**INPUT SUMMARY TABLES**

**Mid-Coast Water Planning Partnership -- Prioritization Approaches Input Worksheet**

Please indicate (with an “X” or comment) what prioritization approach(es) you think could be helpful with prioritizing actions under each imperative. Think of this as a high-level prioritization to help the MCWPP clarify how it approach its implementation efforts. This project goal is to have a prioritized action list by October 2023, so the time and resources involved in the approach(es) should be considered.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Water Action Plan Imperatives** | | | | | | | |
| **Prioritization Approach** | **Public awareness and support** | **Regional capacity and collaboration** | **Monitoring and data sharing** | **Water conservation, efficiency, and reuse** | **Ecosystem protection and enhancement** | **Resilient water infrastructure** | **Source water protection** | **Water supply development** |
| **Decision support system (scoresheet, actions can have the same score)** | XXXX | X XXX | X XXX | XXX X | X XX | XXXX | XXXX | XXXX |
| **Paired comparison analysis (comparing actions against each other)** | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| **Deliberation** | XX | XX | XX X | XX | XX | XX | XX | XX |
| **Cost-benefit analysis** |  |  |  | X |  | X X |  | X X |
| **Champion approach** | XXX | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| **Ecosystem restoration and enhancement specific method** |  |  |  |  | X X |  | X |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Mid-Coast Water Planning Partnership -- Prioritization Criteria Ideas List**

Please review these potential criteria that could assist with prioritization of actions. Feel free to make changes to descriptions using track changes and to add additional criteria for consideration at the end of the table.

| **Potential Prioritization Criteria** | **Do you like this criterion? (Yes/No)**  **Feel free to provide comments.** |
| --- | --- |
| * Water Action Plan   + Phases of implementation   + Data collection and monitoring focused on highest needs identified in the plan   + Cross-cutting imperatives   + Specific performance metrics for each imperative category | Yes  Yes, although not clear how this is a criterion. I do think we should utilize the work that’s been done to date to prioritize, for example, those that were identified for early phases. The cross-cutting imperatives may be too broad to prioritize.  Yes, MCWPP Action Plan should be starting point for prioritization effort  Yes, should lean on the plan to the extent possible.  Yes |
| * Improvements to water quantity   + Benefits for drinking water and other beneficial uses   + Benefits for fish and wildlife | Yes  Yes, “Other beneficial uses” includes fish and wildlife – shouldn’t be split off  Actions that result in increases in protected instream flow in priority stream reaches should be heavily weighted  Yes  Yes |
| * Improvements to water quality   + Benefits for drinking water and other beneficial uses     - Drinking water quality parameters     - Assists with water treatment   + Benefits for fish and wildlife     - Protects or improves water quality (303(d),TMDL) | Yes  Yes, “Other beneficial uses” includes fish and wildlife – shouldn’t be split off  303(d) and TMDL are not solely for benefit of fish and wildlife  Yes  Yes |
| * Habitat benefits   + Increases the amount of habitat (connectivity)   + Impacts a biologically-significant location with Oregon Conservation Strategy--Strategy Species | Yes  Yes, Confirm – are biologically significant locations known with specificity?  Consider ancillary benefits of actions that facilitate delisting of OC Coho  Yes  Yes  Yes |
| * Addresses root causes of problems | Absolutely  Like it, but extremely vague  Yes, the Partnership might be best at tackling root causes and systemic issues that an individual entity would not have bandwidth to tackle on their own and if solved could benefit the entire region.  Absolutely |
| * Multiple benefits to instream and out-of-stream water users   + Meets goals of more than one action/imperative   + Benefits watershed processes or habitat connectivity of multiple areas   + Ecological, social, educational, and economic benefits   + Flood control, pollinator habitat, soil improvement, carbon sequestration, recreation | Yes  Yes  Yes – actions that benefit instream and out-of-stream should be prioritized, actions that further multiple goals of IWRS should be prioritized  Yes, always good to look for multiple benefits and win-win solutions.  Yes |
| * Magnitude of benefits   + Broad vs. targeted impact   + Number of acres restored, volume of water conserved, etc. | Yes  Yes  Too vague – to whom? In relation to what?  Yes  Location Specific |
| * Project readiness (lead entity, permits, site access) | Yes  Yes, project readiness is a helpful prioritization criterion, provided there isn’t inequitable investment in getting projects ready.  Yes, good to get some early wins and build momentum  No—sometimes grant funding is available for design etc. |
| * Availability of funding and other resources   + Grant program criteria | Yes  Part of readiness?  No—once we have a project it’s easier to look for funding. |
| * Resilience to climate change | Yes  Maybe, likely difficult to score and differentiate between actions; a lot could fall into this category.  Yes  Yes, if we can agree on what makes something more resilient to climate change.  Yes |
| * Cost-effectiveness (Efficient) | Yes  Yes, VALUE, benefit for the cost, it can be subjective.  Yes |
| * Public support   + Bridging multiple stakeholder groups or perspectives   + Implementation partners | Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes for implementation partners , no for “people who haven’t been in the room” |
| * Geographic priorities, including identified sensitive areas | Yes  Yes  Yes, Geographic and other plan priorities.  Yes |
| * Stakeholder engagement or education | Yes, might be combined with “public support”  Need more detail here – not sure how this is a prioritization criteria  Yes  No |
| * Benefits the local economy | Yes  No, causation too attenuated. All projects in MCWPP Action Plan will benefit local economy  Yes  No |
| * Conserves water   (or “reduces water demand through agricultural and urban water use efficiency.”) | Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes |
| * Avoids new State or Federal Threatened or Endangered species listings | Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes |
| * Urgency (e.g., a regulatory need or deadline that is driving implementation) |  |
| * Other | We have already prioritized the pieces of the action plan. Doing this again is simply “busywork” and not a good use of our time or dollars. |
| * SEQUENCING, IS ONE ACTION NEEDED FIRST BEFORE ANOTHER | Yes |
| * IS THE TASK APPROIPRIATE FOR THE PARTNERSHIP OR IDENTIFIED LEAD | Yes |
| * Leads to long term solutions | yes |
| * Reduces conflicts over time and space | yes |
| * Leads to increased realization and care for our water resources | yes |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Projects Information**

Please list any of your current projects needing further support/development or near-term planned projects in the Mid-Coast that fall under an Imperative.

If possible, indicate under which action(s) and imperative(s) that the project falls (See example in the table). If you are uncertain or would prefer help, leave the action/imperatives section blank.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project**  **(Name, brief description)** | **Public awareness and support** | **Regional capacity and collaboration** | **Monitoring and data sharing** | **Water conservation, efficiency, and reuse** | **Ecosystem protection and enhancement** | **Resilient water infrastructure** | **Source water protection** | **Water supply development** |
| *Example.*  *Water treatment plant reuse project.*  *Reusing backwash water for industrial use.* |  |  |  | *Action 23* |  |  | x | x |
| **I believe we need to address possible 2nd water sources for municipalities and industry during low flows. Aug-Nov.** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **A engineered pre treatment from reservoirs that have not turned over and are in poor water quality. Newport res. And Mill cr. Reservoir in Toledo.** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |