



**STATE-SUPPORTED REGIONAL WATER PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT WORK GROUP  
DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY**

December 6, 2022 from 11:00a.m. - 3:00p.m.

**ACTION ITEMS:**

ACTION	BY WHOM?	BY WHEN?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Follow-up with Anton Chiono, Kathleen George, Bobby Brunoe, Heather Bartlett, Ana Molina, and Lauren Poor for their responses.</li> </ul>	OC	Within a week
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Make minor adjustments to v4 Straw (remove reference to OWRD in Recommendation U)</li> </ul>	OWRD	Week of Dec. 12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Share updated alignment check results after all members are accounted for with true final results.</li> </ul>	OC	Week of Dec. 12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Share key dates for upcoming forums relevant to this Work Group's efforts</li> </ul>	OC/OWRD	Week of Dec. 12

**Meeting Attendees:**

Work Group Members: Adam Denlinger, April Snell, Bob Rees, Caylin Barter, Chandra Ferrari, Chrysten Rivard, Dan Thorndike, Daniel Newberry, Donna Beverage, Holly Mondo, Illeana Alexander, Jason Fenton, Jeff Stone, Jennifer Wigal, JR Cook, Kate Fitzpatrick, Kelly Timchak, Kimberley Priestley, Margaret Magruder, Niki Iverson, Oriana Magnera, Peggy Lynch, and Racquel Rancier

Process Leadership Team: Representative Reardon, Representative Helm, Meg Reeves and Morgan Gratz-Weiser

Staff: Lili Prah, OWRD

Facilitation Team: Robin Harkless and Jennah Stillman, Oregon Consensus

**MEETING SUMMARY:**

***Welcome, Introductions, and Housekeeping***

Robin welcomed everyone to the final meeting of the HB 5006 Work Group, noting that today would conclude the process with a formal alignment check on the final version of the recommendations from v4 of the Straw proposal shared by OWRD including some work done by small groups. She clarified that the group had discussed and evolved these recommendations over the past few months and that no further refinement or negotiations would be made. To clarify how the recommendations and alignment check results would move forward, Robin explained that they would be inserted into a simple, final report that

would also include a brief introduction about the legislation that directed this process, general information about the Work Group, and an appendix with all supporting materials (e.g., meeting summaries, etc.) Additional agenda items included addressing an outstanding question about whether or not to include the Terms & Definitions in the report, discussion time for the Work Group members to share how the final recommendations had landed for them along with any closing remarks about hopes for the work moving forward. Finally, the group would hear closing remarks from the Process Leadership Team.

Lili Prah, OWRD, then shared a high-level overview of how the final recommendations had been refined since the previous version (v3) which included integrating workgroup member discussion and feedback from meetings, development on state recognition recommendations from a small group of volunteer workgroup members, and additional email input from the full workgroup on the neutral facilitation recommendation. Also, she noted that two workgroup members had volunteered to review the recommendations for clarity and consistency, and those edits were integrated into the final version. All changes were reflected in a redline version which had been shared in advance.

#### Work Group Final Discussion on Final Recommendations in v4

Robin then invited every workgroup member to share their perspective on how they viewed the recommendations and anything else that they might want the full workgroup to be aware of going into the final alignment check. She clarified that this would not be the time to make further refinements.

- Jeff Stone (Oregon Association of Nurseries) shared that although the planning process is important, he doesn't want the process to be the product. He added that local initiation and support are essential and done in relationship with state agencies, and flagged some outstanding uncertainty about how the consultation process would engage other state agencies besides OWRD.
- Kimberley Priestley (WaterWatch) shared that she saw alignment around themes of data and agency capacity and has seen this in other forums, and felt it would be important to elevate state investment.
- Niki Iverson (LOC) pointed out that the reality of getting all of the recommendations funded will be challenging and that prioritization is likely to play out in the legislative session.
- Daniel Newberry (Johnson Creek Watershed) highlighted a desire to see the balance between funding both data inventories and group functions in legislative allocations, cautioning that there will always be more data needed and therefore must also enable groups to operate while that collection happens.
- Bob Rees (NW Guides and Anglers Association) shared that it had been helpful to learn more about water policy throughout the process and appreciated the space to do so.
- Jennifer Wigal (DEQ) shared her perspective on how water quality interfaces with this process, in bringing together both political and hydrological boundaries in future projects. She recognized the constrained role of agencies and noted that DEQ doesn't currently have the desired capacity to

participate in planning discussions and hoped that the recommendations, along with the thoughtful community engagement conversations, would change that in the future.

