

**Basin Study Work Group**  
**Thursday, December 12, 2013, 8AM - 11PM, COIC Admin Offices**  
**Draft Meeting Notes**

**ATTENDING**

Mike Britton, North Unit Irrigation District	Danielle MacBain, GSI
Suzanne Butterfield, Swalley Irrigation District	Kimberly Priestley, WaterWatch of Oregon (by phone)
Kate Fitzpatrick, Deschutes River Conservancy	Mark Reinecke, Bryant, Lovlien and Jarvis (Avion)
Kyle Gorman, Oregon Water Resources Department	Ken Rieck, Tumalo Irrigation District
Jason Gritzner, Deschutes National Forest	Betty Roppe, City of Prineville
Tod Heisler, Deschutes River Conservancy	Amy Stuart, ODFW
Bill Hopp, Tumalo Irrigation District	Adam Sussman, GSI
Ryan Houston, Upper Deschutes Watershed Council	Mike Tripp, Trout Unlimited
Steve Johnson, Central Oregon Irrigation District	Alan Unger, Deschutes County
Mike Kasberger, Ochoco Irrigation District	Jeff Wieland, Upper Deschutes River Coalition
Eric Klann, City of Prineville	

Also present were:

Bea Armstrong, Deschutes River Conservancy (Director of Development and Communication)  
Joy Cooper, GSI (intern)  
Mary Orton, The Mary Orton Company, LLC (facilitator)

**AGENDA**

The group used the following agenda as a guide during their meeting:

1. Welcome
2. Check-in
3. Overview and approval of agenda
4. Letter of Interest to Bureau of Reclamation
5. Update on Communications with Reclamation
6. Report on State Funding
7. Reports from Subgroups
8. Structure and Decision-Making
9. Next Steps
10. Meeting Evaluation

**WELCOME, CHECK-IN, AND AGENDA**

Suzanne convened the meeting and welcomed everyone. Attendees were invited to check-in. Mary reviewed the agenda and asked for approval. Adam suggested that an update be given on the parallel process to update the charter of the DWA, and Suzanne agreed to cover this after her report on Communications to Reclamation. The group agreed to the agenda with this addition.

**LETTER OF INTEREST TO BUREAU OF RECLAMATION**

Suzanne noted that the Letter of Interest (LOI), the required first step toward applying for a Basin Study grant from Reclamation, was due December 20, 2014. A draft LOI that incorporated feedback from the November 1 BSWG meeting was distributed via email for input prior to the meeting. This redline draft reflected input received over email.

Danielle reviewed the changes that were made based on input. There was some discussion to make some additional changes.

**Consensus:** The group reached consensus (all green cards) on the following changes to the LOI:

- To change the language in the **Geographic Focus** to the following: The Basin Study will occur within the Deschutes Basin of Central Oregon. It will focus on surface water and groundwater upstream of the Deschutes, Crooked and Metolius river systems, including associated storage projects:

**Federal**

Wickiup Reservoir  
Prineville Reservoir  
(Haystack Reservoir?)

**Non-Federal**

Crane Prairie Reservoir  
Ochoco Reservoir  
Crescent Lake

- In the first sentence in the **General Scope of Study** section, delete “according to ranking,” as it is implicit that there will need to be a prioritization process.
- To reference the USGS Study before the discussion of hydraulic connectivity in the first paragraph of the **Water Supply Challenges** section.
- In the last paragraph of the **Water Supply Challenges** section, add a sentence like: “Between then and now, X acre-feet have been restored due to a variety of programs providing permanent and temporary instream benefits,” and to indicate that need remains.” DRC agreed to get GSI this number.
- When sending the LOI out it was agreed to:
  - CC: the Congressional delegation, the Governor, and Phil Ward with OWRD
  - BCC: Dawn Wiedmeier, all BSWG and DWA members, and Michael Garrity with American Rivers
- Change the date to the relevant date.

#### UPDATE ON COMMUNICATIONS WITH RECLAMATION

Suzanne reported that there is a meeting set with Reclamation for December 12, which Dawn Wiedmeier, Doug DeFlicht, Tod Heisler, Amy Stuart, Steve Johnson, Adam Sussman, and she would attend. Adam is preparing the agenda and requested that any questions people wanted addressed should be sent to him. Suzanne mentioned that in general, Doug would like to periodically check in with the group, but needs to keep an arms-length until the selection process is complete.

