

STATE-SUPPORTED REGIONAL WATER PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT WORK GROUP

DRAFT Meeting Summary

October 20, 2022 from 11:00am-3:00pm

Zoom Meeting

ACTION ITEMS:

ACTION	BY WHOM?	BY WHEN?
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Review the Work Group webpage and verify that all materials (e.g., public meeting materials, reference materials, worksheet responses and redline versions of the v1 and v2 straw proposals) are posted and clearly accessible.	OWRD	ASAP
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Add topics to the 11/1 agenda:<ul style="list-style-type: none">Recognition of a Plan and ImplementationOverarching system fundamentals recommendationOther outstanding topics or proposals	OC	Before next meeting
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Draft an overarching recommendation related to fundamentals for the system of regional water planning and management	Chrysten, Kate, Kelly, Bob	Before next meeting
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Revisit and revise the Community Engagement Guide principle, “Regional Planning Should Recognize that Tribal Engagement is Unique and Layered” to clarify the intent behind and context around the term “layered.”	Illeana, potentially additional tribal representatives	Before next meeting
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Draft a proposed recommendation regarding directives for the state’s role and responsibilities in Place-Based Planning, that emphasizes data support.	Kimberley	Before next meeting

Meeting Attendees:

Work Group Members: Anton Chiono, Adam Denlinger, April Snell, Bob Rees, Caylin Barter, Chandra Ferrari, Chrysten Rivard, Courtney Warner Crowel, Dan Thorndike, Daniel Newberry, Donna Beverage, Heather Bartlett, Illeana Alexander, Jennifer Wigal, JR Cook, Kate Fitzpatrick, Kelly Timchak, Kimberley Priestley, Lauren Poor, Margaret Magruder, Niki Iverson, Oriana Magnera, Peggy Lynch, Racquel Rancier,

Staff: Lili Prah, OWRD

Facilitation Team: Robin Harkless and Jennah Stillman, Oregon Consensus

MEETING SUMMARY:

Welcome and Introductions

Facilitator, Robin Harkless, welcomed the Work Group and opened the meeting with a reminder of the dwindling process time and finish on the horizon. She encouraged all members to continue bringing their

voices forward in support of a ‘no surprises’ principle for this collaborative work. In addition to the written worksheet feedback received on v1 and v2, she clarified that all of the discussions during Work Group meetings will also be considered as part of the deliberative inputs for iterative recommendation drafts, including suggestions for friendly amendments and additional details. She reviewed the focus topics for today’s meeting which included: a proposal regarding a tiered approach to Place-Based Planning grant funding; clarifying the state’s role and responsibilities in Place-Based Planning; reviewing the Community Engagement Guide and recommendations; and as time allows, reviewing the draft introduction language for the report. She shared that the November 1st meeting would focus on topics of implementation and recognition of a plan. OWRD would be prepared to share information regarding how these steps have played out with the Place-Based Planning pilots and evaluation, in order for the Work Group to be better informed to discuss and advise on this piece of the system.

Some Work Group members shared comments regarding clarification around consensus checks and deliberative topics, the final report format, and accessibility of materials on the public website. Peggy Lynch (League of Women Voters) suggested that the final report should speak to an overarching emphasis on the needs for state agency funding and staffing required to support regional water planning. Additional conversation around this reframing later ensued and is captured below in the summary. Kimberley Priestley (WaterWatch), April Snell (Oregon Water Congress), Caylin Barter (Wild Salmon Center), and Chrysten Rivard (Trout Unlimited) voiced concerns generally related to how the deliberative items, group conversations, feedback, and preliminary consensus checks are being woven together; and how outstanding topics will be addressed and/or incorporated in the report. Chrysten said she would follow-up with specifics about any substantive items that she feels have gotten dropped that she is most concerned about, but did not offer any specifics at the meeting. Oriana added a comment about the need to show how the work has evolved. Caylin shared that OWRD’s current webpage designated to this project was difficult to navigate and noted specific difficulty providing clarity for the public on how the group narrowed its focus on the next generation of Place-Based Planning. Oriana agreed about the desire to make information more accessible and added that it could be confusing for the public to know what to comment on and that perhaps there could be more specific framing for public input. Lili Prah (OWRD) shared that the structure of v3 straw proposal is intended to streamline and consolidate interconnected or overlapping recommendations, and integrate all feedback collected to date from worksheet responses and meeting discussions around deliberative topics. Robin added that this v3 structure will show the substantive evolution of topics, specifically where gut-checks were conducted along the way to signal levels of early agreement. She clarified that right now, tracking has occurred through the meeting summaries and the cross-walking work that OWRD has done to show the iterative changes from one version of the straw proposal to the next. Racquel Rancier (OWRD) added that their team will discuss the website format and work to get all documents in one place.