- Kate Fitzpatrick (Deschutes River Conservancy) shared her appreciation for this group's opportunity to think aspirationally about water management in a way that was different than lobbying for interests. She also shared her hope for every basin to have access to specific resources (e.g., Basin Coordinator, etc.) and for the conversation to continue beyond this forum in addressing tensions between state and local management in order to be prepared with data, agency capacity, and regionally appropriate solutions for when water crisis may occur.
- Illeana Alexander (Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua & Siuslaw Indians) spoke about tribal capacity challenges, hopes for implementing all of the recommendations, and appreciation for the shared learning process to help get everyone up to speed.
- Adam Denlinger (SDAO) reflected on the short amount of time the group had at hand, but nonetheless was able to build a successful document that the state can use to move forward.
- Kelly Timchak (Curry Watershed Partnership) noted that it would be important to continue learning from the Place-Based Planning pilots going forward, in hopes of implementing these recommendations and continuing improvement.
- Peggy Lynch (League of Women Voters) shared that she appreciated this work's broader messaging around state agency funding needs, the connection to IWRS, and the need for collaboration among various water agencies. She noted that it was not yet clear what a formalized state agency coordination would look like, and also wanted to emphasize that the lack of data should not hinder planning in working towards abundant clean water for all Oregonians.
- JR Cook (NE Oregon Water Association) shared that he felt the group did the best they could with the charge they were given, but still saw outstanding needs around state agency education and garnering on-the-ground regional perspectives for water policy. He also felt that it was important to continue balancing support for efforts that were in place before the Place-Based Planning program that may not be able or want to comply with new program sideboards.
- Holly Mondo (Harney Community Water Collaborative) shared that they felt this process was important to continue building trust and cooperation, and hopefully bring increased funding for agency capacity and data.
- Chandra Ferrari (ODFW) appreciated the opportunity for the state agencies to have a voice in this process, despite having a different role in the workgroup, and the recommendations' direction to improve the state's water planning and management tools through sufficient investment in data, agency capacity, thoughtful implementation, and trust and partnership between state and local entities. She added that long-term efforts will require significant investment and suggested that Recommendation V would be specifically helpful to state agencies to have resources in base budgets with carryover funding.

- Caylin Barter (Wild Salmon Center) shared her appreciation for the funding call-outs, who the workgroup is looking to make those decisions, and the direction to the agencies to implement those recommendations. She had hoped that some elements could have been addressed earlier in the process so that more details could have gone further. She also expressed her hope to engage with the future phases of this work moving forward.
- Margaret Magruder (Association of Oregon Counties) expressed her enthusiastic support for water planning but also expressed nervousness about the lack of specificity around some of the funding called for.
- Dan Thorndike (Oregon Business Council) emphasized the need for the state to take water seriously and shift resources accordingly to actively invest in proactive water actions across all agencies and address/improve implementation and permitting delays. He also shared his perspective that OWRD should not be the smallest generally funded agency, and the importance of Recommendation V. He shared his hope that the work group's effort will be used to inform forthcoming processes (e.g., rulemaking, etc.) and noted that one piece of legislation won't encompass all of the recommendations.
- Chrysten Rivard (Trout Unlimited) highlighted the importance of convening groups like this one to focus on addressing holistic water challenges ahead. She shared her excitement about the Section I overarching system recommendations to provide resources and information necessary to make good decisions for the best outcomes and hopes that the challenge of limited resources can be addressed.
- Donna Beverage (Union County Commissioner) shared that she felt it was important for all basins to have the same opportunity and success that the Upper Grande Ronde had in the Place-Based Planning pilot, and also noted the challenge of maintaining a statewide program that meaningfully supports all basins. She indicated an interest in the forthcoming DEQ Water Data Portal project as an asset for groups going forward. Other important considerations she highlighted were to continue including local and agricultural representation in planning groups, encouraging federal agency partnerships (for permitting support, etc.), and the desire to let the local group choose their facilitator even if it was someone from within the local watershed.
- Jason Fenton (Burns Paiute Tribe) shared his appreciation for everyone's hard work in this process.
- Racquel Rancier (OWRD) spoke about the next steps following this work and the Department's intention to take the recommendations from this report to build capacity, support basins across the state, and include all voices along the way.
- April Snell (Oregon Water Resources Congress) shared her hope that the relationships developed in this workgroup can translate into successful legislative advocacy, and the need to continue working together to implement these recommendations. She felt that although the charge was vague, this group had tackled one of the least controversial and complex issues within the realm of water topics.

