

## HB 5006 Draft Version 3: RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKING

---

The feedback used to draft v3 includes the following sources.

- V2 Worksheet Written Feedback ([Summary](#))
  - 10/4 Workgroup Meeting Discussion ([Meeting Recording](#); [Meeting Summary](#))
  - 10/20 Workgroup Meeting Discussion ([Meeting Recording](#); [Meeting Summary](#))
  - 11/1 Workgroup Meeting Discussion
- 

### Recommendations Removed in V3

- **PP 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 and are being deployed on behalf of a collaborative planning and implementation group. (Removed based on 11/1 Meeting Discussion on Implementation).
- **PP Recommendation L:** The state should be required to participate in a specified role in place-based planning processes. (Removed based on worksheet Responses).

### Table 1: V3 Draft Recommendations

Table 1 shows how V3 Draft Recommendations have evolved from the V2 Draft based on written feedback and workgroup discussion.

VERSION 3 Language (CURRENT DRAFT)	V2 Language
<b>Section I: Recommendation A</b> The Legislature should fund state agency capacity and commit resources to collecting, processing, interpreting, and distributing water data for more effective water planning and management for instream and out-of-stream needs. This should include developing climate-informed water budgets for basins across the state to better understand current and future hydrologic conditions. <i>(Note that while a long-term commitment to improving water data will greatly benefit future water planning, given the current critical and pressing need, regional water planning should be pursued based on the data and information that is currently available and not be dependent on creating climate-informed water budgets.)</i>	<b>DTA Recommendation A</b> The state should commit to collecting, processing, interpreting, and distributing water data for effective water planning in Oregon. 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.  <b>Small Group Concept Language</b> <a href="#">Link to small group concept language</a>

VERSION 3 Language (CURRENT DRAFT)	V2 Language
<p><b>Section II: Recommendation I</b></p> <p>The Legislature should fund data inventories across the state to (1) understand the availability of data and information essential to Place-Based Planning and (2) identify strategies to fill gaps where they exist. Data inventories would inform strategic and effective water planning and management for instream and out-of-stream needs and help prioritize state-supported place-based planning throughout the state with a focus on areas of scarcity.</p>	
<p><b>Section I: Recommendation B</b></p> <p>The Legislature should fund, and Governor should direct, the appropriate level of agency capacity needed for interagency data collection and analysis, technical support, and coordinated work-planning and budgeting to ensure robust cooperation and engagement by and between agencies in support of water planning and management efforts that seek to meet both instream and out of stream water needs.</p>	<p><b>DTA Recommendation B</b></p> <p>The state should fund the 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 an interagency team.</p> <p><b>Small Group Concept Language</b>  <a href="#">Link to small group concept language</a></p>
<p><b>Section I: Recommendation C</b></p> <p>The Community Engagement Guide should be provided to regional water planning and management groups, in hopes that it will provide support to ensure that no one is left out of processes.</p>	<p><b>CE Recommendation C</b></p> <p>Offer a best practices guide to regional planning groups to assist them in engagement efforts (see: Community Engagement Guide developed and endorsed by the HB 5006 Work Group).</p> <p><b>Small Group Concept Language</b>  <a href="#">Link to small group concept language</a></p>
<p><b>Section II: Recommendation D</b></p> <p>Having a state-recognized plan should provide planning groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to an interagency team that can help navigate funding opportunities and provide other implementation support. (This</li> </ul>	<p><b>PP Recommendation G</b></p> <p>The state should provide resources to fund continued engagement of local groups and state partners to move a state-recognized plan into implementation. The outcomes of this continued engagement could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refinement and feasibility assessments of plan actions and strategies</li> </ul>

