

Attachment 2 – Required Improvements

The changes identified in the table below are those that are required for the Mid-Coast Water Planning Partnership’s Integrated Water Resources Plan to receive a recommendation from the review team that the Water Resources Commission recognize the plan. The changes are organized by requirement category and question in column 1 (see Appendix B of the Draft Step 5 Guidance for full list of required categories). In addition to the review team finding (column 2), the table lays out a proposed solution (column 3) as well as notes where in the draft plan the solution might be placed to address the issue (column 4). In addition to helping secure a recommendation to the Commission that the plan receive state recognition, there are many other benefits to adopting these changes, including 1) demonstrate, document, and memorialize that the plan and planning process followed the Draft Planning Guidelines and IWRS principles, 2) improve appeal to funders, and 3) facilitate and aid implementation.

Requirement Category and Review Question	Review Team Finding	Proposed Solution	Location in Draft Plan
Current and Future Water Needs	<p>The Draft Plan does not adequately describe cultural issues or concerns related to water resources, though it is briefly mentioned. Do the Siletz Tribes have a plan or strategy for protecting or restoring water related to fishing in the streams or estuaries?</p> <p>Draft Plan does not adequately describe current instream demands to the extent known.</p>	<p>The plan should describe how the Siletz Tribes have used aquatic resources in the planning area, current activities related to those interests such as ownership, restoration programs, and protection of significant cultural fishing sites. The PRT recommends this information be summarized in the Basin Overview section to provide context to the planning effort.</p> <p>The plan should contain a summary of the instream analysis that was done and is mentioned in the draft plan. This could be accomplished by pulling summary information from past reports/work.</p>	<p>General Overview and/or Overview of Instream Water Uses and Needs, page 30</p> <p>Current and Future Instream Water Needs for Fish and Wildlife, page 33.</p>
Understanding Water Resource Supply, Quality, and Ecological Issues	<p>The Draft Plan lacks sufficient detail about the status of current surface water quantity, particularly concerning current instream supplies or flow in streams.</p>	<p>The plan should include a summary of the status of current surface water quantity. OWRD produced two memos on surface supply and demand that are a good source of</p>	<p>Understanding Water Resources Quantity,</p>

<p>Does the Plan document an understanding of the water resources supply, quality, and ecological issues in the planning area for both surface and groundwater?</p>	<p>The Draft Plan lacks sufficient detail about the groundwater situation. The groundwater information in the draft plan is dispersed and is not easily located making it difficult for the reader to get a sense of the understanding of groundwater supply. A new reader may not understand why groundwater is not a solution.</p>	<p>information. Summary information from those memos could be pulled into the plan.</p> <p>Previous groundwater work done by OWRD would be a good source of information and summary information could be added to the plan under the Water Quantity Section. One option is to add a short, dedicated section on groundwater to include an overview of geology, characteristics of the aquifers, productivity of the groundwater source.</p>	<p>Quality, and Ecological Issues</p> <p>Water Quantity page 18/19</p>
<p>Solutions or Recommended Actions Do the solutions identified adhere to the IWRS Guiding Principles?</p>	<p>The draft plan does not identify if cost was a consideration during prioritization of actions, which is an IWRS Guiding principle. Also, it is unclear how the cost figures for various actions were developed and to what degree of accuracy or reliability are those figures.</p>	<p>The plan should either describe if cost was considered during prioritization. If it wasn't, please describe when costs will be considered. It would be helpful to describe what the reader should make of the cost figures included in the plan.</p>	<p>Overview of the Strategic Action Imperatives, page 48 and/or 51</p>
<p>Plan Adoption by Planning Group Does the planning group have a sound process for final review and adoption of the Final Plan?</p>	<p>The Draft Plan does not describe how feedback from the public and the PRT will be incorporated into the Final Plan or the amount of time for partner review of the Final Plan prior to adoption. The Final Plan should describe the process that was used to get from Draft Plan to Final Plan.</p>	<p>The PRT would like to discuss this with the Mid-Coast Partnership so we understand how this will happen and would like the pathway to be documented in the plan so there is a clear understanding among partners and a reference for what happened in the final plan.</p>	<p>Discuss and document by e-mail.</p>