

**Deschutes Basin Study Work Group
Meeting Notes**

Wednesday, October 16, 10:30-12:00
COID Administration / Hawthorne Station Conference Room
334 NE Hawthorne Ave, Bend

Mike Britton, NUID
Suzanne Butterfield, SID
Kate Fitzpatrick, DRC
Jeremy Giffin, OWRD
Brett Golden, DRC
Bill Hopp, TID
Ryan Houston, UDWC
Betty Roppe, City of Prineville
Lisa Morgan, City of Prineville
Amy Stuart, ODFW
Adam Sussman, GSI
Mike Tripp, TU (telephone)
Alan Unger, Deschutes County
Steve Johnson, COID
Tod Heisler, DRC
Mary Orton, The Mary Orton Company
Kyle Gorman, OWRD

Introductions

BSWG chair Suzanne Butterfield convened the meeting and asked for introductions.

Basin Study Workplan and Criteria

Kate reviewed the approach outlined in the Draft Basin Study Work Plan. She noted the January 9, 2014 deadline for submitting a letter of interest and the expected late February deadline for submitting a full proposal. Kate commented that the 2010 proposal provides a good basis for the 2014 proposal.

The group discussed Reclamation's Study Proposal Selection Criteria. Kate presented a table that outlined the status of elements of the Basin Study that appear in the selection criteria. The table outlines which information the group already has and what additional information we'll need to gather through the Basin Study.

Kate proposed that the Study Team structure proposed in the BSWG Process Proposal at the last meeting had almost complete overlap with the full BSWG, so recommended that the structure be the full BSWG and subgroups as necessary to work through technical issues. Kate identified potential subgroups:

- Whychus
- Crooked
- Deschutes
- Environment
- Groundwater

- Irrigation

Betty asked to add NUID to the Crooked subgroup.

Suzanne highlighted that Reclamation is looking to collaboratively develop the plan of study with the work group. Doug DeFlicht is on the selection committee so he cannot be too involved in developing the plan of study. Steve suggested initial discussions with Deputy Area Manager Dawn Wiedmeier.

Steve commented that state agencies need to be involved as well at the policy level. OWRD has indicated support for both funding and policy. Steve will take the lead in getting policy-level commitment and staff liaison from OWRD. Adam Sussman suggested that John Unger will likely be that liaison.

Bill suggested adding increased irrigation system reliability for TID under elements to be addressed by the Basin Study, particularly in relation to climate change.

Betty inquired whether the City of Bend's concerns about the name of the Basin Study Work Group were resolved. Adam clarified that the City of Bend accepts the Basin Study Work Group as the name of the group working on the draft work plan, proposal, and application process. Suzanne expressed interest in working towards having the application be "from DBBC in behalf of the DWA." Kate noted that WaterWatch sent email comments preceding this meeting indicating that they are not comfortable with the DWA being the applicant on the basin study. Betty commented that the group discussed this at the last meeting and decided that the proposal would be "in behalf of the BSWG," and this was reflected in the Process Proposal that was revised after the group's discussion last meeting. Suzanne recalled this and withdrew her suggestion. She underlined the importance of the parallel process to look at how to work through trust issues related to the DWA, by modifying the DWA MOU. Steve clarified that DBBC will be the applicant on behalf of the BSWG (as a result of conversations he had with the State that indicated they are not interested in being the applicant or co-applicant). The Basin Study Work Group's role only extends through the application process right now.

Facilitation

Kate commented that she sees great value in bringing in a facilitator to create clarity on discussions and decisions throughout this application process. Given some of the past trust issues, she believes that a facilitated process will be the most successful and is an opportunity to build trust throughout the basin. She asked the group if 1) they are interested in facilitation, 2) if they're comfortable with Mary Orton as facilitator.

The current proposal is to facilitate the process through application submittal. If the group finds it useful, there's a possibility to continue facilitation.

Suzanne noted that part of the application process is getting through the DWA issues. She notes that DWA has some questions related to their MOU and whether they should form their own 501(c)(3). She proposed that Mary Orton spend some of her time on these issues and proposed that DRC pay for her time to help DWA address these issues. Tod said that he would consider investing some DRC resources in facilitating the DWA issues. However, the DRC doesn't have that many resources to invest and is not committed to funding a long-term process to address DWA issues. DRC could provide seed funding to

initiate facilitation. Betty asked if DRC could commit to initial funding for two meetings. Tod will return to the group with a response.