VERSION 3 Language (CURRENT DRAFT)	V2 Language
<p>assumes an interagency team is sufficiently funded, as described in Recommendation G.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to implementation coordination funding and support for plan updates as described in Recommendation O (5) and (6).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Working to address any policy needs with the state</li> <li>• Preparation of projects to take advantage of implementation funding opportunities</li> <li>• Ensuring that the pursuit of strategies and actions continue to represent a balanced representation of water interests</li> </ul> <p><b>PP Recommendation I</b> The state should provide resources to local planning groups to update plans every 10 years to reflect changes in local conditions and/or updates to data availability or climate change information.</p>
<p><b>Section II: Recommendation E</b> To maintain state recognition and access to associated resources, planning groups should be required to complete biennial reports to the Water Resources Commission that demonstrate their progress on implementation, and that their pursuit of plan strategies and actions continue to represent a balance of instream and out-of-stream water interests.</p>	<p><b>11/1 Meeting</b> Ideas developed at the 11/1 meeting during discussion around implementation; no major concerns raised on general concept</p>
<p><b>Section II: Recommendation F</b> The state may use state recognized plans to identify common themes across basins to help inform updates to the Integrated Water Resources Strategy.</p>	<p><b>PP Recommendation K</b> The state should use state recognized plans to help inform updates to the Integrated Water Resources Strategy.</p>
<p><b>Section II: Recommendation G</b> The Legislature should provide funding for a formalized interagency coordination team to support and participate in Place-Based Planning. At a minimum, the interagency team should consist of OWRD, DEQ, ODFW, OWEB, ODA, OHA, and Business Oregon and be equipped with the capacity to provide the following, within their mission and authorities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Consultation on the development of grant selection criteria and during the grant review process.</li> </ol>	<p><b>DTA Recommendation B</b> The state should fund the 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 an interagency team.</p> <p><b>DTA Recommendation C</b></p>

VERSION 3 Language (CURRENT DRAFT)	V2 Language
<p>(2) Coordination and consultation during the planning phase, providing technical and planning support to planning groups and developing educational resources to fill gaps in planning group capacity, knowledge, or skillsets.</p> <p>(3) Consultation and review of plans for state recognition.</p> <p>(4) Coordination and consultation to planning groups with state-recognized plans, providing support to help navigate existing agency programs and funding opportunities.</p> <p>(5) Consultation and review of implementation reporting to ensure that the pursuit of strategies and actions in state recognized plans continue to represent a balance of instream and out-of-stream water interests.</p> <p>(6) Coordinated work-planning and budgeting to ensure robust participation from an interagency team.</p>	<p>Within their mission and sideboards, state agencies should support planning groups by developing educational resources tailored to fill gaps in local capacity or knowledge/skillsets.</p> <p><b>PP Recommendation F</b></p> <p>The state should support capacity for an interagency team that provides planning assistance throughout the process. At a minimum, this would include coordination and consultation with local groups along the way (e.g., offering training, participating in meetings, permit coordination, grant identification) and technical support, as described in Recommendation B of the Data and Technical Assistance above.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><b>PP Recommendation G</b></p> <p>The state should provide resources to fund continued engagement of local groups and state partners to move a state-recognized plan into implementation. The outcomes of this continued engagement could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refinement and feasibility assessments of plan actions and strategies</li> <li>• Working to address any policy needs with the state</li> <li>• Preparation of projects to take advantage of implementation funding opportunities</li> <li>• Ensuring that the pursuit of strategies and actions continue to represent a balanced representation of water interests</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section II: Recommendation H</b></p> <p>The legislature should fund OWRD regional/basin coordination, 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:</p> <p>(1) Provide consultation to groups interested in undertaking PBP.</p>	<p><b>PP Recommendation A</b></p> <p>The state should provide staff support, funding, and training for communities looking to initiate the planning process. This could include things like helping to identify local leadership, developing a standard planning readiness guide, conducting an assessment of a community’s social readiness and capacity to engage in the process, pre-application conferences, training webinars, and</p>