- Oriana Magnera (Verde) reflected on the idea of community as it relates to water both in a local connection context and as a public statewide resource and shared her appreciation for the productive conversations around this in order to ensure that all voices are included and that this community building effort can continue.
- Morgan Gratz-Weiser (Governor's Office) shared her hope and commitment to supporting this conversation continuing in the next Governor's administration and the upcoming session.

### ***Formal Alignment Check on Final Recommendations in v4***

Robin then invited all workgroup members to submit their final, formal alignment check on each recommendation. She acknowledged that some workgroup members were not at the meeting and that OC would follow up to obtain their responses as soon as possible so that accurate final results could be shared. Some workgroup members (Kimberley, Caylin, Donna, Peggy, and JR) requested that the voting spreadsheet not be included in the final report, so as to not misconstrue a numeric vote on a recommendation concept for legislative support where the details will be worked out. The workgroup generally agreed that it would be preferable to show the level of alignment for each recommendation without tagging individual names in a vote. Robin affirmed that the voting spreadsheet would be used as a tracking tool but would not be included in the final report. She also clarified that as per the Operating Protocols, the state agencies and Governor's Office were not official voting members of the workgroup. For reference, the "1-5" alignment check key is listed below.

- *"1" Enthusiastic support - I would be a champion for this recommendation*
- *"2" Support - I support this recommendation*
- *"3" Neutral, on the fence, no concerns or very mild concerns with this recommendation*
- *"4" Serious concerns or questions and will continue to raise them if this recommendation advances*
- *"5" No way - will actively seek to block this recommendation from moving forward*

**ACTION:** OC will follow-up with Anton Chiono, Kathleen George, Bobby Brunoe, Heather Bartlett, Ana Molina, and Lauren Poor for their responses.

### Final Alignment Check Results

- Recommendation A results: (All 1-3) 1's = 17, 2's = 2, 3's = 1, 4's = 0, 5's = 0
- Recommendation B results: (All 1-3) 1's = 14, 2's = 5, 3's = 1, 4's = 0, 5's = 0
- Recommendation C results: 1's = 7, 2's = 12, 3's = 0, 4's = 1, 5's = 0
- Recommendation D results: (All 1-3) 1's = 10, 2's = 3, 3's = 7, 4's = 0, 5's = 0
- Recommendation E results: 1's = 7, 2's = 6, 3's = 6, 4's = 1, 5's = 0
- Recommendation F results: (All 1-3) 1's = 11, 2's = 2, 3's = 7, 4's = 0, 5's = 0
- Recommendation G results: (All 1-3) 1's = 6, 2's = 11, 3's = 3, 4's = 0, 5's = 0

