

Upper Grande Ronde River Watershed Partnership
Place-Based Integrated Water Resource Planning
Stakeholder Meeting No. 32

Meeting Minutes
September 16, 2020
Conference Call

ATTENDANCE:

Adrienne Averett, Dave Johnson, Leonard Flint, Larry Larson, Rodger Huffman, Tim Bailey, Jed Hassinger, Bill Gamble, Donna Beverage, Jesse Steele, Tony Malmberg, Matt Insko, Anton Chiono, Kyle Carpenter, Curt Ricker, Steve Parrett, Dana Kurtz, Brett Moore

I. WELCOME

a. Introductions

Donna welcomed the group at 5:05pm. Donna stated the next meeting will hopefully have an in-person option.

b. Meeting Guidelines

Donna discussed guidelines for virtual meetings: state your name, speak up when talking, and use chat function.

c. Recap of June 24, 2020 Stakeholder meeting

Dana provided a recap of the June 2020 meeting. Feedback was sought about meeting time preference; 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. is the preferred time. Dana stated that the Partnership is applying for an OWRD feasibility study grant due October 15. The Partnership indicated support for this application.

i. Step 4 report schedule, overview, and preliminary comments

Most recent draft was emailed to everyone September 8; it includes incorporation of additional comments since last meeting.

II. Step 4 Report Review (80 minutes)

a. Revised Schedule

Dana presented the revised schedule:

October 14, 2020	VOTE to adopt Step 4 Report
November 11, 2020	Review DRAFT Step 5 Report
December 9, 2020	Revisions to Step 5 Report
January 2021	Revisions to Step 5 Report
February 2021	Adopt DRAFT Step 5 Report
March 1, 2021	Need to Submit plan to allow for 30-60 days agency review (ODA, ODFW, OWRD, DEQ)
April 2021	Wait/work implementation
May 2021	Wait/work implementation (presentation of final plan to the OWRD commission)
June 30, 2021	Grant extension expires

Upper Grande Ronde River Watershed Partnership
Place-Based Integrated Water Resource Planning
Stakeholder Meeting No. 32

- b. Review and discussion of stakeholder comments

Dana led discussion of stakeholder comments. See *attachment*.

III. Conclusion (5 minutes)

- a. Requests for Step 5 working groups forthcoming
- b. Next meeting is October 14, 2020 (5-7) Misener Room/Conference Call
- c. Other Comments

Donna adjourned the meeting at 6:55 p.m.



Place-Based Integrated Water Resources Planning

Stakeholder Committee Meeting No. 32

Upper Grande Ronde River
Watershed Partnership

Union County, Oregon
September 16, 2020



I. Welcome



Meeting Agenda

- Welcome
- Step 4 Report Review
- Conclusion



Introductions

- Name
- Organization



Meeting Guidelines

- Use Chat Function (remind me if I miss it)
 - State your name when talking
 - Speak up
-



Recap of June 24 Stakeholder Meeting + Admin

- **Virtual Meeting** – we are attempting a combination meeting tonight (please share feedback)
- **Step 4 Preliminary Comments**
- **Received additional comments** and were incorporated into document to be discussed tonight (sent out 9/8)
- **Meeting Times** – a change in meeting time (5-7) for the next few months based on the poll. **Not many people voted, keep the same or change for Oct-Dec?**



Recap of June 24 Stakeholder Meeting + Admin

- **OWRD Feasibility Study Grant Application**– Deadline is October 15, would be awarded in April 2021 (hopefully after plan is complete).
- The Steering Committee supports an application for a water storage feasibility study (tentatively planned to be just above ground storage).
- There is funding now, might not be funding later. Storage is our top strategy, and this is the next step. **Is the group supportive of this effort?**
- Need 50% match funds – so we would look at OWEB, BOR. Any other ideas?



Recap of June 24 Stakeholder Meeting + Admin

- **Timelines and meetings for the next 9 months:**

- October 14, 2020 – **VOTE** to adopt step 4 report
- November 11 – review Draft step 5 report
- December 9 – revisions to step 5 report
- January – revisions to step 5 report
- February – adopt DRAFT step 5 report
- **March 1, 2021 – need to submit plan to allow for agency review (ODA, ODFW, OWRD, DEQ,) 30-60 days for agency review)**
- April – wait/work implementation
- May– wait/work implementation (presentation of final plan to the OWRD commission)
- **June 30, 2021 – grant extension expires**



II. Step 4 Report Review



Step 4 – Revised Schedule

- ~~Report reviewed by the steering committee (review completed: 6/15)~~
- ~~Emailed to stakeholders (6/16)~~
- ~~Preliminary Comments were due (6/23)~~
- ~~Will be discussed at tonight's meeting (6/24)~~
- ~~Comments are due one week after tonight's meeting (Wednesday 7/1)~~
- ~~Comments will be addressed and compiled. Revised report will be sent to stakeholders on week after comments submitted (7/8)~~
- Report sent out 9/8 – to be discussed tonight
- Revised report to be sent out within 1 week after stakeholder meeting (9/23)
- Send any additional comments within 1 week (9/30)
- If new comments minimal/stakeholders indicate they are addressed satisfactorily, we will plan to vote on the Step 4 Report at the next stakeholder meeting (10/14). Will let you know by 10/7 if a vote is planned.



