

Basin Study Work Group Steering Committee (BSC) Meeting

October 19, 2017, 9:00 am - 12:00 pm

Barnes & Sawyer Room, Deschutes Services Building, 1300 NW Wall Street, Bend, OR 97701

ATTENDANCE

Dave Dunahay, Central Oregon Fly Fishers

Craig Horrell, Central Oregon Irrigation District

Richard Ladeby, City of Madras

Bill Duerden, City of Redmond

Lisa Seales, Coalition for the Deschutes

Phil Henderson, Deschutes County

Tod Heisler, Deschutes River Conservancy

Terry Smith, Lone Pine Irrigation District

Mike Britton, North Unit Irrigation District

Russ Rhoden, Ochoco Irrigation District

Theresa DeBardelaben, Oregon

Department of Agriculture

Kyle Gorman, Oregon Water Resources

Department

Jer Camarata, Swalley Irrigation District

Marc Thalacker, Three Sisters Irrigation District

Mike Tripp, Trout Unlimited

Ken Rieck, Tumalo Irrigation District

Gregg Garnett, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation

Bridget Moran, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Peter Lickwar, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Jennifer O'Reilly, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Jason Gritzner, U.S. Forest Service

Ryan Houston, Upper Deschutes Watershed Council

Rex Barber, Water for Life

MEMBER ATTENDANCE BY PHONE

Adam Sussman, City of Bend

Jan Roofener, Deschutes County Soil & Water Conservation District

Kimberly Priestley, WaterWatch of Oregon

MEMBER ATTENDANCE BY EMAIL/PHONE AFTER THE MEETING

Chris Gannon, Crooked River Watershed Council

Tom Bennett, Natural Resources Conservation Service

Paul Lipscomb, Oregon Land and Water Alliance

Bonnie Lamb, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality

Tom Davis, Native Reintroduction Network

Shawn Gerdes, Arnold Irrigation District

MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS NOT PRESENT

Avion Water Company

Bend Paddle Trail Alliance

Central Oregon Cities Org.

City of LaPine

City of Prineville

Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs

Portland General Electric

Sunriver Anglers

Also Attending:

Jamie McLeod-Skinner, Oregon Congressional Candidate (Phone)

Jennifer Johnson, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation

Bea Armstrong, Deschutes River Conservancy
Leslie Clark, Central Oregon Irrigation District
Yancy Lind, citizen
Midge Graybeal, Akana Consulting
Casey Roats, Central Oregon Cities/City of Bend
Natasha Bellis, Deschutes River Conservancy
Edna Rey-Vizgirdas, Bureau of Reclamation

In addition, Mike Relf, Bureau of Reclamation, attended; Niklas Christensen, contractor with Watershed Professionals Network, attended; Kate Fitzpatrick, Deschutes River Conservancy, attended as Process Coordinator; Kelsey Wymore, Deschutes River Conservancy, attended as process support.

AGENDA

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

1. Welcome, introductions, and minutes: Craig
2. Study Element Updates
3. Scenario Development
 - Review revised draft Deschutes, Whychus and Crooked water management scenarios.
4. Communications
4. Public Comment: Kate
5. Next steps

WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, AND MINUTES

Craign Horell and Kate Fitzpatrick facilitated the meeting, welcomed everyone and asked for self-introductions. Craig reminded the group that the Study is nearing the end of its budget and that he looks forward to the group moving forward on scenario selection.

Meeting Minutes Approval

Minutes from the September 7, 2017 meeting, were approved with **ALL GREEN CARDS**

STUDY ELEMENTS UPDATE

Niklas Christensen gave an update on Water Professional Network progress:

- Niklas shared updates on the water conservation assessment. It's largely a summary of the Farmers Conservation Alliance work over the last two years. It also includes a review of the SWCD work on two private laterals in COID and Swalley, and a few changes to the on-farm assessment that Niklas walked the group through.
- Arnold Irrigation District and Lone pine System Improvement Plans (SIP) are done, but they are not yet included in the WCA. He will add them to the list after he receives them.
- Discussion around incentives needed for water users to upgrade irrigation systems.

Mike gave an update on Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) storage and modeling:

- Mike reiterated that the basin study is not an implementation plan. Its purpose is to generate scenario options. It is critical to keep in mind that no one scenario is the answer, we are just gathering information and presenting alternatives. Reclamation will be careful when presenting this information so it doesn't appear prescriptive.

- Reclamation is getting underway with modeling and will have results by May 2018. Reclamation will be requesting an extension of time from its own program to write up results, but the information will be available to the BSWG, cognizant that BSWG time/budget will be done.
- The storage technical working group has developed a recommendation that for the purposes of scenarios, BSWG consider a generic storage site, not a particular one.
- A technical sufficiency review team will look over the work Reclamation has done in modeling and climate change. U.S. Geological Service will likely be a technical reviewer.
- Jennifer Johnson and the modeling team have been hard at work on the model. She has come up with a method to finish it up and keep in budget.
- The technical working group and planning team have agreed on a good approach for modeling scenarios.
- Peter asked about the Prineville Reservoir pilot study Reclamation had mentioned as an independent effort. Jennifer reported that it's a pilot study to look at how reservoir operations may behave under future climate predictions. It's an investigation of how to conduct this type of study and Prineville was used as the example. Results can be shared when it is complete.

SCENARIO DEVELOPMENT

The goal is to approve scenarios for input into the Riverware model. Kate gave a brief background on the scenario development process to-date, introduced the scenario development discussion and gave a brief background of the activities. Kate reviewed the comments with the group from the last meeting regarding the options presented, and discussed revisions based on those comments, as outlined in the materials. She clarified that scenarios are meant to give us information about using and combining tools to get us to goals. These are not implementation plans.