VERSION 3 Language (CURRENT DRAFT)	V2 Language
<p>(2) Help identify the local leaders, key state and federal agencies, tribes, and stakeholders needed for a successful planning process.</p> <p>(3) Coordinate an interagency team (described in Recommendation G) to support and execute planning from consultation through implementation.</p> <p>(4) Support and participate in the planning process and any continued processes associated with implementation coordination.</p>	<p>other activities that build community capacity and awareness around planning readiness.</p>
<p><b>Section II: Recommendation I</b></p> <p>The Legislature should fund data inventories across the state to (1) understand the availability of data and information essential to Place-Based Planning and (2) identify strategies to fill gaps where they exist. Data inventories would inform strategic and effective water planning and management for instream and out-of-stream needs and help prioritize state-supported place-based planning throughout the state with a focus on areas of scarcity.</p>	<p><b>DTA Recommendation A</b></p> <p>The state should commit to collecting, processing, interpreting, and distributing water data for effective water planning in Oregon. 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><b>Section II: Recommendation J</b></p> <p>Place-Based Planning grant selection should be based on established criteria that consider planning group readiness and align with strategic priorities determined by the state.</p> <p><b>Section II: Recommendation L</b></p> <p>The Place-Based Planning grant program should be accessible to basins with different levels of capacity and resources and be structured to provide onramps for groups through different tiers of support. Examples of these tiers include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Small Capacity Grants</b> to help groups, especially those in underserved areas, prepare and assess their readiness to engage in the Place-Based Planning process.</li> <li>• <b>Planning Grants</b> to help support groups in following the Place-Based Planning guidelines to develop a plan and achieve state recognition.</li> </ul>	<p><b>PP Recommendation J</b></p> <p>The state should develop a grant program for the next generation of place-based planning and implementation that funds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Foundational work and plan development for communities ready to engage and invest in place-based planning; and</li> <li>(2) Continued engagement, implementation, and plan updates, as described in PP Recommendations G, H, &amp; I, for groups with state recognized plans.</li> </ol>

VERSION 3 Language (CURRENT DRAFT)	V2 Language
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Implementation Coordination Grants</b> to help support continued engagement of planning groups as they move a state-recognized plan into action.</li> </ul> <p><b>Section II: Recommendation M</b> The PBP grant should be structured to ensure planning groups that continue to meet criteria in planning and implementation guidance and are consistent with statewide IWRS principles are given priority to receive funding for continued planning and implementation coordination.</p>	
<p><b>Section II: Recommendation K</b> 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.</p>	<p><b>PP Recommendation A</b> The state should provide staff support, funding, and training for communities looking to initiate the planning process. This could include things like helping to identify local leadership, developing a standard planning readiness guide, conducting an assessment of a community’s social readiness and capacity to engage in the process, pre-application conferences, training webinars, and other activities that build community capacity and awareness around planning readiness.</p>
<p><b>Section II: Recommendation N</b> PBP grants should require applicants to cost share, either through in-kind or cash matching.</p>	<p><b>11/1 Meeting</b> Ideas developed at the 11/1 meeting during discussion around implementation; no major concerns raised on general concept</p>
<p><b>Section II: Recommendation O</b> At a minimum, the Legislature should fund the Place-Based Planning grant program to enable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Support for meaningful community engagement, at the outset and ongoing. This would include resources for broad outreach, education, multiple channels for engagement and capacity building throughout the process.</li> </ul>	<p><b>CE Recommendation A</b> Place-Based Planning funding should include support for meaningful community engagement, at the outset and ongoing. This would include resources for broad outreach, education, multiple channels for engagement and capacity building throughout the process.</p>

