

Basin Study Work Group Steering Committee (BSC) Meeting

March 3, 2015, 1:00 p.m. - 4:00 pm

Barnes and Sawyer Rooms, Deschutes Services Building, 1300 NW Wall Street, Bend, OR 97701

ATTENDANCE

(See Attachment A for the updated Active Members Tracking sheet.)

Member Representatives and Alternates Present

Arnold Irrigation District: Shawn Gerdes
Avion Water Company: Mark Reinecke
Central Oregon Flyfishers: Dave Dunahay
Central Oregon Irrigation District: Craig Horrell
City of Bend: Adam Sussman (also Technical Co-Coordinator)
City of Prineville and Central Oregon Cities Organization: Betty Roppe
City of Redmond: Bill Duerden
Crooked River Watershed Council: Chris Gannon
Deschutes County: Alan Unger
Deschutes River Conservancy: Tod Heisler, Kate Fitzpatrick (also Process Co-Coordinator)
Lone Pine Irrigation District: Chris Louis
Native Reintroduction Network: Tom Davis
Ochoco Irrigation District: Mike Kasberger
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality: Bonnie Lamb

Oregon Water Resources Department: Kyle Gorman
Portland General Electric: Bob Spateholts
Swalley Irrigation District: Suzanne Butterfield
Three Sisters Irrigation District: Marc Thalacker, Pamela Thalacker
Trout Unlimited: Mike Tripp
Tumalo Irrigation District: Ken Rieck
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation: Doug DeFlicht
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service: Nancy Gilbert, Peter Lickwar
Upper Deschutes River Coalition: Jeff Wieland
Upper Deschutes Watershed Council: Ryan Houston
Water for Life: Rex Barber
WaterWatch of Oregon: Kimberley Priestley

Member Organizations Not Present

Bend Paddle Trail Alliance
City of Madras
Natural Resources Conservation Service

North Unit Irrigation District
U.S. Forest Service

Also Attending

Bea Armstrong, Deschutes River Conservancy
Jeremy Giffen, Oregon Water Resources Department
Sarah Medary, Haner Park HOA

Salem Opeifa, Oregon Water Resources Department
Jeff Perreault

In addition, Mike Relf, Basin Study Lead from the Bureau of Reclamation attended the meeting. Mary Orton, The Mary Orton Company, LLC, attended as Facilitator and Anne George, The Mary Orton Company, LLC, attended and took notes.

AGENDA

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

1. Welcome, Self-Introductions, and Minutes
2. Project Manager
3. Plan of Study Development
4. Public Comment
5. Next Steps

6. BSWG Steering Committee Chair Transition
7. Meeting Evaluation

WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, AND MINUTES

Suzanne opened the meeting and welcomed everyone. Attendees introduced themselves. The minutes from the February 3, 2015 meeting were approved with no objection.

PROJECT MANAGER

Suzanne said that the Planning Team had begun to discuss the next stage of the project and recommendations to the BSC on the role and hiring of a project manager for the Basin Study. She noted that any approach would have to be consistent with public procurement rules under which the DBBC must operate. She said that Tod, Marc, and she had met and agreed on a possible approach for the recruitment of a technical project manager for the Basin Study, and they were looking for feedback from the BSC before further developing it.

Tod shared the possible approach. (Please see Attachment B for his PowerPoint presentation.)

- The Upper Deschutes Basin Study is an interdisciplinary study that will require many different experts.
- A tight interdisciplinary team must be developed of technical specialists from different fields including engineering, economics, marketing, water law and policy, and ecology.
- Project management is a separate technical specialty and will require an individual(s) who can communicate well, provide status reports, coordinate technical specialists, coordinate with Reclamation, implement public outreach, and manage the accounting on the study.
- The work of the consultants needs to be integrated and be outcome focused.

Tod said they recommended that someone who could manage the technical consultants and ensure deliverables were completed well should fill the project management role. They said they felt there existed capacity and knowledge in the BSWG to fill many of the project management and administrative roles of the project. He specified that COID was willing to give in-kind assistance to the Project Manager, and DRC was willing to subsidize assistance to the Project Manager. The goal would be to minimize administrative, coordination, and management costs to ensure there were sufficient funds for the technical studies.

