

Basin Study Work Group (BSWG) Steering Committee Meeting

May 27, 2014, 1:00-4:00 pm

Upstairs Conference Room, Mid-Oregon Credit Union
1386 NE Cushing Drive, Bend

(Near the corner of 27th and Neff)

Meeting Notes

ATTENDEES

The following people attended the meeting:

Bob Borlen, Central Oregon Irrigation District
Mike Britton, North Unit Irrigation District
Suzanne Butterfield, Swalley Irrigation District
Garrett Chrostek for Mark Reinecke, Bryant,
Lovlien and Jarvis for Avion
Leslie Clark, Central Oregon Irrigation District
Dave Dunahay, Central Oregon Flyfishers
Kate Fitzpatrick, Deschutes River Conservancy
Shawn Gerdes, Arnold Irrigation District
Nancy Gilbert, US Fish and Wildlife Services
Kyle Gorman, OR Water Resources Department
Tod Heisler, Deschutes River Conservancy
Brett Hodgson, OR Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
Bill Hopp, Tumalo Irrigation District

Ryan Houston, Upper Deschutes Watershed
Council
Mike Kasberger, Ochoco Irrigation District
Chris Louis, Lone Pine Irrigation District
Danielle MacBain, GSI
Kimberley Priestley, WaterWatch of Oregon
Ken Rieck, Tumalo Irrigation District
Adam Sussman, GSI
Marc Thalacker, Three Sisters Irrigation District
Pamela Thalacker, Three Sisters Irrigation
District
Mike Tripp, Trout Unlimited
Jeff Wieland, Upper Deschutes River Coalition

Mary Orton of The Mary Orton Company, LLC attended as facilitator.

AGENDA

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

1. Welcome
2. Self-introductions
3. Review and approval of minutes from April 17
4. Request from DBBC to pause for 45 days
5. Next steps
6. Meeting evaluation
7. Adjourn

Welcome and Introductions

Suzanne Butterfield welcomed everybody to the meeting. Participants were invited to introduce themselves.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

The April 17 meeting minutes were approved with the following addition: "Where charter language is dropped in, black text indicates items agreed-upon; blue text indicates items not yet discussed."

COMMUNICATIONS WITH RECLAMATION

Suzanne told the group that BOR expects to announce the Basin Study awards at the Western Governors' Conference June 9-11. Upon announcement, the DBBC will be eligible to enter into a

contract with the State of Oregon and the State money could start flowing. The next step would be to develop an MOA and Plan of Study with BOR.

REQUEST FROM DBBC TO PAUSE FOR 45 DAYS

Mike Britton, chair of the Deschutes Basin Board of Control (DBBC), explained why the DBBC has asked for a pause in activity. The DBBC has been engaged in the development of a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) for five years. Several million dollars have been spent and it is presently their number one priority. They are nearing some deadlines that are requiring a great amount of energy and output. They felt that in order to be fully engaged in that process, they could not simultaneously be fully engaged in the BSWG process. They are not abandoning this process, but just requesting a pause. He is hopeful that this group recognizes the value of the HCP to the districts and also to instream values. He reassured the group that the irrigation districts want to be and will be engaged in the BSWG, and they are asking for a pause to attain the HCP milestone that will allow them to have more time for BSWG. They are trying to have what they need done by mid-July, but the end of July is the drop-dead date. So right now they are asking for a pause until mid-July.

The group discussed and clarified the role of the Planning Team. The Planning Team is a group that works to prepare agendas and design meetings to try to make these meetings efficient and productive. It has no decision-making authority. It consists of Suzanne, Kate, Mike Britton, Mary, Danielle, Adam, and Tod.

Nancy commented that while she appreciates the irrigation districts' workload, the BSWG process has deadlines, too, and asked what needs to get done for the Basin Study. She added that while the DBBC is working on a product right now, that is just the start of the HCP dialogue and the process will continue to be time-consuming for them. Is the pause, in reality, going to be longer to accommodate that? She suggested that eventually we need these processes to move forward together, and there are likely some ways to achieve efficiencies. Mike emphasized how time-consuming the current product is. Nancy suggested that although the HCP can contribute to this basin planning effort, this is a broader effort: complementary, but broader. Mike agreed that they could dovetail somewhere in the process.

Suzanne proposed agreeing that if we awarded the study in June, DBBC would handle any state or federal deadlines that come up during the pause and would keep BSWG up-to-date by email.

Ryan suggested clarifying the timing of the Plan of Study development. The group discussed the idea that while the group has been saying that the Plan of Study would be completed by October (the most optimistic timeframe) for planning purposes, there are no hard deadlines. Others said that it was unlikely that Reclamation would be ready to proceed right after award.

Kimberley expressed concern that if deadlines for the Plan of Study arise in September/October and the groups haven't had time to meet, they may not be prepared. She suggested that subgroups that do not require DBBC participation could move forward during the pause (i.e. Crooked instream, Deschutes instream and groundwater subgroups). She also suggested finalizing the charter by email. This way, the group could make progress in some areas without consuming DBBC time.

Adam clarified that there is no timing pressure with the State funding. Mike Britton added that the state knows that DBBC is in the HCP process and bumping up against deadlines.

Ryan advocated for getting the charter done so we can hit the ground running after the pause. Regarding subgroups, on one hand we have developed good momentum that includes the input and time of outside consultants, but we have to make sure that there is lots of good dialogue with the larger group to ensure the subgroups are focused on what the larger group wants done.