A member asked how this plays into cities and how they can help find a permanent path to mitigation credits. Overall, scenarios are generating 200-300K acre-feet of water instream; the projected demand by cities is 13,000-20,000K AF over 50 years. Discussion that the water rights transfers incorporated in the scenarios should generate mitigation credits. Cities should stay engaged as scenario results are evaluated and feasibility issues identified.

Discussion of Scenarios included.

- Lack of input from the group may be information overload as there is a lot of technical information to digest.
- The planning team has spent a lot of time on these scenarios to make sure they are representative.
- A member commented that scenario 1 isn't reality based and that is concerning. The other concern is that people outside of this group think it is prescriptive and not just a scenario. Craig suggested that this will be further addressed in communications.
- Concern that the on-farm estimate (particularly piping private laterals) is too high in the scenarios, due to authority, feasibility and implementation issues, and therefore, the cost per acre is artificially low.

- On the other hand, discussion that the most cost-effective opportunities should be highlighted; this may highlight the need to focus on implementation issues.
- Discussion on how and when legislative may be needed; BWG will discuss whether there is any agreement around policy recommendations as part of scenario evaluation once modeling results are available.
- A member pointed out that once pressurized water is available, it brings landowners to consider on-farm opportunities and changes.

Some group members were reluctant to agree on the scenarios and discussion continued around costs, on-farm implementation, unrealistic expectations from the public, pressurized systems and communications. Craig reminded the group that this is a study, not an implementation plan. The study is supposed to look at tradeoffs of different alternatives. He is happy the group had this conversation and that these issues came out, and urged the group to move ahead with scenarios.

Kate asked for a group vote on the Deschutes scenarios approval – **GREEN CARDS except for One YELLOW CARD**. Mike Tripp, Trout Unlimited, raised the yellow card, with the concern that Scenario 1 is not feasible to implement and thus does not serve the group. As a reminder, as per the charter, a yellow card means a member does not like an agreement, but can live with it.

The Lower Crooked River Scenario was presented and reviewed by Kate. There was a brief discussion on scenario options. Jen, Russ and Kate will circle back on how to make sure the model represents OID's reduced duty in dry years. Kate asked for a group vote for approval – **ALL GREEN CARDS**

The Whychus Creek Scenario was presented and reviewed by Kate. Kate asked for a group vote for approval – **ALL GREEN CARDS**

COMMUNICATIONS

Bea gave an update on challenges in effectively communicating the BSWG to the general public. She introduced Edna Rey-Vizgirdas as Reclamation's communication representative now working with the communications subgroup. This work is incredibly technical and if we don't give the public the talking points and info, they will be misinformed and make assumptions. Bea wants to engage BSWG in the communication process. An open house meeting is an option in Bend and a town hall meeting in Madras in December. The communications subgroup is going to meet next week to figure out the talking points. The steering committee will be receiving an email from Bea to weigh in before materials are presented to the public. Edna commented that the public knows something is going on and there are only 6 months left to give the public a chance to hear what is going on here and what the process is.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Marc let the group know there is a historical and modernization exhibit displayed on the second level of the Deschutes County building for one month.

Phil Henderson said the Deschutes County Commissioners wrote a letter to SHIPO opposing the historical designation of 3 miles of Central Oregon Irrigation District canal. Craig will be in Salem in front of SHIPO tomorrow.

NEXT STEPS

The next BSWG meeting will be held in January 2018. November and December 2017 steering committee meetings have been canceled. New meeting information for 2018 will be communicated with the group through email notification.

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 (✓) indicates that someone repeated an item. The following comments were received.

*Meeting evaluation not conducted at June meeting

+	Δ
+ Good participation and discussion around scenarios.	Δ Worried how to keep the message simple – not a prescription, but a complex study
+ Keeping the group on schedule	
+ Open discussion	

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.”

P=participated
 O=participated by phone or email afterwards
 Empty cell=no participation

Organization	6/12/17	7/13/17	9/7/17	10/19/17
Arnold Irrigation District	P	P		O
Avion Water Company	P		P	
Bend Paddle Trail Alliance				
Central Oregon Cities Organization				
Central Oregon Flyfishers	P	P	O	P
Central Oregon Irrigation District	P	P		P
City of Bend	P	P	P	P
City of La Pine		P	P	
City of Madras			P	P
City of Prineville				
City of Redmond		P		P
Coalition for the Deschutes	P	P	P	P
Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs	P	P		

Crooked River Watershed Council				O
Deschutes County			P	P
Deschutes County Soil & Water Cons. Dist.		O	P	P
Deschutes River Conservancy	P	P		P
Lone Pine Irrigation District		P		P
Native Reintroduction Network		P		O
Natural Resources Conservation Service		P		O
North Unit Irrigation District		P		P
Ochoco Irrigation District		P	P	P
Oregon Department of Agriculture			P	P
Oregon Dept. of Environmental Quality		P	P	O
Oregon Land and Water Alliance	P	O	P	O
Oregon Water Resources Department		P	P	P
Portland General Electric		P	P	
Swalley Irrigation District	P	P		P
Sunriver Anglers	P	P	P	
Three Sisters Irrigation District				P
Trout Unlimited	P	P	P	P
Tumalo Irrigation District	P	P	P	P
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation		P	P	P
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	P	P	P	P
U.S. Forest Service	P			P
Upper Deschutes Watershed Council	P	P		P
Water for Life	P	P	P	P
WaterWatch of Oregon	P	P	P	P