Tod concluded by saying that, after receiving feedback from the BSC today, the Planning Team plus Marc and Ryan would develop a more detailed proposal regarding the hiring of a Project Manager for the BSC to review at the April BSC meeting.

Comments and questions included:

- I think you want to hire the Project Manager early because that person needs to be able to accept accountability.
- A technical advisory committee should be formed right away, comprised of people who are uninvolved and who will focus on the science, maybe from the areas of hydrology, groundwater and surface water, irrigation, recreation, and water quality. Oregon State University could help us make sure we are not wandering too far off on the science.
- If we hired a Project Manager and that person hired sub-contractors to complete the work, would that person need to follow procurement rules in the hiring of those sub-contractors?

- Suzanne replied that anyone hired on the study must be hired according to procurement rules.
- The plan sounds good on the surface.
- I would like to see a general contractor hired and let that person hire the specialists. The general contractor would use the technical advisory group as a resource. This would simplify our dealings with sub-contractors.
 - Marc replied that hiring a general manager would not work, based on the current budget numbers. He said he recommend the BSC allow the Planning Team to bring them a Project Manager proposal for their consideration.
- Do the organizations in this room have the capacity to do the task management part of this work?
 - Craig replied that COID had a stake in the success of the study and the organization was willing to provide in-kind work, while working with a Project Manager. He said he believed the study required a Project Manager who was part of a team. He said he thought splitting the work up would increase costs and that the group needed to hire a Project Manager.
 - Tod said DRC was willing to subsidize work with the Project Manager.
- You have to manage the project and the many pieces. You have 5 to 10 science-based disciplines that you have to make sure you do not over- or under-extend or misrepresent.
- A review committee could be created to blend the work together. An advisory committee would not need to rein in the information.

Adam said that language about a technical review team that understood what the experts were saying and could translate that back to the BSWG should have appeared in the Plan of Study. He said he knew that he wrote that section and for some reason it was not in the POS; however, it was in the project management graphic that was shared at the last meeting.

AGREEMENT: The group agreed that the Planning Team plus Marc and Ryan would bring a proposal for the scope and hiring process of a project manager to the next BSC meeting on April 7, 2015.

PLAN OF STUDY DEVELOPMENT

Adam presented the updated Task Tables (see Attachment C). He said the group first completed the challenging work of developing the specific task lists and budget estimates. This work had taken many months and would continue to progress. There had been many opportunities for individuals and organizations to provide input on the process and outputs.

Because of the work of the subgroups, the Budget Balancing Committee (BBC), and the BSC, the budget was now balanced. Reclamation has indicated that while it will be helpful to the BSC to have agreement on the level of detail in the Task Tables, a less detailed Task Table would appear in the Plan of Study to allow for flexibility as the study progresses.

Adam explained that the columns on the Task Tables marked “Initial Budget” showed the budget estimates the subgroups considered shortly after the first of the year. The columns marked “Subgroup Recommended Budget” provided the budget estimates based on feedback from the subgroups. The columns titled “Post-Budget Meeting” provided the most recent budget estimates and incorporated feedback from the BBC, as well as the Whychus Subgroup which met after the BBC meeting.

Adam said that everyone had worked diligently to find cost savings in an effort to balance the project budget. He added that the BBC deliberated with respect for the work of the subgroups in mind and did not approach the budget recommendations by simply cutting budget numbers.

Deschutes Subgroup Task Table

Significant Deschutes Subgroup budget changes noted by Adam:

- BSWG budget for Task 2.3 was reduced from \$150,000 to \$80,000 by the subgroup and the BBC.
- BSWG budget for Task 3.2 was reduced from \$100,000 to \$72,000, after discussion with Central Oregon Irrigation District.
- BSWG budget for Task 4.3 was reduced from \$80,000 to \$55,000, after a review of the work that needed to be done.
- BSWG budget for Tasks in Section 5 was reduced from \$140,000 to \$50,000. After the Deschutes Subgroup recommended a substantial cut, the BBC recommended the final reduction based on an estimate of 160 hours or less of contract consultant work, which they felt would be sufficient to complete the tasks from this section.

BSC comments included:

- The final budget recommendation from the BBC, following the work from the Deschutes Subgroup in February, resulted in a 45% overall budget reduction from the initial budget.
- Our assumption originally was that the trade-off analysis would have required a substantial budget. I support the budget as proposed, but if we find that we need more funding, I will be a strong advocate for using the reserve for this series of tasks.