Bob said it would be helpful to see a timeline set up. He considers this not as a pause, but the HCP as a subgroup that will bring its information back to the larger group in July. He sees nothing wrong with subgroups doing some work in between, and is open to dialogue over email for review of documents.

Pamela said that the DBBC wanted to participate in all the subgroups, but just does not have the bandwidth to be present right now. Every interest has a bias, and being present helps develop understanding and trust.

Tod said he could agree to a short-term pause, and the group needs to figure out how BSWG and the HCP are going to work together. Not talking about these issues heightens potential conflict. What do we need to do to continue to build trust and mutual support to get permits and a basin plan together? The DBBC is currently working behind closed doors on the HCP which puts others in an awkward position when they will be asked what they think about the plan.

It was acknowledged that there would be a major erosion of trust if DBBC moved forward in any substantive way on the Basin Study during the pause. So we need clear agreements on what happens and doesn't happen during the pause. What are the minimum things we need to do to remain credible with BOR and yet doesn't overstep the trust boundaries of this group?

Kimberley asked whether, if the group pauses, everyone could acknowledge that it may take until December to get the Plan of Study done. She also suggested checking in with others' workloads in August when the group would start ramping up again. Brett Hodgson, Kimberley, Mike Tripp, and Dave Dunahay will be gone for parts or all of August.

Marc Thalacker said that you would need to have the same meetings twice if DBBC is not there. He said the group should take its time to make sure the Plan of Study is thought through. He suggested examining what is relevant for the Basin Study outline, as it seems like there is a lot of energy on instream studies.

Ryan said he understood the importance of close coordination between the subgroups and the large group, and is comfortable with a pause. He asked if the HCP product would contain new information to inform this process. Mike Britton answered that Mary Vaughan (Biota Pacific and HCP contractor) wants to schedule a stakeholder meeting in July, which may be to parlay new information.

Kyle suggested that this be called not a pause, but rather a "retreat for enhanced planning for the future." Danielle clarified that her BOR contact is talking about the Plan of Study being done more around November or December. Mike Britton said 45-60 days is an estimate, and suggested a 30-day check-in to identify progress and when the group could start meeting again. There was a high level of interest in starting to understand the outcomes of the HCP to see where the overlaps with the HCP might be.

AGREEMENTS

Each of the following items was discussed separately and consensus tested on each. After all the items were agreed to, the entire package was tested for consensus, and the result was consensus with all green cards. For this meeting, any red cards blocked consensus, and yellow cards could speak to concerns if they want, but do not have to.

1. BSWG agrees to a rescheduling of about 60 days until approximately August 1. BSWG understands this means the Plan of Study development process can extend by the same timeframe if needed.

Consensus with all green cards.

2. The DBBC will provide a 30-day update on whether and how much additional time is needed before BSWG resumes, and will provide an update every 30 days if necessary.

Consensus with all green cards.

3. The BSWG subgroups will also pause in their work during this period.

Consensus with the following yellow cards: Brett Hodgson, Kimberley Priestley, Nancy Gilbert, Dave Dunahay, and Mike Tripp.

Dave commented that continuing the prioritization of reaches and miles would be useful.

Mike commented that there are subgroup tasks that have been delegated to individuals or agencies, and he sees no reason those cannot be completed before the next BSWG meeting.

Consensus with all green cards to add the language that individual/agency work can continue.

4. The Planning Team will continue work on the Charter with email input from all, and will circulate a draft in advance of the next BSWG meeting.

Consensus with all green cards.

5. Mike Britton will make sure the invitation to the HCP stakeholder meeting is sent to BSWG.

Consensus with all green cards.

6. When BOR calls DBBC with the award, DBBC will address all deadlines and will alert BSWG in advance, creating an opportunity to weigh in on any actions.

Consensus with all green cards.

7. When BOR calls DBBC with the award, the Planning Team will draft a press release and circulate it for review to BSWG. It will refer to the award as awarded to DBBC on behalf of the Basin Study Work Group.

Consensus with all green cards.

8. In the near future, meetings will be scheduled through December. (Kate will take the lead for Steering Committee meetings and chairs will take the lead for subgroup meetings.)

Consensus with all green cards.

9. USFWS and the DBBC (including Marty Vaughn) will work on how to communicate between BSWG and the HCP.

Consensus with all green cards.

10. The Planning Team will work on agendas for BSWG during the pause, with subgroup input, and will circulate them for comment.

Consensus with all green cards.

MEETING EVALUATION

On paper forms, Mary Orton invited everyone 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 (Δ). Below are the results of this exercise. Each check mark (\checkmark) indicates that someone endorsed a previously mentioned item.

+	Δ
+ We made rational decisions and communicated well.	Δ Make absolutely sure that everyone's concerns are addressed.
+ The openness of the participants.	Δ It took too long to decide on the delay.
+ People are civil to each other.	Δ Too much side conversation on northeast corner of table.
+ Frank discussion.	Δ Need a better location with parking.
+ Seemed efficient use of time, felt it was open discussion.	Δ Warmer room.
+ Orderly and efficient.	Δ Water. Spend a little money on comfort. (Maybe a little Basin Study money can be spent on meetings in the future.)
+ The willingness of everyone to understand the need for the rescheduling. All the green cards from the various interests was good.	Δ N/A.
+ Glad Adam and Kimberly were here in person.	Δ (Nothing noted.) $\checkmark\checkmark\checkmark$
+ Mary moved along to consensus.	
+ We completed the agenda under schedule.	
+ Got done early!	