VERSION 3 Language (CURRENT DRAFT)	V2 Language
<p>(2) Capacity support specifically to tribal and other under-represented or marginalized communities for meaningful engagement in place-based planning.</p> <p>(3) Support for capacity and/or funding for professionals to help prepare for and execute planning according to the Place-Based Planning Guidelines. Examples include capacity for project management, creation of governance agreements, DEIJ trainings, technical plan writing, and foundational expertise in water science, ecology and biology, climate science, and water law.</p> <p>(4) Support for professional independent third-party facilitation with subject matter expertise.</p> <p>(5) Support for continued engagement of planning groups to move a state-recognized plan into implementation. This would provide capacity to planning groups to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refine plan actions and strategies,</li> <li>• Identify, prepare, and apply to funding opportunities to implement plan actions and strategies,</li> <li>• Coordinate with the interagency support team as needed,</li> <li>• Ensure that the pursuit of strategies and actions continue to represent a balanced representation of instream and out-of-stream water interests, and</li> <li>• Complete biennial reports to the Water Resources Commission on the status of implementation.</li> </ul>	<p><b>CE Recommendation H</b></p> <p>The State should provide capacity support specifically to tribal and other under-represented or marginalized communities for meaningful engagement in place-based planning.</p> <p><b>PP Recommendation C</b></p> <p>The state should provide support to local groups to help them prepare for and execute planning. At a minimum, this includes staff capacity and/or funding for professionals to help with governance agreements, DEIJ trainings, consensus decision making, project management, water science, ecology and biology, climate science, water law, and technical plan writing.</p> <p><b>PP Recommendation E</b></p> <p>The state should provide resources to planning groups to fund professional independent third-party facilitation.</p> <p><b>PP Recommendation G</b></p> <p>The state should provide resources to fund continued engagement of local groups and state partners to move a state-recognized plan into implementation. The outcomes of this continued engagement could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refinement and feasibility assessments of plan actions and strategies</li> <li>• Working to address any policy needs with the state</li> <li>• Preparation of projects to take advantage of implementation funding opportunities</li> <li>• Ensuring that the pursuit of strategies and actions continue to represent a balanced representation of water interests</li> </ul>

VERSION 3 Language (CURRENT DRAFT)	V2 Language
<p>(6) Support for planning groups to update plans when significant changes in local conditions, data availability, or climate change information indicate the need for a plan update.</p>	<p><b>PP Recommendation I</b> The state should provide resources to local planning groups to update plans every 10 years to reflect changes in local conditions and/or updates to data availability or climate change information.</p>
<p><b>Section II: Recommendation P</b> The PBP Program should build on guidelines developed in the Pilot phase and update planning guidance to incorporate feedback and lessons learned from the Place-Based Planning Pilot and the Place-Based Planning Independent Participatory Evaluation (McLain et al., 2022), as well as the recommendations in this report. These Guidelines should be provided to the planning groups at the beginning of their planning process.</p>	<p><b>PP Recommendation D</b> The state should build on the guidance developed for the Place Based Planning Pilot, incorporating feedback and lessons learned to update guidelines and benchmarks for state recognition in Step 2: Plan Development. They should make this guidance available to the planning groups at the beginning of their planning processes.</p>
<p><b>Section II: Recommendation Q</b> The PBP guidelines should establish a clear set of standards for engagement tied to accessing state funding for place-based planning, based on the following high-level principles from the Community Engagement Guide:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Regional Planning Should be a Collaborative with Communities</li> <li>(2) Participation in Regional Planning Should be Balanced and Inclusive, and Should Include both Instream and Out of Stream Interests</li> <li>(3) Regional Planning Should Be Transparent and Accessible for All</li> <li>(4) Regional Planning must recognize that Tribal Engagement is not a monolith and each Tribe may have a different level of engagement in planning, different structures for communication and outreach, and different governmental departments engaged in planning and implementation.</li> <li>(5) Regional Planning Should Foster Public Input Early in the Process and Ongoing</li> <li>(6) Regional Planning Should Sustain an Informed Public</li> <li>(7) Regional Planning Should Support Trust Building Between All Participants, Community Members, and the State</li> </ol>	<p><b>CE Recommendation B</b> Establish a clear set of standards for engagement tied to accessing state funding for regional planning, based on the high-level principles from the Community Engagement Guide. These principles should be considered criteria for grant funding.</p>



VERSION 3 Language (CURRENT DRAFT)	V2 Language
(8) Regional Planning Should Demonstrate Accountability	
<p><b>Section II: Recommendation R</b></p> <p>Add to the PBP Guidelines that building foundational trust with and among interested parties, planning groups, and state agencies should be prioritized prior to plan development and writing. This includes setting foundational norms for group engagement and developing and understanding foundational data.</p>	<p><b>PP Recommendation B</b></p> <p>The state should provide resources to build foundational trust with and among interested parties, planning groups, and state agencies prior to plan development and writing. This includes setting foundational norms for group engagement and developing and understanding foundational data.</p>
<p><b>Section II: Recommendation S</b></p> <p>Add to the PBP Guidelines that to demonstrate commitment, planning groups should develop and memorialize their commitments to the planning process through a Charter, Memorandum of Agreement, Operating Protocols, or something similar. This should include a clear scope and purpose of the planning effort, which must remain within the State’s authority and public benefit obligations.</p>	<p><b>CE Recommendation G</b></p> <p>To demonstrate commitment, planning groups need to develop and memorialize (through, e.g., a Charter, MOA, Operating Protocols or other) their commitments to the planning process. This should include a clear scope and purpose of the planning effort, which must remain within the State’s authority and public benefit obligations.</p>
<p><b>Section II: Recommendation T</b></p> <p>To provide more consistent and sufficient funding to state agencies and planning groups throughout the planning and implementation process, the Legislature should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Create a fund that allows for carryover funding and a base budget for place-based planning;</li> <li>(2) Support permanent instead of limited duration positions at agencies; and</li> <li>(3) Given the nature and scale of investment required by place-based planning, the State Legislature should consider a future process to explore revenue sources that would allow the state to commit to this significant and sustained investment.</li> </ol>	<p><b>SF Recommendation A</b></p> <p>The state should create a fund for regional integrated water resources planning and implementation that provides consistent and sufficient funding to local groups throughout the planning and implementation process</p> <p><b>SF Recommendation B</b></p> <p>Given the nature and scale of investment required by regional integrated water resources planning and implementation, the legislature should create a workgroup to explore alternative revenue sources that would allow the state to make this significant, high priority investment.</p>

## HB 5006 Draft: Guiding Principles Tracking (11/7/2022)

V3 Language Guiding Principles introduced by workgroup members	V1 Straw: Guiding principles from (8/24/22)	V2 draft: SB 266 (2015)/ Section 2(4) of Chapter 780 Oregon Laws 2015
Adapted from August Straw Concept "Assumptions"	Adapted from IWRS Key PBP Principles (P. 115)	<b><i>Place-based integrated water resources strategies...must:</i></b>
<p>(1) Place-Based Plans will be developed at a watershed(s) or basin scale.</p> <p>(2) The planning process will be transparent, inclusive, and collaborative, with a balanced representation of water interests.</p> <p>(3) The planning process will be voluntary and involve a partnership between the state and communities.</p> <p>(4) The planning process will involve strong public participation and community engagement.</p> <p>(5) The planning process will be informed by the best available data and scientific information</p> <p>(6) The approach to planning will be integrated and based on the goal of better understanding and meeting instream and out-of-stream water needs now and in the future, including water quantity, water quality, ecosystem needs and climate change.</p> <p>(7) State agencies will serve as active partners throughout the phases of water planning and implementation.</p> <p>(8) The planning process will be guided by the principles in the state's Integrated Water Resources Strategy (p. 179) and 100-year Water Vision (p.21-22).</p> <p>(9) Place-based planning will be non-regulatory, consistent with state laws and policy, and will not jeopardize existing water rights.</p> <p>(10) Water is a public resource.</p>	<p>A. Locally initiated and led collaborative process</p> <p>B. Voluntary, non-regulatory approach</p> <p>C. Includes a balanced representation of water interests</p> <p>D. Conducted in partnership with the state</p> <p>E. Integrated, addressing instream and out-of-stream needs, including water quantity, quality and ecosystem needs</p> <p>F. Utilizes an open and transparent process that fosters public participation</p> <p>G. Facilitates implementation of local solutions</p> <p>H. Builds on and integrates existing studies and plans</p> <p>I. Does not jeopardize existing water rights</p> <p>J. Recognizes the public interest in water</p> <p>K. Consistent with the principles in the Integrated Water Resources Strategy and 100 Year Water Vision, and with state laws and policy.</p> <p>L. Developed and implemented at a watershed(s) or basin scale</p> <p>M. Involves strong public and community engagement</p> <p>N. Informed by the best available data and science</p> <p>O. Considers potential natural hazards and future changes in climate and population</p>	<p>(a) Be developed in collaboration with a balanced representation of interests</p> <p>(b) Balance current and future in-stream and out-of-stream needs</p> <p>(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</p> <p>(d) Facilitate implementation of local solutions</p> <p>(e) Be developed utilizing an open and transparent process that fosters public participation</p> <p>(f) Be developed in consultation with the department (OWRD).</p>