Suggestions for questions to be asked Reclamation were as follows:

- Amy Stuart pointed out that the Deschutes and Crooked reaches are at very different stages, and Reclamation may be able to help sort out how to treat this in the proposal.
- Steve suggested that better understanding the scope of the proposal versus the plan of study will help.
- Examples of both of these could be requested from Reclamation, and there are also examples available on the internet. Dawn has committed to sending a successful proposal for our review.
- How will BSWG interact with Reclamation?

#### UPDATE ON DWA EVOLUTION

Suzanne reported that there was one meeting two months ago with herself, Amy Stuart, Kimberley Priestley, and Tod Heisler, which started the dialogue. She said that since there are some who are very interested in having the DWA survive and thrive, they wanted to hear concerns so they can help it evolve into a trusted group. The meeting was short and productive, and the group agreed to meet again. The main concerns discussed were that the membership is light on instream flow representation. As a result, there are concerns when the DWA represents itself in Salem as a three-legged stool with balance from agricultural, municipalities, and instream. They would like membership and decision-making to be reflective of a true balance. Kimberley added that the group also discussed giving this whole thing time to percolate, and that this BSWG process right now may be what re-instills trust in the basin. Resolution to the DWA question should not be rushed.

Suzanne added that contributions to the DWA from member groups have been \$23,000, and are primarily being used for GSI to help secure the state money for the Basin and for splitting the cost with DRC to be the technical coordinators for BSWG. She said this is the best year for contributions to date, she thinks partners are excited about progress towards the Basin Study.

## REPORT ON STATE FUNDING

Adam circulated the letter of support received from OWRD, and said obtaining the letter was a good relationship-building exercise. He reported that he is continuing dialogue with the state on how much we are counting on the state funding, and has been developing a relationship with the new senior analyst and fiscal staff. There will be a legislative session in February. Some entities, including the League of Oregon cities and the Special Districts Association, will be working to shore up implementation of SB 839 (the funding bill for Basin Study match). Although the legislative record is clear that we are seeking \$750,000 for the Deschutes Basin study, work will be done to strengthen the ties between SB839 and the funding sources to provide greater assurance. He was hopeful that the next letter would say more definitively that \$750,000 is for Deschutes River basin study.

## REPORTS FROM SUBGROUPS

### **Deschutes Subgroup**

The group had no concerns about the Deschutes Water Planning Initiative (DWPI) keeping its name and doing the work of the Deschutes Subgroup.

Kate noted that while the DWPI has been focused on water supply options and water management scenarios, they can take up additional work needed for the basin study proposal. They will be informed by the Instream and Groundwater subgroups, as they relate to the Deschutes above Lake Billy Chinook without the Whychus, Crooked, or Metolius.

Bill asked how the Deschutes Subgroup is different from Upper Deschutes Instream Subgroup. The Upper Deschutes Subgroup is working solely on instream needs that would inform water demands in the Deschutes. Ryan noted that to date they have been focused solely on the upper Deschutes between Wickiup and Bend, but are open to discussions of expanding the scope of this group to other reaches and/or supporting other subgroups to help answer questions about instream needs.

Mary reviewed the subgroups. Three subgroups are geographic (Whychus, Deschutes, Crooked) and two are topical (Groundwater, Instream). The concept is for the topical subgroups to bring information to the reach subgroups. The Groundwater Subgroup encompasses the entire Deschutes basin.

### **Crooked Subgroup**

Betty reported that the Crooked Subgroup met November 21, and in attendance were NUID, DRC, COID, OID, City of Prineville, WaterWatch, Crooked River Watershed Council, and ODFW. The tribes were invited, and indicated that while they are capacity-limited right now, they are keeping an eye on the process. Other suggested participants included Terrebonne, Deschutes Valley Water District, NOAA, DEQ, and Crook County. At the first meeting, Steve gave an overview of how this work fits into BSWG. The group didn't reach any concrete conclusions, but decided that it will focus on questions related to instream goals, flow-ecology relationships, and what strategies are appropriate to include in the basin study. The next meeting was set for January 8th, 10-12 at Prineville City Hall.

### **Whychus Subgroup**

Marc Thalacker agreed to lead this group and has indicated he will plan a meeting soon.