- Recommendation H results: 1's = 6, 2's = 11, 3's = 1, 4's = 2, 5's = 0
- Recommendation I results: 1's = 10, 2's = 3, 3's = 5, 4's = 2, 5's = 0
- Recommendation J results: (All 1-3) 1's = 8, 2's = 6, 3's = 6, 4's = 0, 5's = 0
- Recommendation K results: 1's = 6, 2's = 8, 3's = 3, 4's = 3, 5's = 0
- Recommendation L results: 1's = 10, 2's = 6, 3's = 3, 4's = 1, 5's = 0
- Recommendation M results: 1's = 5, 2's = 11, 3's = 1, 4's = 3, 5's = 0
- Recommendation N results: 1's = 3, 2's = 8, 3's = 4, 4's = 3, 5's = 2
- Recommendation O results: 1's = 4, 2's = 11, 3's = 4, 4's = 1, 5's = 0
- Recommendation P results: (All 1-3) 1's = 5, 2's = 7, 3's = 8, 4's = 0, 5's = 0
- Recommendation Q results: 1's = 11, 2's = 7, 3's = 1, 4's = 1, 5's = 0
- Recommendation R results: 1's = 7, 2's = 10, 3's = 2, 4's = 1, 5's = 0
- Recommendation S results: 1's = 2, 2's = 10, 3's = 7, 4's = 1, 5's = 0
- Recommendation T results: (All 1-3) 1's = 1, 2's = 12, 3's = 7, 4's = 0, 5's = 0
- Recommendation U results: 1's = 5, 2's = 9, 3's = 3, 4's = 3, 5's = 0
- Recommendation V results: 1's = 7, 2's = 5, 3's = 4, 4's = 4, 5's = 0

After reviewing where the workgroup members present had landed on the final recommendations, there was a brief discussion about what was considered a 'consensus agreement,' to which Robin responded it was ultimately up to the group to articulate. Some workgroup members felt that any results with a "4" or "5" should not be considered a 'consensus.' Ultimately there was agreement amongst the workgroup to include the "1-5" reference scale in the report and not label the results as 'strong, weak, etc' with the intention to let the data speak for itself. Also, there was an agreement to not attribute specific organizations to specific votes, unless someone specifically chose to do so for themselves.

### ***Final Comments on the Final Recommendations and Alignment Check Results***

- Peggy shared that she felt that some of the "4's" could have possibly been addressed by having more time to work through details given the complicated issues and limited amount of time.
- Kelly suggested highlighting any results that had "1-3" responses to help signal where support was garnered from the whole group. Others agreed that it would be worth highlighting concepts that have real support for them.
- Caylin shared she was glad to see such strong alignment around the Section I recommendations and noted that some of the recommendations with the lowest levels of consensus were N (which she felt the group didn't have much time to discuss- recognition) and U (which she was not sure why there was not as much consensus about the need for neutral facilitation).

There was a discussion about Recommendation U and a minor, proposed change that was identified would help some people get to a stronger level of support. Jeff felt that including OWRD in the recommendation

was problematic and felt the group agreed on the emphasis of choice is up to the local group. Others (Caylin, Oriana, Kelly, and Holly) agreed with the suggestion to remove “OWRD” from the language. Kimberley shared that she felt comfortable with the proposed change given that OWRD facilitation would still remain an option if a local group wanted to choose them.

Dan expressed concern about this recommendation potentially being too prescriptive and hoped that neutral facilitation is something that would be built into the whole process already. Kimberley shared her perspective that from some past efforts explicitly having a neutral facilitator is not assumed and needs to be standardized going forward for accountability and importance to the state. The workgroup agreed that just including “neutral facilitation” was sufficient and that the proposed minor change could be reflected in the final report.

**ACTION:** “OWRD” will be removed from Recommendation U so the final language can be reflected as: *Planning groups that receive funding from the PBP grant program should be required to (1) be facilitated by a neutral professional facilitator with subject matter expertise (with the choice being the planning groups) and (2) document the plan utilizing the services of a professional technical writer with subject matter expertise.*

There was also discussion about the delineation of Section I and Section II recommendations, the first of which was intended to address the broader statewide system and the second which was focused specifically on the Place-Based Planning program and associated concerns about Recommendation N (*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.*)

- JR shared that he was concerned about Place-Based Planning potentially being given priority over existing efforts given the way this recommendation is written.
- Chrysten added that given the group didn’t have much time to dive into the recognition and funding recommendations as much as may have been needed, that could be where some of the lack of clarity and concerns are coming from. She felt that this was too strong of a recommendation given the reality of the state budget cycle, resource scarcity, and the need to make critical decisions in order to support groups and see the efforts through. With more time to vet different language and explore the process, she felt that it could have gotten further.
- Dan shared that he felt some recommendations seemed too directive and narrowly focused, but didn’t want to stand in the way of them going forward.
- Peggy clarified the difference between the two sets of recommendations and noted that Section II was intended to shift the pilot into an actual program and not to be in competition with existing efforts, but to potentially support them.