Facilitator’s note: Formal consensus checks will be conducted after v3 of the Straw is deliberated upon, following the November meeting(s) once the group has concluded its deliberate efforts in this process and the work pivots to report writing. Work Group members will be asked to offer their formal level of support on substantive recommendations; the range of responses (weak, strong, or no consensus with outlying concerns noted) will be inserted into the Work Group report.

Straw Proposal (v2) Review and Deliberations

Qualifying for Place-Based Planning Funding

Robin reviewed where the Work Group left off during their last meeting on October 4th related to this item. Although the Work Group did not reach early alignment around the Pathway and Process Recommendation A, there was general agreement around 1) having established criteria to access Place-Based Planning funds and 2) creating tiered entry points to support different groups and varying levels of need. OWRD followed up and worked with a small group to further this idea. Dan Thorndike (Oregon Business Council) shared an overview of the following proposal related to qualifying for Place-Based Planning funding and clarified that the small group had focused on what supports could be included in the various tiered options, rather than creating a binary threshold of ‘all in/out model’ that was less accessible and effective.

- **Augment Process & Pathway Recommendation A with:**

Part 1: The legislature should fund OWRD regional/basin outreach and engagement staff throughout the state to help facilitate and guide groups through the Place Based Planning Process. At a minimum, these staff would:

1. Provide consultation to groups interested in undertaking PBP
2. Help identify the local leaders, key state and federal agencies, tribes, and stakeholders needed for a successful planning process
3. Coordinate interagency data collection, analysis, and technical support as needed by the planning group
4. Coordinate an interagency team to support and execute planning from consultation through implementation
5. Participate in the planning process and any continued processes associated with implementation

Part 2: OWRD should create easily accessible materials, including a pre-application checklist, for potential conveners and planning groups to preliminarily assess (1) whether Place Based Planning is the best tool to meet their needs and (2) their initial capacity and readiness to engage in Place Based Planning.

- **Replace Process & Pathway Recommendation J with:**

The Place-Based Planning grant program should be competitive and structured to provide onramps for groups with varying levels of capacity and resources. Specifically, the Place Based Planning grant program should include:

1. Small Capacity Grants to help groups, especially those in underserved areas, prepare and assess their readiness to engage in the Place Based Planning process. At a minimum, this would include scoping and convening of a group to (1) assess their needs and capacity, and (2) identify program design and cost of things like critical data, facilitation, and program administration (including report writing).

2. Planning Grants to support groups in following the Place Based Planning guidelines to develop a plan and achieve state recognition.
3. Implementation Coordination Grants for groups with State Recognized Plans to continue collaboration and coordination as they implement their plans.
4. Grants for Plan Updates for groups to update their plans to reflect progress in implementation, changes in local conditions and/or updates to data availability or climate change information

Work Group member feedback included, but was not limited to:

- Peggy shared her appreciation for this recommendation and supported providing small capacity grants.
- Daniel Newberry (Johnson Creek Watershed Council) shared his support for this proposal and how the different points of access and need areas help address equity concerns and issues with capacity. He also urged OWRD to continue considering equity as part of the grant process going forward.
- Kimberley raised confusion regarding how this proposal related to the action item from the October 4th meeting, which was to address qualifying for Place-Based Planning funding in addition to the tiered options of support. Specifically, she raised outstanding questions about 1) criteria for being chosen to do Place-Based Planning, 2) what activities/actions ‘implementation’ should encompass, and 3) subsequent checks and balances around supporting implementation. It was clarified that this proposal was not intended to replace the recommendation around prioritization criteria, and Kimberley urged the Work Group to revisit that piece. Given the references to implementation, a topic not yet discussed, she was not comfortable offering her gut response on the idea today and requested a hold on doing any sort of consensus check on this item for today. She asked for clarification that specific tiers of the funding structure being presented were related to groups who had qualified for Place-Based Planning. *(NOTE: This clarification is still needed, the Work Group will need to revisit depending on if and how the tiered funding idea moves forward in this process)*
 - In response, Dan shared that he felt it would be difficult for the Work Group to come up with meaningful recommendations around what qualification criteria should be. He assumed that if there was funding available to create this pot, the details would be sorted out in a rulemaking activity.
 - Racquel added that OWRD was preparing to put forward information during the November 1st meeting around what criteria was previously used for the Place-Based Planning pilots, which could help inform that forthcoming discussion.
 - Peggy added her perspective that the Work Group had agreed that implementation was intended to include a variety of actions to address water problems that might come with or from the plan (not just projects).
- Chrysten shared her support for the scoping component of the proposal. She reflected that taking the time upfront would help identify which issues and concerns were either appropriate for undertaking a Place-Based Planning process or identifying a different state tool that may be needed. She recommended building out another level of clarification in the recommendation as to what

should happen in that first tier of scoping in a clear and coordinated way. She also shared that she felt it would be important for this process to ensure that if there was a crisis in an area, addressing it would not be delayed, which she felt could potentially happen if there was a planning exercise underway.

