) Community Engagement Recommendations (45 minutes)

- Update and Overview: Community Engagement Task Group
 - Review draft Guide and intent behind some of the potential recommendations.
- General Clarification: Who is intended to take these actions?
- Clarify Recommendation A: Is this meant to be a recommendation to establish a separate fund? Or included within a Place-Based Planning grant?
- Refine Recommendation B: Should the baseline standards be higher? Expand on community outreach.

4) Pathway and Process Recommendations (60 minutes)

- Refine Recommendation F: Agencies should have active roles as participants, in addition to providing technical data as needed. Agencies should be adequately resourced to serve as active participants. (*Related to State Support definition and Data Recommendation B.*)
- Revise Recommendation. G: One suggestion to remove “working to address policy needs” altogether, and another suggestion to keep it and add “*and local policy.*”
- Revise 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, 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.”

- Remove/Refine Recommendation K: Cut this recommendation, or, better define.
- General level “5” Concerns and Suggestions:
 - Assert the state “will” rather than “should” in these recommendations
 - State support should cover all aspects of planning
 - “Support” should be defined as funding, data, technology, etc, not direction and control of process. (**related to item above under Balanced Representation, potential required roles for state government*)
 - Define interagency team and their role (*OWRD will speak to this*)
 - Propose annual review, 5 year update (*another comment suggested funding a 10-year review is not realistic and should not be guaranteed*)
 - Determine who creates benchmarks

5) Sustaining and Funding Recommendations (As time allows and will be continued October 4)

- NEW Recommendation: 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.
- Concern with Recommendation A: Support funding place-based planning, but have serious concerns about creating a fund that automatically funds projects outside existing grant programs that require demonstration of public benefit.
- Revise Recommendation B: 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.
- Concern and Revision for Recommendation B: This is not suited for a work group, would instead propose a Task Force or developing an RFP for this action.
- Other Concerns:
 - Issue of equitable access to planning and implementation funds. Suggestion for a recommendation addressing equity concerns.
 - Creating a new fund given the likelihood of this creating a need for new fees or taxes.