### **Upper Deschutes Instream Subgroup**

Ryan Houston reported that the group has met twice, once in November and on December 11. It has included ODFW, DEQ, OWRD, Forest Service, USFWS, Trout Unlimited, WaterWatch, DRC, and the Upper Deschutes River Coalition. Ryan reported that the group recognizes that the instream demand is not fully understood. They are focused around instream flow needs and benefits from incremental flow changes. They have set up a series of study questions and are sorting out what studies are necessary to answer the questions. The study questions are organized around the following key values: fisheries, stream habitat restoration, Oregon spotted frog, and water quality. Under each of the four categories, they have identified research questions, for example: what are the incremental benefits to redband trout habitat with incremental discharges in the Deschutes River? Are there

existing studies? Are they good enough? What kinds of studies are needed? How long will it take and how much will it cost? They don't want to constrain ideas at the start, but will ensure that what comes back to BSWG is applicable to the supply/demand conversation of the Basin Study. They have created a matrix that lays out this framework. It is a working document, and is open to any who want the detail.

Betty asked what happens to subgroup work. Mary said that the group hasn't decided the details of that yet, but one model would be that the subgroups make recommendations based on consensus (or forward several options if consensus was not reached) to the BSWG, and the BSWG acts as a steering committee that makes final decisions. Amy noted that the biggest information gaps lie on the flow-ecology side. Filtering will be important. Suzanne asked whether we can use instream flow-related HCP studies. Steve said they haven't been done yet. It would be worthwhile to schedule time with Biota Pacific and Kramer Fish Sciences to bridge the content and needs of the two studies. If this is going to be the basin's 20-year plan, it would be good to get all instream flow needs defined. The instream flow water rights that had been filed, whether they were perfected or not, were used for the 2006 DWA studies. This gave us bookends at the time and probably needs to be refined.

### **Groundwater Subgroup**

Kyle reported that the group met December 4 and included Kimberley, Patrick Griffith, Gen Hubert with DRC, Kyle, and Adam Sussman. Kyle has circulated minutes to the subgroup and will work with Kate to finalize them. The group discussed using pending groundwater permits in the Deschutes as the groundwater demand for the basin study. The complexity is that existing demand is known, but future demand is more opaque because rates of growth and development are unknown. Perhaps even more problematic, the way the mitigation program is set up (with a 200 cfs cap) promotes speculation. Steve added that the districts don't accept that the 200 cfs under the cap is de facto supply, because it is assumed it would all come from the districts. Exempt wells should also be acknowledged if not quantified. The group agreed to meet again, with facilitation, and to try to arrive at a number that has credibility behind it given the unknowns for a decided-upon time frame (20, 30, 50 years?). The group will also delineate groundwater demand by zone. Kate noted that Gen Hubert updated pie charts of demand by zone and has a working document on which existing demand is speculative and which is more solid.

### **Subgroup Management**

Subgroup notices (though not doodle polls) and meeting notes will be sent to the whole BSWG. After the Reclamation meeting, we can give subgroups more detail on what needs to be done by when for the proposal. The planners – Suzanne, Tod, Adam, Kate, and Mary (the "Gang of Five") will work on this timing issue and relay to the group.

### **Structure and Decision-Making**

Mary reviewed the questions on the agenda and some ideas she had attached to the agenda. There was discussion on how this group interacts with Reclamation, and how long this group should commit to whatever decision-making processes it agrees to. Some thought that this group is specifically to get us through the proposal submittal. Others thought that this group should stay together with consistent decision-making governance through the plan of study formation and throughout the study. Significant concern was expressed about the possibility of a group signing onto the proposal and then being excluded from the same level of participation or decision-making beyond that.

The group discussed who gets an official decision-making seat at the table. The goals are to be representative of the three legs of the stool, while making it a manageable size. Mary suggested each sector choose a certain number of official "seats." Bill expressed concern with irrigation districts relying on other irrigation districts to speak for them and asserted that each district should have a decision-making seat.

No consensus was reached on these issues at this time, and the group acknowledged needing to spend time on this at the next meeting to reach resolution.

## NEXT STEPS

- GSI will make changes to the LOI based on today's meeting, will circulate to the Gang of Five, and then will submit to Reclamation as discussed.
- Kate will send a doodle for the next meeting and additional meetings between now and March.
- Steve will call Dawn to find out the due date of the proposal.
- The next meeting agenda will include
  - Structure and decision-making
  - Timetable and decisions to be made

## MEETING EVALUATION

Everyone was invited to provide one piece of feedback about what they liked about the meeting, indicated below with a plus symbol (+), and one piece of feedback about what they would like to change for the next meeting, indicated with a delta symbol ( $\Delta$ ). Below are the results of this exercise.

+	$\Delta$
+ Good communication – everyone participated.	$\Delta$ Bigger meeting room.
+ Made progress – thumbs up.	$\Delta$ Keep moving forward.
+ Great facilitation.	$\Delta$ Nothing.
+ Snacks. (I have other things I liked but I am limited to one!)	$\Delta$ (Nothing noted.)