Whychus Subgroup Task Table

Adam explained that the Whychus Subgroup met the day after the BBC meeting. The BBC had recommended a slightly more reduced budget than what appears in the Post-Budget Meeting columns of the Task Table following the Whychus Subgroup meeting.

Significant Whychus Subgroup budget changes noted by Adam:

- The BBC had recommended a budget of \$20,000 to complete the tasks in Section 4, but the Whychus Subgroup recommended a final budget estimate of \$27,000 for this section. The additional \$7,000 was taken from the budget reserve to allow for a balanced budget.
- The BSWG budget for tasks in Section 5 was reduced from \$30,000 to \$20,000.
- The final budget recommendation represents a 41% budget reduction for the Whychus Subgroup Task Table from the initial budget shown.

Crooked Subgroup Task Table

Adam said the BBC might not have understood that while the Crooked Subgroup had discussed and documented a reduction to its budget from \$111,000 to \$87,000, the Subgroup had not committed to that reduction. Adam said the BBC began its deliberations looking at a budget of \$87,000 and recommended that the budget be reduced to \$80,000. This budget represents a 28% cut from the initial budget estimate.

Significant Crooked Subgroup budget changes noted by Adam:

- The BSWG budget for the tasks in Section 4 was reduced from \$39,000 to \$30,000.
- The BSWG budget for the tasks in Section 5 was reduced from \$30,000 to \$10,000. Because of the implementation of the recent legislation regarding management of the Crooked River, the group indicated that they did not anticipate a need to assess many scenarios for this reach.

BSC comments included:

- What about the budget estimate for Task 4.1.c (*“Reconnaissance evaluation of potential structural storage opportunities [identify legal constraints first to guide analysis]”*)? Was Mike Kasberger at the BBC meeting?
 - Kate replied that he was not present and that there was more detail to the tasks in Section 4 than what was shown on the Task Table. The Crooked Subgroup indicated they wanted Reclamation to do the 4.1.c work and \$25,000 was budgeted, she said.
 - Mike Kasberger said that the work described would involve a broad review, unlike what is envisioned for the storage task on the Deschutes.
- The Deschutes and Whychus subgroups took a significant cut in Section 2, which was not the case for the Crooked.
 - Kate replied that each subgroup had its own story and different items were important for different subgroups, as follows:
 - The scenario work to be done on the Deschutes was very complex.
 - On the Whychus, Three Sisters Irrigation District trusted the supply studies that had been done and the budget reflected this. The scenario work would also be helpful on this reach.
 - On the Crooked, it may not be as important to run as many scenarios because of the legislation implementation. However, consensus did not yet exist regarding how much water was needed for instream. Some evaluation of options might be more beneficial than scenario work.
- The budget for Task 2.2 (*“To help refine instream demand, identify and apply an approach to evaluate year-round flow-temperature relationships in the Crooked River from Bowman Dam (river mile 72.8) to Osborne Canyon (14.1) and in Ochoco Creek from Ochoco Reservoir (10.4) to the mouth (0.0)”*) is important because everyone is interested in water quality. But if we talk about the mission of the study – to identify water imbalances – I am not sure Task 2.2 provides new water or is addressing water imbalances.
 - Kate replied that a Basin Study looked at existing and future water demand and how to mitigate that imbalance by evaluating options. It would be important to understand that imbalance on the Crooked, because there has not been consensus to date on how much water was needed in different parts of the year on this reach. Instream needs on the Crooked have not been fully defined, and this study will move the group toward that definition.
- The Subgroup originally budgeted for two instream flow studies and had earlier agreed to cut that in half. The “Initial Budget” columns from January 30, 2015 reflected an earlier 50% cut that had already been taken for the Crooked.
- At the end of the climate study, I am not sure what people will be able to agree to regarding storage. If temperatures increase and water is not stored as snow in the hills, the only way to capture the water for uses below would be new storage. We should look at the new storage.
 - Mary noted that looking at storage was supported at the Crooked Subgroup meeting. Funding had been moved from the BSWG budget to the Reclamation budget and increased from \$6,000 to \$25,000. These numbers were included in the collection of tasks in Section 4 of the Crooked Subgroup Task Table.

- Does the storage discussion imply that the rule curve will have to be adjusted?
 - If we are going to use the rule curve as an option and if on a dry year we need to change the rule curve to store more water, there will be no water to store.
 - Kate noted that there are ongoing discussions about when it might be useful to modify the rule curve. She said she wanted to remind members that in Task 4.1.i. (“*Evaluate addition legal constraints not addressed under other options [e.g., modifying rule curves]*”) there was budget to look at modifying rule curves and the parameters involved.
- I am concerned about money being spent on the federal side to do climate change studies because realistically we are going to have more, less, or long-term averages of water on a year-to-year basis. Without additional storage, we will not have supply. We are going to run reservoirs on real time water availability. I would suggest that much of the climate study budget be shifted into storage studies on the Reclamation budget.
 - Mike Relf replied that it made sense to think about whether the study had the right balance of resources. He said the reason climate change was inherent in the program was that the study needed to provide the best projections of supply and demand as the basis for the scenarios, including surface water and groundwater interactions. How new storage options or other options could benefit the region could be additional helpful information.

Overarching Task Table

Adam said that the Overarching Task Table cut across all of the study areas. He said he had received feedback from Reclamation on reducing the budget on the Overarching Task Table. In addition, a number of other changes had been made:

- The scope reserve was increased from \$25,000 for each partner to \$50,000 for Reclamation and \$45,000 for BSWG. Adam said he thought the reserve should be \$75,000 for each partner, but the current levels allowed the budget to be balanced.
- The Communications and Outreach Plan (COP) was added to the budget, with \$5,000 budgeted for each partner. This is not a substantial budget to conduct quarterly public meetings, but the BBC thought the group could use existing resources from the irrigation districts and the cities.
- In Section 7 of the Overarching Task Table, the Project Management budget has been increased to \$80,000 for each partner, a substantial increase from the initial budget. Adam said he derived the Project Manager costs by estimating a project manager hourly fee of \$100. Based on this rate, the current budget would pay for 1000 hours of Project Manager time, approximately 28 hours per month over a three-year period.

Mike Relf said Task 2, evaluating stream quality, was originally identified only on the Deschutes Subgroup Task Table, and later was shifted to an overarching task. Adam said after discussion and the presentation from Jennifer Johnson, they agreed that RiverWare would allow them to evaluate temperature changes using existing data. This was not solely a Deschutes-specific task and they could use it in the trade-off analysis work in all of the reaches.

BSC comments included:

- Data availability is important to understand, especially since we do not have much money for data acquisition.
- Do not commit to contractors that you have data that you do not actually have for the modeling.

Adam directed the group to the POS Roll-up Table and said that the entire budget from the Post-Budget Meeting columns was summed in this table. Tasks 1 through 7 on the table were the

requirements of the Basin Study. Adam said the Project Manager would need to be guided by the Task Tables, so they had included language in the POS section titled “Project Manager” that the BSWG had developed detailed information about the tasks to guide in their execution.

Task Table Discussion

Mary invited comments and suggestions from members regarding any of the Task Tables.

Comments and questions included:

- Is Reclamation comfortable with the level of detail in the POS?
 - Mike Relf replied that they were and that the detailed tables had allowed the group to focus on what the group wanted to include in the study. However, as the study progressed, he said the group would need to shift funds depending on what happened. He said the work done had been a great start and it informed the Roll-up Table so everyone could have more confidence in completing these tasks.
- I hope the BSWG budget for Task 7 (\$241,600) can be reduced by a third via contracting packaging.
- I am surprised to see that the budgets for Task 3 and Task 5 are similar. I suggest moving money from Task 3 to Task 5. We may also need additional funds to complete Task 5, but I am not proposing a change at this time.
 - After Kate said the funds allocated for COID fit into Task 3, but the work was actually part of the work of Task 5, the commenter withdrew any concern.
- I commend the work of the BBC and the subgroups.
- The term “evaluate” has a number of different meanings. When I see it I think it is getting down to the numbers and I do not think this is something you can do.
 - Mike responded that the term did have a broad meaning and that in this case the subgroups had specified what they wanted to look at in Task 3.
- The term “evaluate” needs to be defined in any RFP or RFQs.

CONSENSUS: The group agreed by consensus to approve for now the Task Tables as presented today given that the numbers may change in the future.

Mary noted that Kate and Adam’s work on the Plan of Study, along with that of the subgroups, had allowed the members to approve the Task Tables by consensus, and she invited the BSC to applaud their work.

Plan of Study Narrative

Mary said the group would next review the narrative of the Plan of Study (POS). If additional time were needed to review, the group could discuss additional items at the next BSC meeting. She said if consensus could not be found on the POS, the Charter allowed for the Chair to appoint a small group to bring back a revised POS to the BSC.

Mike discussed the process once the POS was approved by the BSC. He said the Area Manager from Reclamation, who will ultimately sign the Memorandum of Agreement, would review the completed POS and would likely have comments. Mike would provide a revised POS to the Management Team at Reclamation for their review. Salem mentioned that the Oregon Water and Resources Department, the funding partner on the non-federal cost share partner portion of the project, would also review the POS to ensure that the State of Oregon finds it satisfactory.

Many BSC members noted that they needed more time to review the draft POS. The group agreed to the following deadlines:

- March 10: Comments on the POS due from BSC to Adam.
- March 13: Revised, redlined POS will be distributed.
- March 17: Deadline for members to object to any proposed revisions to the POS.
- April 7: BSC seeks final approval.

Reclamation and the funders from OWRD said they would provide feedback on POS by March 27, and the final version will be sent to the BSC after that date.

Kate told the group that Jonathan La Marche from OWRD was not able to attend the meeting today and had provided some comments on the POS, mostly adding studies and details of models, that would be incorporated into the revised POS.

Mary invited comments on the POS narrative, and said that the group would attempt to reach consensus on the suggested changes. She said the Planning Team or another small group would address, after the meeting, any comments on which the group did not reach consensus.

The following changes to the narrative POS were agreed to by consensus of the BSC:

- Pages 7 and 8, Section 2.2, Water Quality: Add that they will look at the effects of temperature on the river.
- Page 9, Models: Add more about what each model addresses.
- Page 13, Section 3.2, Roles and Responsibilities of the Study Team: Add BSWG Charter language for the role of the BSC as the decision-making body.
- Page 13, Section 3.2, Roles and Responsibilities of the Study Team: Add BSWG Charter language to clarify that the BSC chooses contractors.
- Page 13, Section 3.3, Change Management Plan: Add that significant changes would be approved by the BSC.
- Page 14, Section 3.4, Risk Management Plan: Add that risks defined in bullet #5 (*“risks determined to be most likely and to have the greatest potential impact”*) will be reported to some body (as in Section 3.3).
- Page 18, Task 2, “Analysis of Current and Future Water Demand,” 5th bullet: Move that language (*“Assess data availability and implement appropriate analytical approaches to evaluate temperature issues affecting stream water quality”*) from the Upper Deschutes subbasin section to the section describing overarching tasks.
- Communication and Outreach Plan: Specify how the BSC will be updated on changes to the COP.
- Include in an appropriate place the requirement for progress reporting.

The group also agreed by consensus that the Communications Subgroup (when it was named) would address the following comments:

- Regularly update SHARC/Upper Deschutes area.
- Address whether and which consultants should attend the public meetings.

The following comments were not agreed to in the time allowed and will be assigned to the Planning Team or another small group for resolution:

- Page 5, Section 2.1, last sentence of the first paragraph: *“Ultimately, most new water demands must be met through the reallocation of existing supply.”* This seems presumptive that there would be moving and shifting of the current allocation. I have trouble with the word “most” in that sentence.
- Page 9, Section 2.3, 4th bullet, *“The Upper Deschutes Watershed Council and Crooked River Watershed Council collect continuous temperature data and water quality data (pH and dissolved oxygen) across the Deschutes River and its tributaries.”* The CRWC collects more data than pH and dissolved oxygen. Perhaps remove the parenthetical comment or preface it with “e.g.”
- Add riverfront property owners to the list of target constituents.

Other comments and questions included the following:

- Pages 14-15, Section 3.5, Technical Sufficiency Review Plan: Mike said that the Basin Study Program required a technical proficiency review, and there was some flexibility regarding the number of reviewers needed and the timing of the review work. The guidance, he said, is that it was better to do the reviews throughout the study as the work was done. He said at Reclamation they send a technical memo to a technical review team as soon as it is completed. This section included some assumptions and he asked that members review it because changes could be made. In answer to a question, Mike replied that prior peer reviews could serve the place of technical reviews, and it would be helpful to know which items had been peer reviewed.
- Page 19, Task 4, Develop Options to Meet Future Water Supply Needs: What is the significance and context of Monner Dam?
 - Monner was assessed in the early 1970s and has been talked about for many years as a multi-pronged solution to address water supply issues. It seems to fit nicely in this type of study to shift and move water, rather than finding new supplies, although some may want to see that as well.
 - The 1970 study looked at a whole suite of sites and Monner Dam was the one that showed possibility. For this study, Reclamation was not comfortable with looking solely at Monner and said they would look at many options. If the previous study is still correct, they would then look more closely at Monner.
- Page 21, Task 6, Develop Draft and Final Basin Study Report: Mike said that the BSWG and Reclamation would work together on the Draft and Final Basin Study reports. He said the Basin Study Report would be a unified report of all the work that had been done. The report would also reference the work of any consultant on specific studies or reports. However, he said Reclamation would work to limit appendices so the document was not unwieldy. Mike confirmed that studies and reports could be made available on the project website.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment was provided.

BSWG STEERING COMMITTEE CHAIR TRANSITION

Suzanne said it had been an honor to serve as Chair of the BSWG Steering Committee, and that she was pleased to pass the mantle of Chair to Craig Horrell.

MEETING EVALUATION

Members were provided forms on which to write 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). Each check mark (\checkmark) indicates that someone endorsed a previously mentioned item. The following were received.

+	Δ
+ Excellent preparation of documents, materials.	Δ Onus on Work Group to be better prepared through document review.
+ Volume of tasks accomplished.	Δ Well, more time to review materials would be grand; probably not in the cards.
+ Good comments! I was surprised we only had 15 comments.	Δ Identify missing parties and note their attendance percentage.
+ Good progress.	Δ Have a briefer on who is on what committees.
+ A lot was accomplished.	Δ ?
+ Good meeting. High productivity level.	Δ All acceptable.
+ Good discussions.	Δ (Nothing noted.) ✓✓✓✓✓
+ Following closely the agenda.	
+ Well run meeting.	
+ Coordination of the meeting comments.	
+ I think your best facilitation yet, Mary.	
+ Facilitator got busy at end stopping very important discussion; too worried about schedule.	
+ Glad no one was on the phone.	

ADJOURN

Suzanne adjourned the meeting at 4:00 pm.

Attachment A: BSC Active Members List

From Section 3.a of the Charter: “If a member organization does not participate in decision-making at two consecutive meetings by attendance or by email (see 4.a.vi), that organization cannot participate in decision-making until after it participates at two of the prior four meetings.”

Organization	11/3/14	1/6/15	2/3/15	3/3/15
Arnold Irrigation District	P	P	P	P
Avion Water Company	P	P	P	P
Bend Paddle Trail Alliance				
Central Oregon Cities Organization	P	P	P	P
Central Oregon Flyfishers		P	P	P
Central Oregon Irrigation District	P	P	P	P
City of Bend	P	P	P	P
City of Madras				O
City of Prineville	P	P	P	P
City of Redmond	P	P	P	P
Crooked River Watershed Council	P	P	P	P
Deschutes County	P		P	P
Deschutes River Conservancy	P	P	P	P
Lone Pine Irrigation District	P	P	P	P
Native Reintroduction Network	P		P	P
Natural Resources Conservation Service			P	
North Unit Irrigation District	P	P	P	
Ochoco Irrigation District	P	P	P	P
Oregon Dept. of Environmental Quality	P	P	P	P
Oregon Water Resources Department	P	P	P	P
Portland General Electric		P	P	P
Swalley Irrigation District	P	P	P	P
Three Sisters Irrigation District	P	P	P	P
Trout Unlimited	P	P	P	P
Tumalo Irrigation District	P	P	P	P
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation	P	P	P	P
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	P	P	P	P
U.S. Forest Service	P	P	P	O
Upper Deschutes River Coalition		P	P	P
Upper Deschutes Watershed Council	P	P	P	P
Water for Life			P	P
WaterWatch of Oregon	P		P	P

Attachment B: Project Manager Discussion PowerPoint Slides

Attachment C: BSWG Task Tables