

# Interagency Cooperation State Water Plans

# Briefing Paper

## State Legislation

Often state legislation directs agencies to informally cooperate with the lead agency or to establish an interagency task force for the development of the state water management plan.

### Kansas

Legislation directs a number of specified agencies (i.e., the Division of Water Resources of Department of Agriculture, State Geological Survey, the Division of Environment, Department of Wildlife and Parks, State Conservation Commission and all other interested state agencies) to cooperate with the Kansas Water Office in the formulation of the state water plan (§82a-903).

### Missouri

The Department of Natural Resources is directed, as lead agency, to establish an interagency task force consisting of any and all department and agencies, including the University of Missouri, that are necessary to accomplish the purposes of the plan (§640.430).

### Utah

“All other ...agencies shall cooperate with the Division of Water Resources in the formulation of a state water plan...” (§73-10-15). The Division of Water Resources writes the initial draft plan and provides it to a state coordinating committee comprised of eleven water-related state agencies for review and comment.

## Integrated Resources Planning

An innovative approach to interagency collaboration is the use of Integrated Resources Planning (IRP) techniques that involve least-cost analysis of resource management options (i.e., direct and indirect costs and benefits of demand-side and supply-side alternatives). Simultaneous to this analysis, the IRP framework considers multiple planning objectives or competing policy goals and includes community participation in the planning, decision-making and implementation processes.

### Hawaii

The state water code calls for cooperation between the Commission on Water Resource Management, the counties and other state agencies to form an integrated and coordinated program for water management. It defines certain responsibilities of specific state agencies and the roles and responsibilities of the county in general with respect to preparation of the Hawaii Water Plan. To effectively accomplish these legislative requirements, Hawaii adopted IRP techniques to address the complexities associated with planning, regulation and management of water resources.

Different state and county agencies prepare separate components of the Hawaii Water Plan; therefore, the IRP approach intends to provide specific focus and guidance to each agency responsible for updating specific components. The IRP framework charts the path each agency should follow over the planning horizon, and identifies the required interactions between the various plan components and the planning steps to be undertaken (Commission on Water Resource Management, Department of Land and Natural Resources, Statewide Framework for Updating the Hawaii Water Plan, 2000).

## **Executive Orders**

An alternative approach to gain interagency cooperation is through a governor issued executive order.

### **Minnesota**

Minnesota's Governor Ventura issued an executive order directing agencies to cooperate with the lead agency in the state water management planning process (Executive Order 99-15, 2000).

## **Memorandum of Understanding**

A second alternative is the use of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to clarify the roles of the cooperating agencies and to gain agency commitment.

### **Washington**

Washington established a MOU to create a statewide interagency caucus to implement its Watershed Management (HB 2514) and Salmon Recovery Planning (HB 2496) legislation. The MOU was established for three purposes:

- 1) to clarify the roles and responsibilities of participating state agencies in support of watershed planning at the local level,
- 2) to foster cooperative working relationships among the participating state agencies, and
- 3) to help coordinate and, where possible to simplify implementation procedures.

Although the purpose of the caucus is to coordinate statewide support for local watershed planning efforts, the MOU approach could effectively unite cooperation for state-level planning (Department of Ecology, Watershed Planning, Chapter 247, Laws of 1998, ESHB 2514 and Chapter 246, Laws of 1998, ESHB 2496).