## HB 5006 Draft: Terms and Definitions Tracking (11/7/2022)

### Workgroup feedback re: Terms and Definitions

- V1 Worksheet Written Feedback ([Summary](#))
- V2 Worksheet Written Feedback ([Summary](#))

VERSION 3 Language (CURRENT DRAFT)	V1 Language	V2 Language
<p><b>Balanced Representation of Water Interests:</b> (adapted from <a href="#">PBP 2015 DRAFT Guidelines</a>)</p> <p>Each basin is unique in terms of the actual distribution of interests and stakeholders. A balanced representation of water interests includes diverse interests representing both instream and out-of-stream water needs and ensures that all persons potentially affected by a place-based plan are invited to have a voice in the decision-making process. This includes environmental justice communities, particularly members of minority or low-income communities, tribal communities, and those traditionally under-represented in public processes. Some groups may represent multiple stakeholder categories (e.g., a city or district may also represent the local water utility).</p>	<p><b>Balanced Representation of Water Interests:</b> <i>Source: <a href="#">PBP 2015 DRAFT Guidelines</a></i></p> <p>“The group will need to decide its own structure for involving diverse interests and should describe this approach within its plan. Most importantly, the structure needs to ensure that the planning body represents a balance of interests from different sectors. Diverse representation is a key tenet of integrated water resources management. Each basin will be unique in terms of the actual distribution of interests and stakeholders. Having diverse interests engaged and invested from the beginning will help ensure a process that meets both instream and out-of-stream water needs. Remember that these needs encompass water quantity, water quality, and ecosystem needs, considering both surface water and groundwater resources. In determining the composition of a planning group, it is important to ensure that all persons potentially affected by a place-based plan have a voice in the decision-making process. This includes environmental justice communities, particularly members of minority or low-income communities, tribal communities, and those traditionally under-represented in public</p>	<p><b>Balanced Representation of Water Interests:</b></p> <p>Each basin is unique in terms of the actual distribution of interests and stakeholders. A balanced representation of water interests includes diverse interests representing both instream and out-of-stream water needs and ensuring that all persons potentially affected by a place-based plan are invited to have a voice in the decision-making process. This includes environmental justice communities, particularly members of minority or low-income communities, tribal communities, and those traditionally under-represented in public processes. Some groups may represent multiple stakeholder categories (e.g., a city or district may also represent the local water utility). Generally, interests in any given place may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local governments (cities, counties, and special districts)</li> <li>• Tribal governments</li> <li>• Municipal water and wastewater utilities</li> <li>• Major industries or employers</li> <li>• Agriculture (small and large operations)</li> </ul>