- Caylin shared that she felt the proposal generally made sense, especially having a centralized coordination staff and data, but should be tied to broader needs to address funding and capacity issues. Reflecting on the Place-Based Planning pilots, she shared that it hurt the process when some agencies weren't allocated funding to participate, and that this barrier around funding agency support should be addressed going forward.
- Kelly shared her appreciation for the proposal and wondered how realistic that this would all get funded, citing current staff capacity limitations at OWRD. She offered a friendly amendment to reorganize the recommendations reflective of the actual sequence these actions would be in if implemented.
- Related to current basin and engagement coordinators, Racquel provided clarification about their purviews, in general and how they relate (or don't) to Place-Based Planning. With two Basin Coordinators, there is not currently enough staff to cover the state. From OWRD's perspective it would be helpful to have those positions in more places and connected to a broader suite of basin issues in order to help move work forward.
 - April shared concerns about budget realities and funding requests. She advised that the Work Group be strategic about what it prioritizes with respect to elevating funding requests to the legislature and next Governor. She said she supports funding complex basin positions to work with diverse interests and communities in water planning efforts, but these positions should address broader needs beyond just Place-Based Planning. She agreed that more coordination was needed around grants, data analysis and agency staff engagement.
 - Kate added that the Deschutes has a complex basin coordinator and this has been a significant value-add resource that she hoped all basins could have in some form in the future.

The Work Group members' discussion evolved, circling back around to a comment raised earlier in the meeting about broader, critical system-level needs that need to be addressed to enable successful regional water planning and management work. Building upon the conversation related to Place-Based Planning funding and supports, the group generally agreed that without first prioritizing and addressing the current overarching system-level need for funding related to ***state agency data collection and analysis, staffing, and interagency coordination***, then no program, Place-Based Planning or otherwise, can be successful.

Work Group members further discussed and generally confirmed that the fundamental needs noted above are worth articulating as a strong recommendation from the Work Group. After the break (see notes below), a small group volunteered to take this topic and develop it into a proposal - building off the prior agreed items related to Data and Technical Assistance, and the discussion around the proposal laid out today.

Action: Bob, Chrysten, Kate, Kelly and Peggy will work on a draft for the full Work Group to review at the next meeting.

Work Group member feedback included, but was not limited to:

- Dan shared that if the state is serious about addressing integrated water issues across the state (e.g., quality, quantity, etc.), all relevant state natural resources agencies need to be connected, coordinated and funded to work meaningfully and effectively moving forward. Having only OWRD liaising with water planning and management hinders the process.
- Caylin suggested to clearly call out and prioritize the recommendations around expanding the state's data access and technical assistance, where the group had landed on general agreement that it was important to underpin not just Place-Based Planning, but all other water planning and management work. She offered an articulation of potential top recommendations as to imperatives: 1) Fund water data (collection and analysis) and 2) Fund staff across all water agencies.
- Kate Fitzpatrick (Deschutes Basin Collaborative) agreed that to reflect the bigger picture needs of the system, an overarching recommendation should stand on its own related to prioritizing funding for data, staffing for agencies, and interagency coordination.
- Chrysten agreed that this overarching recommendation should be separate and not specifically tied to Place-Based Planning, given that it was relevant to the success of *all* water planning in Oregon. She expressed her perspective on the need for a state-level process for strategically coordinating and investing in priority areas of concern.
- Illeana Alexander (CTCLUSI) added that in addition to starting with a baseline of data, staff, and funding, there should also be flexibility in how places build on that and start planning and/or projects.
- Donna Beverage (Union County Commissioner) affirmed that she felt interagency coordination is a high priority in general, and specifically with providing data to planning groups and making that information public.
- Kimberley shared that she generally agreed with prioritizing bigger system issue recommendations for funding data and agency staff, as discussed in early meetings, but was concerned about suggesting funding for any and all water planning without sideboards or standards in place.
- Donna and Chrysten both suggested that the state should identify priorities and then align those with different basin needs (related to water crisis issues of concern, separate from a group's readiness for planning) to strategically invest resources and proactively address issues.
- Daniel asked if funding is just dependent on who is ready/capacity or does the state also prioritize grants based on other criteria?
 - Peggy expressed that if we have the data, staffing & coordination, *then* who gets grants is a secondary issue. First, the state needs the overall information and capacity before deciding which planning should be prioritized.
- Margaret added that planning groups, counties, and cities also need capacity and should be considered.

