

Basin Study Work Group: Deschutes River Subgroup Meeting

DeArmond Room, Deschutes Services Building
1300 NW Wall Street, Bend, OR 97701

October 28, 2014, 1:00 pm to 3:00 pm

Attending

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
Mike Britton, North Unit Irrigation District
Dave Dunahay, Central Oregon Flyfishers
Shawn Gerdes, Arnold Irrigation District
Kimberley Priestley, WaterWatch
Mark Reinecke, Deschutes Water Alliance
Adam Sussman, GSI Water Solutions
Kate Fitzpatrick, Deschutes River Conservancy
Leslie Clark, Central Oregon Irrigation District
Ken Rieck, Tumalo Irrigation District
Lauren Mork, Upper Deschutes Watershed Council
Suzanne Butterfield, Swalley Irrigation District
Bonnie Lamb, Department of Environmental Quality
Mike Tripp, Trout Unlimited
Chris Louis, Lone Pine Irrigation District
Kyle Gorman, Oregon Water Resources Department
Jennifer O'Reilly, US Fish and Wildlife Services
Jason Gritzner, US Forest Service
Gail Snyder, Central Oregon Landwatch
John Warinner, Geospatial Solutions
Anne George, The Mary Orton Company

1. Welcome

Craig Horrell convened the meeting.

2. Introductions

Participants introduced themselves and declared their desired meeting outcomes.

3. Overview and approval of agenda

Kate Fitzpatrick reviewed the agenda. She introduced Anne George, a facilitator and mediator with The Mary Orton Company, LLC, and invited Anne to assist with facilitation for the remainder of the meeting.

4. Discussion of Basin Study approach

1.1. Use the approach diagram as a tool to discuss Basin Study approach

The BSWG Draft Basin Study Approach Diagram was projected on a screen for participants to view. Participants then used the approach diagram as a tool to understand and prompt discussion about the approach. Under this approach, the Basin Study will identify strategies that incrementally and simultaneously address baseline irrigation, municipal, and instream needs. It assumes that strategies related to major infrastructure (such as large reservoirs) will be applied to go beyond baseline needs.

Participants discussed the role of studies, particularly those related to instream needs, in this approach. Participants agreed that they have not settled on instream needs in some reaches. Under this approach, target stream flows refer to both agreed upon targets and any targets developed through the Basin Study.

Participants provided the Deschutes Basin Board of Control's review of this approach. The districts would like the Basin Study to contribute to the development of long-term plans that identify how each district will meet their own needs in the future. These plans could be drought plans, master plans, infrastructure improvement plans, or other plans as appropriate for each district. Irrigation districts would like the Basin Study to emphasize these plans on par with instream-related studies.

Participants discussed whether these long-term plans will be focused on strategies or outputs. Participants conversed about potential levels of investments in these plans and whether those investments will be enough to develop these plans. The need to develop and implement mitigation and adaptation strategies in the context of broader district plans was also discussed. Participants agreed that inter-district relationships and actions will be central to mitigation and adaptation strategies.

The group discussed how questions for the study could be helpful outputs from the discussion surrounding the approach diagram. It was suggested that members work to identify a list of questions that they would like answered through the Basin Study and these questions could help inform the Plan of Study.

The approach diagram was projected onto a screen to start discussion. The group was asked for their thoughts on whether the approach diagram was helpful in the creation of a Plan of Study (PoS). Participants shared these comments;

- We need clarity on the role of studies in baseline efforts, specifically with regard to the Crooked River.
- The instream box on the diagram could include text about ODFW needs.
- Another slice could appear in the blue section of the diagram that includes a drought & infrastructure improvement plan.

- Do we need a different diagram or a set of diagrams with more emphasis on each mitigation tool? (If you turned one of the blue “knobs” what would each diagram look like?)
- Do we need a new blue slice on the diagram (a new “knob”) called “Inter-Irrigation District Cooperation?”
- Does the diagram need a third and lower horizontal line that demarcates an irrigation district plan?
- The Study is built on identifying benefits for all three stools of the project (irrigation districts, instream, and municipalities.)
- Can the irrigation districts get what they need with the scale of funding available?
- Agreements will be based on results of studies.
- We want to focus the study on solutions.
- We want to develop a capital project list as a result of study.
- Some feel basin study funds need to go to create district improvement plans.
- Optimize the study to help identify how irrigation districts could work together to result in efficiencies.
- It is very important to do good planning and analysis. We don’t want to rush into project planning before master planning is completed. The result of the study should not be just a list of projects.
- Homework for everyone: What are the questions that would need to be answered in the analysis?
- Two important takeaways so far in development of PoS:
 1. The districts need to know that the Basin Study will lead to sustainability.
 2. Intra-district cooperation will be a critical area for analysis.

Members were asked to develop questions that they would want answered in the Basin Study. It was suggested that members work with their caucuses to help develop these.

1.2 Discuss Benefits by Sector

Ryan Houston brought instream recommendations to the Deschutes Subgroup (Attachment 1). He highlighted that these recommendations did not represent the opinions of everyone with an instream interest. He also acknowledged that instream interests have accounted for costs when developing their questions.

Ryan reviewed the upper Deschutes River as an example. He commented that, in the upper Deschutes River, the group recommended having both a minimum winter and maximum summer target. He commented on the different methods used to develop targets in the past and some of the desired outcomes now.

Participants agreed that the recommendations were relatively straightforward. They discussed instream priorities. Ryan Houston suggested that identifying the flows needed to allow for physical restoration in a reference reach of the upper Deschutes River from Wickiup Reservoir to Fall River could be a priority.

Participants discussed the relationships of the Basin Study mitigation strategies and existing targets and available and potential studies to identify flow needs. Ryan Houston commented that additional information would elucidate the benefits from increased stream flows. Participants discussed the relationships between riparian vegetation and flow and the use of riparian vegetation as a proxy for a functioning system.

Participants briefly discussed whether and how mitigation and adaptation strategies that reduce summer water use will increase winter stream flows.

The group discussed the approach diagram by sector. As comments and questions were raised about instream considerations they were noted on a flip chart:

- Why does the diagram start at fifteen years from now? Why not zero to ten years from now?
- Is there a sense of priorities?
- With a focus on an increase in cfs returned to the rivers, what does that increase in water get us? What are the demands and needs? In other words, we might understand how much more water we can have in the rivers. We also need to have a better understanding of the impact or benefits of additional water instream.
- We need to study seasonal flow levels and their impacts.
- There is a “what” and a “how” in this process.
- We need to identify study questions to answer.

Participants will review the proposed instream study questions and identify any potential revisions. They’ll contact Ryan Houston with any recommendations to either general study questions or specific studies.

5. Plan of Study development process

Adam Sussman spoke about how the group could participate in developing the Plan of Study. He recommended that the subgroups discuss issues and recommendations for the Plan of Study. The subgroups would discuss and vet suggestions from members for the draft Plan of Study and the consultants would incorporate subgroup suggestion into the draft Plan of Study. Staff and consultants would review sections with specific participants while they were drafting them. Staff and consultants would bring these pieces back to the appropriate subgroups for further discussion.

Participants discussed Reclamation’s role and the need for their involvement. Participants recommended close coordination with Reclamation as they developed the Plan of Study.

6. Next steps

7. Action items and parking lot

Action Item: Adam will consult with Reclamation as he continues to develop the Plan of Study.

Action Item: Adam will share draft pieces of the Plan of Study at the next meeting.

Action Item: Instream advocates will review the proposed instream study questions and identify any potential revisions. They will contact Ryan Houston with any recommendations for general study questions or specific studies.

Action Item: Ryan Houston will work with Adam Sussman and begin drafting Plan of Study tasks (i.e. draft RFPs based on the study questions discussed today)

Action Item: The DBBC and groundwater advocates will develop draft proposed study questions and bring them for discuss at upcoming subgroup meetings.

8. 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 discussion- feel Plan of Study taking shape	Δ Less focus on the diagram of the approach. The visual was good, but caused too much focus on it.
+ The discussion about how to approach the Basin Study was robust	Δ Tighter time management in first half
+ Chocolate and coffee	Δ (Nothing noted.) $\checkmark\checkmark\checkmark$
+ Good dialogue	Δ Longer meeting to maximize
+ The openness to discuss issues that have been said in the back room in the past	Δ Anne should take a little more charge of calling on people or putting up cards- some method needed
+ “Facilitation Lite” effective: appropriate/needed degree	Δ Meeting should be 1 hour longer
+ Productive, diplomatic conversation	Δ Unclear how work on other groups will mesh up with Deschutes subgroup
+ “facilitation light” apropos for this group- no facilitation might have wasted time and productivity, so good call	
+ Good information	
+ Conversation, Anne’s style was appreciated	
+ Progress, tangible steps to move forward	
+ Graphic was good	
+ Adam’s ideas are great	