- Caylin added that her hope around the intent was that those who had done the planning, regardless of when, would be able to access the funding needed and enable OWRD to respond to shifting planning needs across the state, without dictating a prioritization.
- Per comments from the Work Group, the facilitation team will make sure Section 1 (systemwide to water planning and management) and Section 2 (specifically focused on evolving the PBP tool) will be clearly delineated in the Report.

### ***Process Next Steps: Final Report Writing***

Robin provided an overview of the next steps for the final report, and reiterated the streamlined formatting approach that she had reviewed earlier in the meeting. The workgroup agreed to move the Terms & Definitions to the appendix of the final report, given that it was not a consensus vote section but was something that the workgroup put time and effort into clarifying as it related to interpreting the recommendations. She shared that the report would be submitted on the work group's behalf before the end of the calendar year to the entities represented in the Process Leadership Team (OWRC, OWRD, State Legislators, and Governor's Office), along with the members of the Work Group. There will be a small window for the workgroup to do a final, courtesy review of the Final Report before it is finalized and submitted.

### ***Work Group Closing Remarks***

Robin invited any final closing thoughts from the workgroup members and the Process Leadership Team. Some spoke about the reality of resource constraints on the state's horizon and the desire to elevate and reiterate this work going forward. Others shared suggestions about ideas to put these recommendations in front of the OWRC, legislative committees, and other relevant forums with presentations and outreach.

Some shared their hopes for workgroup members to have a role in supporting and maintaining the work going forward, given the shared learning process and relationship-building that this workgroup went through. Racquel offered anyone interested in joining the OWRD policy engagement distribution list to let her know so they could be added and stay up-to-date with legislative session communications. Another suggestion was made about specifically educating new legislators, and helping connect local legislators to better understand water issues and the importance of this work.

**ACTION:** OC and OWRD will share some key date information about upcoming forums.

Robin expressed her appreciation to everyone for putting in the time and contributing insight to this process to reach this suite of ideas that the workgroup can collectively recommend and advise to future decision-makers. Although she noted some details may not be there, she felt encouraged hearing the





commitments from many to stay engaged, support, and promote ideas from this group in a genuine way as part of a longer-term endeavor. Turning to the members of the Process Leadership Team, she noted that Representative Owens had an unavoidable conflict and could not be present for today's meeting and that Representative Helm had been on the call but had something come up and had to drop from the meeting, but would relay any further reflections if they arise. She then invited the present members of the Process Leadership Team to share their final remarks.

Representative Reardon shared his satisfaction with what sounded like very positive outcomes and expressed his hope for the workgroup to stay connected and maintain positive momentum in working together, and for the work developed in this process to have lasting value. He reflected on the policy and budget work ahead, recognizing that the funding area would need a lot of support, but that it was time. This being one of his final meetings after a decade of serving as a state legislator, he expressed his gratitude for all and his genuine hope for this work to move forward for Oregon.

OWRC Chair, Meg Reeves, extended her thanks on behalf of the OWRC. She appreciated Tom Byler for his early work on this project, Lili for staff work, Racquel for stepping in halfway, Robin for facilitating and managing many interests, and Jennah for coordination. She recognized the challenge of starting with a broad charge and everyone's willingness to take on and persevere through challenges. With a hope that the substance of the group's recommendations will be used as a springboard for statewide activity, she emphasized the hope that the Place-Based Planning program requirements don't outweigh the benefits, which may be a potential subject for more conversation. In the meantime, she shared that she looks forward to cheering the work on and seeing where the recommendations could inform future efforts.

Racquel Rancier, OWRD, acknowledged that water policy is not easy and appreciated everyone digging into the work, and says she sees the recommendations as helpful guidance for the Department.

With gratitude, Robin then adjourned the final workgroup meeting.