

## HB 5066 Work Group Coordinating Committee Meeting #3

### May 9, 2022 Summary Notes

Coordinating Committee (CC) members present: Caylin Barter, Mary Anne Cooper, Margaret Magruder, Kimberley Priestley, April Snell, Oriana Magnera (via phone)

Staff and Facilitation Team: Lili Prah, OWRD; Robin Harkless, Oregon Consensus, Jennah Stillman, Oregon Consensus

*The following notes are provided by Oregon Consensus. They are not a verbatim account of the discussion but meant to serve as a tracking and group memory tool. Coordinating Committee members should review and help refine for accuracy as needed.*

### Essential Elements Framing

Robin invited feedback on the framing tool (“elements” documents - high-level in the work plan and reference table developed by WRD that shows connections to other informing work like IWRS, 100-Year Water Vision, etc.). She clarified that this was meant simply as an organizing and reference tool at this point and not a product of the work group - but wondered if this might become one and as such, how the group should proceed with that. (**NOTE:** The conclusion of this CC meeting left this question open, so for now, it will continue to be an organizing tool more than a group ‘product’.)

As a next step directed from the last work group meeting, WRD staff will reference and integrate existing, specific language from relevant guiding documents (IWRS, 100 Year Water Vision, PBP Guidelines, Basin Plan Guidelines, etc) as it relates more detail around each feature. She reflected on Tom Byler’s statement shared during the work group meeting regarding the importance of addressing regional planning, but also the broader system that also includes pre-planning, planning, moving to ‘action’, implementation, and adaptive management, to identify where systemic improvements may be needed.

The goal for the June meeting would be for the work group to determine what top priority gap areas need to be addressed going forward, identify any early alignment of shared ideas of the group, and where there might be more complex or contentious issues requiring more work.

Individual CC questions/comments/suggestions (*not group agreement per se*):

- One member suggested not to categorize or format too much early on, but another member shared that they felt it would be helpful to start seeing some structure of how the pieces come together, including a through-line of inputs and ideas from the work group to date (questions, additions, modifications, etc).
- One offered that the goal is to develop a structure for planning and identify how to streamline it (e.g. up front data, costs, agency capacity, etc). Some of these systemic pieces

may already exist and be sufficient, some pieces may not exist, and some pieces may need to be improved to create better outcomes.

- A suggestion was made that the PBP evaluation is a logical jumping-off point for this work group, and to crosswalk the results of that evaluation with the elements and learning inputs in this process.
- A suggestion was made to have some ideas to react to, rather than starting from a blank slate.
- The group identified a need to see how work group discussions and feedback weave together at a higher scale with essential elements, themes and related source documents
- One group member wanted to find a way to better understand the needs, interests, and fears of each other. Maybe some of this work is not that controversial after all?
- A primary topic for discussion is about funding. There have been past conversations about funding processes for planning and projects that should be referenced and built upon.
- There was a discussion about the spectrum of water planning and different scales (water region to individual community project level) and recognition that some essential criteria will cross the spectrum of scales, but that this group's focus should be on the broader water region or basin level scope.
- Acknowledged the challenging balance to strike between providing enough definition for clarity and accountability, but without being overly prescriptive as to allow flexibility for regional circumstances and planning spectrum.
- Oregon is the last western state that doesn't have an integrated water plan, but could potentially be a recommendation and foundation laid by this effort. Oregon's basin plans should get updated on a regular interval and are outdated, and state water code should not be diluted by basin plans. (Another noted that one could argue that the IWRS essentially is the integrated plan, if fully executed/ resourced.)
- Big issue topics also include data, capacity (for a planning group and for state agencies), decision-making framework, and who gets a seat at the table.
  - There is a general desire for more data from the state (and analysis of it), but there's a big issue with accessibility and usability - as well as how that information will be gathered and used.

### **June Work Session Meeting**

Robin invited feedback from the CC about different approaches for the June meeting work session. One approach was to look at the essential elements through different temporal phases 1) planning 2) moving a plan to action and 3) implementation (note: adaptive management and pre-planning were identified as important phases of the continuum as well). Another approach was to examine the place where state resources, tools and authorities intersect with regional planning groups - and better define that connection and structure.

Individual CC questions/comments/suggestions (*not group agreement per se*):

- Start with identifying the components (more detail) of the essential elements (high-level) to determine which are good to go, and which need further conversation/definition/systemic improvement.
- Need a clear problem statement for each element in order to build a toolbox and direct the state's role and resources. What is the crux of state support (authority, capacity, information, funding, program, etc)?
- Suggestion for organizing thoughts around the framework and spectrum of state support as a series of choices along the way: (1)What do we need to start the process?; (2)What do we need to carry out the process? (3) What do we have when we are finished with the process?
- Determine what is mandatory in order to receive state funding (prescription), versus what could go on a best practices template (principles). This balance and clear sideboards are important.
- Important to put more definition around the 'pre-planning phase' as well as essential data
- Unclear what is happening with other efforts like the DEQ's Environmental Data Management System for integrated water data that was tied to the 100 Year Water Vision and awarded significant funding. **Oregon Consensus will follow-up with DEQ to get an update on this process.**
- If the CC is going to have an assigned facilitation or note taking (or other) role in the next meeting, it would be helpful to know and prepare in advance.

### Next Steps

In the next missive that OC sends to the work group, will assign everyone to read through the PBP evaluation, and invite people to reflect on their general goals or fears, as it relates to this work group effort, so the group can start to understand the underlying interests and needs of each other. OC and WRD will work on refining the essential elements table document to reflect precise existing foundational language as well as work group work to date, in order to prepare for the next work group meeting. **If desired, WRD can do an analysis to identify some of the gap or problem areas around these elements, as a way to progress the conversation.** OC and WRD will also explore creating a visual to show the spectrum of various water planning and help orient where this group is focusing its work and expectations of state-supported integration.