- Niki agreed with the original, broad focus on helping inform the state on how to better do water planning and management. She shared that ideally, every basin would have a coordinator, and that the state should be doing this but is challenged for funding.

Robin summarized the discussion up to this point that the group generally desired to establish a fundamental recommendation and advice to the state about foundational items for effective water planning and management. She noted the group can also hold space for specifically looking at how to optimize the PBP tool, as has been the focus of work and deliberations since August. These items could be captured in distinct sections of the report. She also acknowledged comments that were shared about keeping Place-Based Planning simple and making sure it continues; and to be strategic about what the Work Group intends to ask the legislature to fund.

Further comments are bulleted below for more context on the topics:

- Kimberley specifically called out an important nuance around the difference between funding staff capacity on ALL planning efforts versus efforts and issues that are deemed priority by the state.
- Ileana shared that it would help small governments, including Tribal Governments, participate more readily if there was a guarantee that there will be available baseline data and staff for maintaining that data. This will be helpful in getting people to the table. Beyond that, competitive grants should take a case by case approach.
- Adam reflected that although planning is important, funding seems to stand alone in this conversation and that lawmakers need to look at this issue and agree that funding is the most fundamental aspect of what we are doing here, with respect to planning for water in the future.
- April suggested that the recommendation should be specifically tied to “regional planning and management” and distinguish recommendations between funding and policy, and perhaps even further delineate those that the Work Group feels are generally important considerations and those that are essential/critical elements related to regional water planning.
- Dan added that Place-Based Planning can be a great tool when properly designed and supported; but without data, agency funding and interagency coordination, it won’t go anywhere and no tool can be successful. He noted that “staff capacity” may be a confusing framing given that it’s really about sufficiency. He asked how the state can fund *all* natural resources agencies so they can effectively do what they need to do?
 - Caylin suggested a broader definition of ‘agency capacity’ that would include both full-time agency staff *and* enable the ability to contract for the service supports, recognizing that this work can’t be done within just the agencies involved with water planning and management.
- Caylin also suggested that this recommendation, and planning efforts, be directly tied to be of service to the IWRS and clarify that the planning frameworks (Place-Based Planning and other tools) are holistic to meet instream and out of stream needs. She added that based on today’s conversation and the group’s energy around foundational priorities, she wasn’t sure if this needed to be tied back to Place-Based Planning, as to focus on bigger issues and barriers to effective regional water planning and management.

- Chrysten suggested that framing should highlight “foundational informational needs for effective planning and management.”

Community Engagement Guide

The Community Engagement Task Group members, plus Kimberley and Kelly shared an update on the changes reflected in the Draft Community Engagement Guide that was based on discussion during the last Work Group meeting and continued in a small group meeting to reach resolution around specific definitions and reflected intent.

Robin added that the Task Group had previously offered a proposal that the high-level principles described in the Community Engagement Guide could be used as a basis for standardizing requirements for a state to provide funding for regional water planning and management. Taking a next step beyond friendly suggestions, this would be part of program standardization going forward. The Community Engagement Principles in current form are as follows:

- A. Regional Planning Should be a Collaborative
- B. Participation in Regional Planning Should be Balanced and Inclusive, and Should Include both Instream and Out of Stream Interests
- C. Regional Planning Should Be Transparent and Accessible for All
- D. Regional Planning Should Recognize that Tribal Engagement is Unique and Layered
- E. Regional Planning Should Foster Public Input Early in the Process and Ongoing
- F. Regional Planning Should Sustain an Informed Public
- G. Regional Planning Should Support Trust Building Between All Participants, Community Members, and the State
- H. Regional Planning Should Demonstrate Accountability

There was a brief discussion around the word “layered” as it relates to the Community Engagement Principle for Tribal participation. Some weren’t clear on what it meant exactly. Illeana offered framing in the chat (that built off a previous comment from Kelly) and suggested the intent of “layered” was to reflect the different levels of Tribal Council, Natural Resource staff, and tribal community members; similar to the federal government. Recognizing that not every tribe will have the same position, interests or ability to engage at the same level, this should be taken into consideration when approaching Tribes to bring them to the table.