The group agreed that they want facilitation. It was acknowledged that Mary's proposal is for a maximum amount and she will charge only for work performed. The group may not have the time or need for the full budget as written.

Mary discussed her potential role, and left the room while the group discussed whether DRC should put her under contract. When she returned, she helped facilitate the group through the decision process.

The following decision was made **by consensus**:

The Basin Study Work Group agrees to accept the facilitation proposal by The Mary Orton Company, LLC to be paid for by the Deschutes River Conservancy.

During the decision-making process, the group decided that, to indicate consensus, they preferred to use the following:

- "Thumb up" means "I am enthusiastic about the proposal."
- "Thumb sideways" means "I can live with the proposal."
- "Thumb down" means "I cannot live with the proposal."

Co-coordination

The group discussed the co-coordination of the group. The proposal was for DRC to provide coordination of process through Kate, and GSI would provide technical coordination through Adam or another GSI representative.

The group discussed GSI's role. GSI will ensure that the technical pieces of the proposal are present and that the application is complete. Adam noted that GSI's proposal included a not-to-exceed budget that likely overestimated his costs. GSI already has a contract with DBBC on behalf of DWA to facilitate state funding for the Basin Study.

Kate corrected an error on the proposed financing plan table: there should be \$7,000 on the "GSI SB 839 coordination" line in the Total Cost column, and the total of that column should be \$89,000.

The group discussed DRC's role:

- "Circulate agendas" does not include setting agendas, as the full group will be involved in setting agendas;
- "Generate meeting notes" means generate first draft of meeting notes that will be reviewed by the facilitator before being sent out for comment to the group;
- DRC will not be mediating the process;
- DRC will ensure that the process includes (or at least invites) all of the relevant stakeholders; and
- DRC will meet weekly with facilitator and chair (not just facilitator).

The following decision was made **by consensus**:

The Basin Study Work Group agrees to accept the proposed co-coordination plan.

Adam noted that GSI's proposal mirrors the co-coordination work plan.

The following decision was made **by consensus**:

The Basin Study Work Group agrees to accept the co-coordination proposal by GSI to be paid for by both the DRC and DWA.

Cost-Share Update

Steve updated the group on his meeting with Phil Ward from OWRD. Steve's assumption was that funding from SB839 would be available to provide match funding to the Basin Study. OWRD still feels that they have the authorization and appropriation to provide the match. Steve indicated that we'll need written assurances to accompany our letter of intent for the Basin Study.

OWRD was comfortable with committing funds and having them roll over into the new biennium. OWRD indicated that part of the \$750,000 may cover their staff position working on the project. They're comfortable with the funding and the timeline. Steve and Adam updated the department on the Basin Study Work Group and they were very supportive.

Tod suggested that we identify any needs beyond the \$750,000 now so that DRC could raise additional funds as necessary. Steve noted that Reclamation's \$750,000 went to Reclamation's staff and their consultants. Tod noted that we shouldn't limit ourselves to \$1,500,000; we can raise additional funds to pay for additional critical pieces of the Basin Study as necessary.

Steve noted that we're missing some information from Reclamation. We have some financial projections; we expect \$750,000 from Reclamation and \$750,000 from State/OWRD. He expects that the subgroups will come up with additional information needs that are ideal but that limited funds would limit work.

Steve noted that in implementing the workplan, we'll need to manage expectations related to the proposal and the Basin Study.

The group discussed whether there will be detailed budgets defined for studies under each workgroup prior to starting the Basin Study.

Follow Up Meetings/Next Steps

Mary, Adam, Suzanne, Tod, and Kate will meet next week (October 22, 1:30-3:30, at DRC) to discuss the workgroups, and the relationship between the Basin Study and DWPI. This group will email recommendations to the larger group in advance of the November 1 BSWG meeting.

The group set their next meeting for November 1, 2013 from 9AM – 12PM. Agenda items include:

- Building on the matrix
- List of everything needed for the Letter of Intent
- Structure/function/level of effort/deliverables of subgroups (review of recommendations that should come out of October 22 meeting).