

What themes are emerging from the Regional Planning Lessons Learned?

E.g. Critical concerns we should be looking at? Principles that we think are important for the system/structure? Key topics for this Work Group to explore or address?



Implementation/Guidance. Need for implementation guidance was noted. Difficulty prioritizing actions was noted. What do the PBP groups think are important elements that should be included in implementation

Often County Commissioners are the ones speaking to legislators in our state. Were the Commissioners specifically reached out to for this process? Or for others?

Water quality should be considered along with quantity, and projected future quality of water to meet the needs of the community and ecology.

Continuity across politics and participants and accountability from the state are key but difficult to maintain

How were local water right holders engaged and how did the workgroup go about addressing conflicts between them? For example, often the senior users will get pressure from junior users...how was that resolved?

What was the motivation for those initially not interested, to come to the table to create a better solution?

Importance of relationship and trust-building and balancing process versus progress in that frame

concern regarding "regions". It seems to me that "regions" would be defined by those wanting to use whatever process will be supported, but it will be important for "regions" to be, for the most part, defined by those interested in

How have the ideas interacted with current water law - is current law limiting implementation of the plans, or is the issue more resources, data, infrastructure needs to fully realize plans?

Keep planning to the local basin, not the region. Be respectful of others.

How did the group move beyond efforts to "pass the responsibility" and try to shift the need for change to other parties?

Timing matters. Need enough to build/develop trust and understanding but not too long to lose interest or momentum.

What would future legislation look like if these groups crafted it? How would they balance all the issues/factors they identified and the interests of the diverse groups they engaged?

What has state-supported meant in your process? How will the state support implementation or use plans to make needed changes that reflect community needs?

Theme: Data Gaps (state agency role in collecting, providing, analyzing) and timing of when this info is provided.

Need for state agency participation to provide timely data and technical assistance to support planning effort

Data gaps - would like more detail on if that's pure data, studies that are needed, and what scale the information is needed for planning purposes.

Need for additional data on water supply, use and demand is needed to effectively support these processes.

How are/were people historically marginalized, not currently in control of water resources needs and rights addressed?

Themes: (1) Having adequate data upfront is key, (2) having adequate agency capacity/funding/coordination is critical (all relevant agencies).

Incorporation of TMDL's into water data would be helpful.

Need for clear planning scope.

Something for our group to consider regarding planning geographies: Water is a public resource, and stakeholders from outside a given basin may have interests and standing in water planning (e.g., recreation, fish, wildlife, treaty rights)

What themes are emerging from the Regional Planning Lessons Learned?

E.g. Critical concerns we should be looking at? Principles that we think are important for the system/structure? Key topics for this Work Group to explore or address?

that salmonid species are facing extinction in many basins. We have both species protection and water quality regulations that are supposed to improve these situations, but largely aren't getting the job done. Is Oregon ok

forget case law. There was a case involving Jackson County's attempt to regulate certain aspects of groundwater. The court overturned these on the basis that water is a matter of statewide concern, only subject to

stakeholders. I think the better question is how to engage the right balance of stakeholders to achieve community and state supported outcomes - not everyone can be at the table or it will be chaos. Strategic

Seven generation / 2050 planning horizon. How do we embed climate change projections in our planning?

significant resources, but can we expect the Upper Grand Ronde to locally provide the resources to implement their plans? And, if the state(the rest of us) will be helping pay, what should "our" collective role be in their plans without

times: water is a public resource th belongs to all Oregonians, not simply to those living in a certain community. Any planning needs to recognize this and include voices that represent broader

"state-supported" in impactful ways that create present and future accountability around resourcing and implementing plans? It doesn't seem meaningful to create new process if we can't ensure that existing processes maintain momentum

The need for clear guidelines for what "state supported" planning means, and what state support gets a region. Is it funding, recognition, prioritization of dollars to invest in their project?

The need for a more defined and clear state role in water planning, as well as the need for strategic funding to move these efforts forward (to address data gaps, implement plans, fund infrastructure, etc).

Question for group to consider as go forth: some want flexibility in law to meet needs, but where does regulation come into play in planning when that is also a tool to get to the same outcome?

Need for early and ongoing involvement of critical stakeholders -- especially those facing big impacts and big barriers to engagement

I haven't heard anything around the role of septic or exempt wells in these processes nor the needs of small towns with limited financial resources but they need updated sewer and drinking water systems.

communities and voices. We work closely with our local tribal governments and associations representing marginalized communities. Are we talking about environmental associations that

Similar to round one, themes: state leadership/capacity is key, foundational data is critical to inform decisions, sideboards to discussion are useful, clear goals of efforts useful

How have these efforts ensured that healthy flow levels for endangered fisheries will be restored?

From the presentations today, it does feel like we still have some very important work moving forward with understanding tribal engagement, and at what level that is best integrated.

Going to the "regions" discussion, didn't most of these groups define their "regions"? Didn't that work?



Water planning and project implementation is a long term investment. It takes a significant investment of time, money and labor to make progress.



State water management is a key component of regional work; how do we dovetail efforts?



Need to address both instream and out-of-stream needs equally is supposed to be the bedrock of PBP, emerging from the IWRS. Unclear if this goal is being realized.



As a water right holder representative, I want to learn more about how water right holders are engaged, and how planning for the future engages around the fact that the resource is largely already allocated to water right holders.

Prioritization: How are plan projects prioritized and how do we ensure that the timing/priority of projects produces instream and out of stream benefits at similar pace/scale? How do we evaluate effectiveness of plans over time?



ROUND 2 (continued)