ACTION: Illeana (with possible input from other tribal representatives) offered to consider reframing and offer revisions for this principle.

OC polled the group on: #1: Do you endorse the Community Engagement Guide for use in future place based planning (with the caveat of potential refined language for tribal engagement principle)? Poll #2: Recommendation that a clear set of standards for engagement should be tied to accessing state funding for regional planning, based on the high-level principles from the Community Engagement Guide.

Some group members weighed in with comments (Caylin, April) that they would like to see a Purpose of the Guide statement before they can be asked to endorse it. There was a quick reflection from the 10/4

meeting at which Ana described the purpose as such: *To be used as a tool to ensure that a diversity of voices are proactively and continuously included throughout a regional water planning effort.*

ACTION: This statement or a similar purpose will be included in the Community Engagement Guide and the group will revisit the question of endorsing this guide and /or elevating the Community Engagement Principles for use in determining funding access for Place-Based Planning.

Clarifying State's Role and Responsibilities for Place-Based Planning

- **The state should assess and develop a full suite of water planning tools and identify which tools or approaches will lead to the most successful outcomes in various basins given geography, community, hydrology, and magnitude of water crisis.** (Chrysten)
 - Chrysten shared that she felt this proposal would be addressed in the fundamental, overarching system recommendation discussed earlier in the meeting. As clarification, she explained that she felt it was essential for this Work Group to convey that water planning and management is important *and* there are multiple ways to go about it to address different situations.

- **Require the state to provide data interpretation, establish planning scope and sideboards within the law, paying for neutral professional facilitation, providing professional SME technical writing services, and having state agency staff participate as group members. Agencies may elect to not provide technical assistance or other means of support to Place-Based Planning efforts if staff resources are not available.** (Kimberley)
 - Kimberley shared her perspective that the state role and framework is critical for Place-Based Planning. Agencies are there representing the public under various missions and need to weigh in on those things at the table. The recommendation should provide both directives *and* an off ramp for agencies, so as not to create any unfunded mandates nor required prioritization of support to PBP over other existing work. She shared that these directives related to the state's role should be more clearly stated and would like the group to discuss where that should be reflected in the documents and/or report.
 - Robin invited the Work Group members to share their thoughts on directing requirements for the state's role in Place-Based Planning.
 - Adam agreed that for Place-Based Planning to be successful, it will take leadership and engagement from state agencies. He also highlighted the reality that many communities might not have the capacity in place to take on this work and that having a structure of state-support to uplift those places is important.
 - Need for smaller entities to get baseline data, data interpretation, and
 - Oriana suggested a friendly amendment for the recommendation to specifically address the state's role around data support for smaller groups or communities that may lack capacity (e.g. staff for gathering baseline data, interpreting, and maintaining data), given the alignment of the group around that topic and its importance in helping groups get started and make informed decisions. Kimberley agreed.

Action: Kimberley will prepare an updated draft proposal related to the State's roles in PBP, and incorporate the suggestion from Oriana.

There was no public comment.

Wrap Up and Next Steps

Robin reflected on the major themes that had emerged during the meeting, including specific Place-Based Planning programmatic recommendations and separate, foundational overarching statewide system recommendations, which she noted would be reflected and tied together in the v3 straw proposal to show a more cohesive structure around the deliberative issues and hopefully, the Work Group's ability to see the full picture.

November 1 meeting:

- Plan recognition and implementation - information sharing from OWRD as well as Work Group discussion about options for defining or structuring this piece. Implementation was a concern voiced from Work Group members throughout the process; there are clear ties to PBP findings; and based on remarks from OWRC Chair Reeves that plan recognition is ill-defined and the Commission would benefit from advice on ways to provide more structure to this as it relates to PBP recognition.
- Some work group members had expressed, via worksheet responses on v1 of the straw proposal, a desire to revisit the Guiding Principles for effective water planning and management that were included in v1 of the straw. These will be brought back to the group for consideration potentially for inclusion in the introduction of the Report. Kate and Kimberley also drafted an introduction statement related to the Place-Based Planning tool in the system.
- Work group members not in attendance will have an opportunity to weigh in on substantive items discussed at this meeting. (*Facilitator's note: The facilitation team is exploring options for a separate, 2-3 hour virtual meeting in mid- November to provide more space for deliberations. In addition, OWRD will consider ways to gather feedback on the v3 straw document that is both accessible and efficient for work group member input as we near the end of the process.*)

The meeting was adjourned.