VERSION 3 Language (CURRENT DRAFT)	V1 Language	V2 Language
	<p>processes. Generally, interests in any given place may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local governments (cities and counties)</li> <li>• Tribal governments</li> <li>• Municipal water and wastewater utilities</li> <li>• Major industries or employers</li> <li>• Agriculture</li> <li>• Forestry</li> <li>• Self-supplied water users</li> <li>• Conservation/environmental groups</li> <li>• Power companies</li> <li>• Small business</li> <li>• Private landowners</li> <li>• Special districts (e.g., irrigation, public utilities, flood control, parks/recreation, drainage, ports, etc.).</li> <li>• State and federal agencies (natural resources, land management, business development)”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forestry (small and large operations)</li> <li>• Self-supplied water users</li> <li>• Conservation/environmental groups</li> <li>• Power companies</li> <li>• Small business</li> <li>• Private landowners</li> <li>• Special districts (e.g., irrigation, public utilities, flood control, parks/recreation, drainage, ports, etc.).</li> <li>• State and federal agencies (natural resources, land management, business development)”</li> <li>• Water-dependent recreation</li> <li>• Anglers/hunters</li> <li>• Tourism</li> <li>• Rural domestic well users</li> <li>• Watershed Councils</li> <li>• Soil and Water Conservation Districts</li> </ul>
<p><b>Community</b> People who live, work, or play within the planning region; entities with an interest or obligation relative to water and ecosystems in the region; people or ecosystems impacted by water planning in the region or water impacted downstream of the region; and governments (federal, state, local, tribal).</p>	<p><b>Community:</b> <i>Source: Draft Community Engagement Guide from Task Group</i> Local community members; entities from outside a region that have an interest or obligation relative to water in the region; people impacted by water planning in the region; and governments (federal, state, local, tribal).</p>	
<p><b>Community Collaboration:</b> Community members impacted by a process are engaged at the outset, asked to define values and</p>	<p><b>Community Led:</b> <i>Source: Draft Community Engagement Guide from Task Group</i></p>	

VERSION 3 Language (CURRENT DRAFT)	V1 Language	V2 Language
<p>outcomes for a process, and empowered to take ownership to shape the process and its ultimate outcomes.</p>	<p>Stakeholders who represent both local and dispersed statewide communities impacted by a process are engaged at the onset, asked to define values and outcomes for a process, and empowered to take ownerships to shape the process and its ultimate outcomes.</p>	
<p><b>Convener:</b> (Adapted from 2015 PBP Pilot Request for Letters of Interest) An individual, a group of individuals, an organization or a team of organizations that bring(s) together a diverse group of people to undertake place-based planning. (Note: a detailed definition can be found in the <a href="#">PBP 2015 DRAFT Guidelines</a>).</p>	<p><b>Convener:</b> <i>Source: This is the definition used in the 2015 Request for Letters of Interest in the PBP pilot. The role of a convener was further defined through the attached <b>Appendix A</b>.</i>  “An individual, a group of individuals, an organization or a team of organizations that bring(s) together a diverse group of people to undertake place-based planning.”</p>	<p><b>Convener:</b> An individual, a group of individuals, an organization or a team of organizations that bring(s) together a diverse group of people to undertake place-based planning.</p>
<p><b>Neutral Facilitator:</b> 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><b>Facilitator:</b> <i>Source: <a href="#">Oregon Consensus Website</a></i> “A facilitator works with a group to explore facts and viewpoints about an issue. Facilitators do not take sides or make any decisions for the group. They help participants work together effectively and guide meetings to ensure balanced involvement by all participants. They support efforts to gather background information about the issues. They also help track decisions and create effective final reports or plans.”</p>	<p><b>Neutral Facilitator:</b> 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><b>Implementation:</b> The deployment of actions and strategies identified in the planning process.</p>	<p><b>Implementation:</b> <i>Source: summary from August 2 workgroup chat</i> The deployment of actions and strategies</p>	<p><b>Implementation:</b> The deployment of actions and strategies identified in the planning process.</p>

