

Water in Oregon – Not a Drop to Waste

Part 1: Regulating Water in Oregon, Part 2 Issues and Perspectives

Background

During the LWVOR's state convention in 2008, members considered a recommendation to restudy two positions on water: *Water Policy and Planning*, adopted January 1977 and revised March 1985, and *Water Quality*, adopted January 1969. During the discussion of these two separate position papers, members determined that water quality and water quantity could and should not be separated. They decided to combine the two reports into one position on Water Resources and authorized a two and half year restudy and requested a report in a year and a final report at the end of that period.

The first report, entitled *Water In Oregon – Not a Drop to Waste, Part 1: Regulating Water in Oregon* was published last year and it reviewed the water laws for our state. Based on that understanding of water regulation, the study committee interviewed Oregon stakeholders to determine the current realities in water resources and its conclusions are published in this current report, *Water in Oregon - Not a Drop to Waste; Part 2: Issues and Perspectives 2010*.

Achieving Consensus

Reaching consensus is much like taking a temperature – does the discussion of the consensus questions indicate strong, moderate, or little support for the any of the proposed answers. What the League is seeking is strong agreement on the issues so that a member agreement committee can establish statements from which Leagues can take action and give testimony .

While members do not take a vote on the answers, they do need to determine if there are little or no objections and a general feeling of agreement with their proposed answers. The role of the discussion leader and the recorder are crucial. The recorder needs to accurately capture the discussion, and the leader summarizes the points agreed on to be recorded. Discussion leaders need to encourage all members to contribute to the conversation.

The discussion group is not writing the final wording for the position, but rather, giving the consensus, or the agreement of the group, on the various questions posed. Think of the word “significant” in assessing member agreement. The state LWVOR member agreement committee will look at all answers and create a position statement that summarizes the significant agreement of all the members. The goal of this process is a credible position statement that the League can use for advocacy and visibility for many years.

Please note: Unit report sheets should be turned in to each local league so that one unified consensus report is sent to the state league office. Either the local board or a special committee can review and agree on the final report from each league. In addition, if your league has units, please copy those report forms and also send them with the league's consensus report. They are important for the archival record of the study.

Due Date

The report sheets and consensus are due November 30, 2010.

Outline of the Reports:

Part I Regulating Water in Oregon

- Introduction – page 3
- Looking at Oregon’s Waters – page 3
- Regulating Water Quantity – page 3
- Regulating Surface Waters – page 5
- Regulating Ground Water – page 11
- Measuring available Water – page 13
- Regulating Water Use for Hydroelectric Power – page 13
- Regulating Water Movement or Sale Out of State – page 14
- Regulating Water Quality – page 15
- Monitoring Water Quality – page 16
- Addressing Pollution Sources – page 19
- Current activities – page 30
- A Snapshot in Time – Page 32

Part 2: Issues and Perspectives

- How Water is Managed – page 4
- The Use of Data – page 7
- Specific Challenges for Water – page 8
 - Addressing Water Rights – page 8
 - Addressing Future Water Demand – page 10
 - Addressing Stream Flow – page 11
 - Addressing Groundwater Contamination and Loss – page 12
 - Addressing Temperature – page 15
 - Preventing Point Source Pollution – page 15
 - Preventing Nonpoint Source Pollution – page 17
 - Addressing Total Maximum Daily Loads – page 19
 - Addressing Trace Pollutants – page 20
 - Addressing Land use and Planning for Water – page 21
 - Addressing Climate Change – page 22
- Steps to Protect and Conserve Oregon’s Waters - page 23
 - Agriculture – Water Conservation and Protection – page 23
 - Industry and Commerce – Water Conservation and Protection – page 26
 - Municipal – Water Conservation and Protection – page 28
 - Forestry – Water Conservation and Protection – page 31
- Putting the Public into the Water Discussion – page 33
- Integrated Water Resource Strategy – page 34
- Summary – page 35

Recommended timing for sections

	<u>1 hour session</u>	<u>1 1/2 hour session</u>	<u>2 hours session</u>
Section A -	20 minutes	30 minutes	40 minutes
Section B -	20 minutes	30 minutes	40 minutes
Section C -	5 minutes	10 minutes	15 minutes
Section D -	15 minutes	20 minutes	25 minutes

Consensus Questions

A. Management Structure

1. There are 11 state agencies with water management responsibilities (*Water in Oregon—Not a Drop to Waste, Part 2* Table 1, detailed discussion of responsibilities by task in *Water in Oregon—Not a Drop to Waste Part 1*), each with its own mission and expertise, interacting with local and federal government and special districts. What actions would you support to improve decision-making by connecting water quality and water quantity issues with each other and with land use decisions? Check all that apply.

- Better communication and cooperation between agencies?
- Conformity in definitions among agencies, such as definition of “beneficial uses”?
- Coordination in the prioritization of water uses/regulations among agencies?
- Consolidation of governmental structures for policy making and/or enforcement?
- Clarification and strengthening of the role of local or regional land use planning in the water management process?
- Other actions? Please describe:

2. When comparing our current statewide model with possible alternatives for managing water protection and conservation, which of the following do you prefer? (If applicable, how should these alternative models relate to the multiple political structures within their boundaries?)

- Our current statewide approach
- Basin management
- Watershed management
- Management based on water or soil types
- Management directed by specific pollutants
- Local government management
- Other? Please describe.

B. Tracking Information and Regulating Use

3. Oregon has limited scientific data on water resources, uses and purity, which impacts the ability of agencies to make informed decisions about water quantity and quality. Is a comprehensive inventory of all water resources necessary to understand availability of water quantity and quality to meet future needs/demands, or is a more limited approach based upon specific criteria adequate? If the latter, what criteria should be used?

Should currently exempt domestic wells be required to obtain a permit? Why or why not?

Should water monitoring/measurement be required by all permit holders and users, or should it be limited according to some criteria? If the latter, what criteria should be considered?

What types of data should water monitoring/measurement collect? Check all that apply.

- How much is used
- Who is using it
- The purpose of the use
- Water purity as compared to standards
- The time period/date
- Other? (Please describe.)

After installation, when/how often should septic systems be required to be inspected?

4. While the current LWVOR Water Quality Position supports the need for water quality standards in Oregon, it does not prescribe how state standards should be determined. What should be the basis for such standards? Check all that apply.

- Promote/foster public health and safety
- Cost
- Need to maintain beneficial uses
- Other (Please describe.)?

5. Climate change could lead to less snowfall and more erratic rainfall. Population growth will increase demands for water supply. What options should the state use/encourage to address future water needs/demands? Check all that apply.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Address each situation individually | <input type="checkbox"/> Changes in land use regulation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Green construction/landscaping | <input type="checkbox"/> Rationing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Increased conservation | <input type="checkbox"/> Use of greywater |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Increased water storage | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Please describe.) |

6. If water conservation is to become a significant part of water quality and quantity management, do you have a preference in favor of an approach based upon:

- Incentives (such as selling saved water to other users or reduced rates for lower consumption), **or**
- Regulations (such as limiting water use for lawns, requiring water saving toilets, shower heads, etc.)?

What other approaches should be considered in promoting water conservation (specific incentives/regulations targeting categories of users (agriculture, industry, municipal use, domestic)?)

Please describe:

C. Communication and Public Input

7. The League believes that informed citizens have an important role to play in governmental decisions. How and when should members of the public be included in water management and planning processes? Please describe.

D. Funding

8. Currently, users pay for their water delivery system, but the water itself is free. League positions note that “all water users must share in the costs of water management”. Should “users” include state and local government as well as individual and corporate users?

Please indicate on the chart below how the costs associated with water capture, storage and delivery should be funded. Also indicate the sources of funding you support to cover present and future costs associated with planning, research, data acquisition, regulation and enforcement and any other program(s) you describe. Additional comments are welcome.

Since water is a public resource, how should funding of water management and delivery be achieved for:

Check methods that apply

	Rate Payers	Permit fees	Charge by volume of water (beyond delivery charges)	Tiered Rate System	State Taxes	Local taxes	Special taxes
Planning - current and future demand							
Research							
Data collection							
Infrastructure, maintenance and delivery							
Public Outreach							
Conservation							
Regulation and enforcement							
Other							

Additional comments:

