

Basin Study Work Group- Deschutes Subgroup

September 10, 2014, 1:00 pm to 3:00 pm
DeArmond Room, Deschutes Services Building
1300 NW Wall Street, Bend, OR 97701

Meeting Notes

ATTENDEES

Jeremy Giffin, Oregon Water Resources Department
Nancy Gilbert, US Fish and Wildlife Services
Brett Golden, Deschutes River Conservancy
Tod Heisler, Deschutes River Conservancy
Craig Horrell, Central Oregon Irrigation District
Ryan Houston, Upper Deschutes Watershed Council
Ted Wise, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Mike Britton, North Unit Irrigation District
Dave Dunahay, Central Oregon Flyfishers
Shawn Gerdes, Arnold Irrigation District
Anna Pakenham, DRC/OSU
Jeff Perreault, public
Kimberley Priestley (phone)*, WaterWatch
Mark Reinecke, Deschutes Water Alliance
Adam Sussman, GSI Water Solutions
Kate Fitzpatrick, Deschutes River Conservancy
Leslie Clark, Central Oregon Irrigation District
Bill Hopp, AttorneyforTumalo Irrigation District
Lauren Mork, Upper Deschutes Watershed Council
Suzanne Butterfield

**It was noted that the ability to hear on the phone was very limited, and we would try to address this in the future.*

Please let us know if you attended and your name was not captured here

AGENDA

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

1. Welcome
2. Self-introductions
3. Overview and approval of agenda
4. Review of subgroup tasks and timelines
5. Overview of Deschutes Water Planning Initiative
6. Discussion of approach for Plan of Study
7. Next steps
8. Meeting evaluation
9. Adjourn

WELCOME& INTRODUCTIONS

Craig Horrell convened the meeting. Participants introduced themselves.

OVERVIEW AND AGENDA

Kate Fitzpatrick reviewed the meeting agenda. No one had any revisions.

REVIEW OF SUBGROUP TASKS AND TIMELINE

Kate Fitzpatrick reviewed the Deschutes Subgroup tasks as they relate to the Basin Study requirements (see handout below). She suggested that this subgroup first identify which approach to take to generate and move water to meet needs in the Deschutes River system. Participants discussed expectations for subgroup recommendations to the Basin Study Work Group. The next Basin Study Work Group meeting should clarify those expectations.

Participants expect that the Memorandum of Understanding and Plan of Study will be developed over six months.

OVERVIEW OF DESCHUTES WATER PLANNING INITIATIVE WORK

Kate Fitzpatrick reviewed the process followed by and the work completed through the Deschutes Water Planning Initiative (DWPI).She briefly reviewed the water supply options developed through the DWPI, the concept of a water management scenario, and the conclusions of the DWPI.

Participants discussed whether the DWPI work provides the correct foundation for the Basin Study or whether the subgroup should consider an alternate approach. DWPI provided the tools and water supply options that could be applied to meet water supply needs (the “raw materials”). It has not yet assembled those water supply options in a scenario that all water users agree on, although one sample scenario was presented at the Nov 18 2013 workshop. Participants have not yet agreed on any details, including those related to costs, investments, mitigation, and other factors.

DISCUSSION OF APPROACH FOR PLAN OF STUDY

Participants discussed the role of the Deschutes Subgroup as it relates to the Groundwater and Instream Subgroups. Participants recommended that, as appropriate by geographic area, the Groundwater and Instream Groups nest their recommendations under the Deschutes Subgroup.

Participants discussed the scope of the problems to be addressed by the Basin Study. For example, the Deschutes Subgroup could identify and prioritize the most challenging problem (the upper Deschutes River, North Unit Irrigation District’s reliability and groundwater mitigation supply) and shape scenarios around those problems.

Summary of the participants’ suggestions to consider in the approach:

- identify how much water \$X, \$Y, and \$Z could create; allocate that water to achieve the greatest benefits; and agree on a scenario to move forward with.
- create scenarios to reach goals at \$X, \$Y, and \$Z, and agree on a scenario to move forward with.
- planning horizon and the potential to shift objectives temporally, with some objectives to be met earlier and some to be met later.
- The need to consider climate change and the planning horizon and timeframe
- The use of instream volumes instead of flows
- Consideration of both costs and potential funding sources
- The use of existing instream water rights vs new water rights

- Small amount of money should be used for new studies

Further discussion on approaches-

Participants discussed the need to consider both costs and potential funding sources. Cost may be different than value. For example, conserved water from Tumalo Irrigation District costs more per acre-foot but may be more attractive to environmental funders. A participant discussed the potential to identify goals, provide several cost caps, and direct the study team to identify scenarios that reach as far as possible towards those goals under those cost caps.

A participant recommended that the Basin Study Work Group discuss these issues with Hood River Basin Study participants.

A participant recommended that Basin Study partners better display the relative scales of the different goals.

A participant suggested that the Deschutes Subgroup consider identifying legal sideboards for the development and inclusion of water supply options in future scenarios.

Participants discussed how to frame the study for consultants. The Deschutes Subgroup could:

- provide clear goals and targets;
- provide draft tools developed from local knowledge;
- recommend objectives for scenarios; and
- provide expertise to evaluate scenarios where local expertise informs evaluation

Participants discussed flow targets, uncertainties related to flow targets, and the ecological benefits associated with those flow targets. They discussed the use of existing instream water rights versus the development of new water rights using better information. They discussed the benefits of an adaptive process and acknowledged the risks of a “moving goalpost.” Participants suggested that a small amount of funding invested in improving the basin’s understanding of stream flow targets could be valuable.

A participant suggested that identifying instream volumes could provide more flexibility than rates while providing additional certainty to existing water users. A participant commented that the study should still consider rates when allocating that water to certain locations or at certain times.

A participant discussed the need to consider climate change and its impacts on water supplies. Participants discussed the planning horizon for the study. The group discussed whether the proposed actions are only “band-aids” with project climate change.

Participants agreed that the purpose of this group is to agree on planning objectives and approach for the Basin Study.

NEXT STEPS

- Characterize planning objectives with regards to timeframes
- Agree on approach
 - DRC staff agreed to draft a “strawman” related to the above (summarize several possible approaches) based on what was heard today and to send out within two weeks.
- Bring in recommendations from the Deschutes Instream Subgroup
 - The Deschutes Instream Subgroup will bring back a summary of what could be done

MEETING EVALUATION

On paper forms, Kate Fitzpatrick 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
+ Good job Kate	Δ None- no facilitation from the outside
+ Free flowing	needed this time; good job Kate!
+ Still no closure on the plan, but I think this is OK for now.	Δ (Nothing noted.)
+ We are all struggling on an approach to frame the RFP	

Deschutes Subgroup Tasks as relates to Basin Study Requirements

Basin Study Requirement	Existing Info	Needed Info	Subgroup Task
<p>1. Projections of water supply and demand within the basin, including an assessment of risks to the water supply relating to climate change as defined in section 9503(b)(2) of the SECURE Water Act;</p>	<p>DWA Studies (2006) DWPI Water Supply Goals and Objectives (2013)</p>	<p>Updated Demands</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groundwater (groundwater group to recommend) • Instream (Instream group to recommend) • Ag (districts to confirm) <p>Climate change analysis</p>	<p>Considering water demands, agree on goals for Basin Study</p> <p>Recommend any additional analysis needed to inform the above</p>
<p>2. Analysis of how existing water and power infrastructure and operations will perform in the face of changing water realities and climate change, as well as other impacts identified within section 9503(b)(3) of the SECURE Water Act as appropriate;</p>	<p>Sufficient info exists under present climate conditions</p>	<p>Climate change analysis</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>3. Development of appropriate adaptation and mitigation strategies to meet future demands</p>	<p>-2006 DWA Studies -District water conservation plans -DWPI Outputs</p>	<p>Further development of supply options and scenarios</p>	<p>Agree upon approach, options and types of scenarios for Basin Study analysis</p>
<p>4. A trade-off analysis of strategies identified and findings and recommendations as appropriate. This includes an analysis of all proposed alternatives in terms of their relative cost, environmental impact, risk (probability of not accomplishing the desired/expected outcome), stakeholder response, or other attributes common to the strategies.</p>		<p>All</p>	