VERSION 3 Language (CURRENT DRAFT)	V1 Language	V2 Language
	identified in the planning process.	
<p><b>Place-Based:</b> (Adapted from <a href="#">PBP Website</a>) 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><b>Place-Based:</b> <i>Source: <a href="#">PBP Website</a></i> “Orients knowledge, decisions, and actions around the specific context of a place in a way that recognizes and strengthens the connection between people and place and empowers people to work together to achieve a shared vision of that place.”</p>	<p><b>Place-Based:</b> “Orients knowledge, decisions, and actions around the specific context of a place in a way that recognizes and strengthens the connection between people and place and empowers people to work together to achieve a shared vision of that place.”</p>
<p><b>Planning:</b> (Adapted from <a href="#">PBP Website</a>) A process used to align people, information, ideas, and resources, in order to 1) identify and understand an issue, need, or opportunity that requires action, 2) envision desired future outcomes, and 3) develop and evaluate strategies and actions to achieve the desired outcomes, 4) implement agreed upon strategies and actions, and 5) monitor, evaluate, and adapt as needed.</p>	<p><b>Planning:</b> <i>Source: Adapted from the <a href="#">PBP Website</a></i> “A process used to align people, information, ideas, and resources, in order to 1) identify and understand an issue, need, or opportunity that requires action, 2) envision desired future outcomes, and 3) develop and evaluate strategies and actions to achieve the desired outcomes.”</p>	<p><b>Planning:</b> “A process used to align people, information, ideas, and resources, in order to 1) identify and understand an issue, need, or opportunity that requires action, 2) envision desired future outcomes, and 3) develop and evaluate strategies and actions to achieve the desired outcomes.”</p>
	<p><b>Partnership with the State/State Support:</b> <i>Source: Adapted from the PBP Pilot</i> The state works in partnership with groups engaging in regional integrated water resources planning and implementation, providing support and guidance throughout the process. Below are brief examples of roles the state may play in the system. Further definition can be found in the program recommendation section of this report.</p>	<p><b>Partnership with the State/State Support:</b> The state works in partnership with groups engaging in place-based planning and implementation, providing support and guidance throughout the process. Below are brief examples of roles the state may play in the water planning system. Specific recommendations about how the state should engage and support planning groups can be found in the program recommendation</p>

VERSION 3 Language (CURRENT DRAFT)	V1 Language	V2 Language
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Legislature:</i> The state legislature passes bills and appropriates funding to support regional integrated water resources planning and implementation.</li> <li>• <i>Oregon Water Resources Department:</i> OWRD can play a variety of roles, including, planning partner, provider of planning, technical, and financial assistance, and statewide program coordinator.</li> <li>• <i>Oregon Water Resources Commission:</i> The WRC formally recognizes completed plans that meet required benchmarks.</li> <li>• <i>Interagency Team:</i> Staff from core state agencies provide technical and program assistance throughout the process and serve as a review committee for deliverables produced by regional groups. In addition to OWRD, the core state agencies include Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board, and Oregon Department of Agriculture.</li> </ul>	<p>section of this report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Legislature:</i> The state legislature passes bills and appropriates funding to support regional integrated water resources planning and implementation.</li> <li>• <i>Oregon Water Resources Department:</i> OWRD may play a variety of roles, including, planning partner, provider of planning, technical, and financial assistance, and statewide program coordinator.</li> <li>• <i>Oregon Water Resources Commission:</i> The WRC formally recognizes completed plans that meet required benchmarks.</li> <li>• <i>Interagency Team:</i> Staff from core state agencies may provide technical and program assistance throughout the process and serve as a review committee for deliverables produced by regional groups. In addition to OWRD, the core state agencies include Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board, Oregon Health Authority, and Oregon Department of Agriculture.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Watershed or Basin Scale/Regional:</b>  Source: <a href="#">PBP 2015 DRAFT Guidelines</a>  “Planning groups have the flexibility of establishing their own geographic planning scale, so long as it meets certain criteria. The Water Resources Department’s existing administrative</p>	



VERSION 3 Language (CURRENT DRAFT)	V1 Language	V2 Language
	<p>drainage basins are a good starting point for identifying the planning scale. These administrative boundaries are further divided into smaller geographic areas within the Department’s basin programs (refer to OAR Chapter 690, Divisions 500-520). Planning groups can chose to focus on smaller geographic areas, such as a sub-basin, or a group of sub-basins, within these boundaries. For example, planning groups could focus on the upper, middle, or lower section of a basin. To the extent possible, planning groups should utilize watershed-based boundaries, accounting for both groundwater and surface water, and situations where the source of water for certain uses (e.g., drinking water or irrigation) originates in an adjacent basin or sub-basin.”</p>	
		<p><b>State Recognition:</b>  Currently, state recognition means that an interagency team of state agency staff review a place-based integrated water resources plan and make a recommendation to the Water Resources Commission to recognize a plan if it is consistent with planning guidelines and statewide IWRS principles. This term may be better defined per the specific recommendations in this report.</p>