Step 4 – Comments 1/5

Calculation Questions – All from Step 2 and Step 3 reports

- **Ag Demand:** How were estimated evapotranspiration factors included in the total agricultural water use?
 - **Ag Demand:** How was future increased irrigation efficiency calculated to show reduce overall future irrigation demands by 24 percent? What would those irrigation efficiencies look like?
 - **Municipal Demand:** Why is self supplied industrial demand (SSIU) demand project to increase 4 fold by 2068?
 - **Instream Demand:** How do we know this demand is being met now, these are just “paper rights”?
-



Step 4 – Comments 2/5

- **Comments**

- **“Balance”** changed to align the available resources with current and future demands (same as governance agreement)
- **Clarify who will benefit from conserved water** –The default use for water generated through efficiency gains will be to benefit the next junior water rights holder, however this water could potentially be protected instream or transferred into OWRD’s conserved water program which protects some portion of the water instream and may allow some of the conserved water to be used for new beneficial uses. Much of this will depend on funding sources, landowner preferences, and project goals.
- **Modeling concerns:** Concerns about basic issues compounding and implying greater value to modeling output than is warranted (several caveats are included in the report about modeling outputs, but stakeholders have decided to include this information in reports, and we are required to estimate future conditions by OWRD so using RCP 8.5 is the approach we agreed upon in Step 3).
- **Strategy concerns:** Concern about carrying forward strategies that cannot address the deficits identified (plan to keep all strategies due to stakeholder desire to do so, will have different levels of focus in step 5 (top 5 strategies first)
- **Too high of goals:** Keeping the 100% eliminate water deficit goal (aspirational) some stakeholders expressed concern, but no viable alternative (ie: 10%, 95% was provided so 100% for water quantity remains, along with a statement about it being aspirational)
- **Too long of timelines for objectives** – Most stakeholders agree on this point, to address it, benchmarks and interim steps to be completed will be included in step 5. Also, we have the statement in the Step 4 report regarding trying to speed up timelines when possible.



Step 4 – Comments 3/5

- **Comments**
 - **Concerns about on-channel storage** – multiple stakeholders have expressed concerns about on-channel storage. It has been proposed that that we combine built storage to be “above ground and below ground”. This provides the option to look into on-channel storage, off-channel storage, and underground storage. Statement was added “Given the challenges of siting on-channel storage facilities in a basin with ESA-listed species, sensitive cultural sites, and river recreation, the UGRRW Partnership further condensed the built storage category to “aboveground storage and underground storage.” The Partnership felt that this acknowledged these unavoidable siting challenges, but still enabled an evaluation of potential aboveground storage sites in the future on a case-by-case basis. “ The steering Committee reviewed this change and supports it.
 - **Citations and Extended Executive Summary** – more citations and longer summary now – please review



Step 4 – Comments 4/5

Voting and Governance (all quotations from Governance agreement)

- **Covid 19** – as always, you can call into meetings and this counts for attendance.
- **Meeting attendance 2/4 meetings question:** “Individuals must have attended (in person or through conference call) at least two of the last four meetings to participate in decision making.” (This means of last 4 meetings you need to attend 2 to vote in the current meeting (meeting number 5).
- **Review of reports should count for voting (not just meeting attendance)**– Review of reports is very important for match funding and to produce the best documents. However it is necessary to attend meetings to build consensus through hearing conversation and differences in opinion. Additionally, the Governance Agreements states that to vote you “must have attended” meetings.
- **Concern about agencies as stakeholders** – “The Stakeholder Committee will consist of all those balanced representation of local Partners willing to participate in the planning process and who have an interest in water related issues within the Watershed.” “Each Stakeholder Committee organization or individual that is a signatory to the MOU will have one vote, regardless of the number of additional individuals from that organization that are present at meetings.” (This statement was agreed to in the governance document, and additionally agencies also contribute to plan implementation)
- **Quorum** “Rather than establishing formal quorum rules, the Partnership agrees that substantive decisions should not be made at meetings where a broad representation of stakeholders are not present” (we will use the meeting RSVP process to ensure that most of the usual attendees are there when we make a vote. Any stakeholder can request that a vote not be taken at a meeting they will miss. – email votes are okay, if you were present at the voting meeting. Our goal is most people involved in decision as possible.



Step 4 – Comments 4/5

Voting and Governance (all quotations from Governance agreement)

- **Concern about consensus definition:** “an agreement of all parties Stakeholder Committee members minus two allows the process to move forward.” (We did define consensus at the beginning and would need a vote of the Partnership to redefine it if desired. The Steering Committee supports this original version).
 - **Concern that the consensus process was not followed for prioritization** - In the step 4 report it states that the initial prioritization vote was to create a draft order of strategies, consensus was achieved through approval of the overall objectives, strategies document as written. The initial voting was a voting was a mechanical step to get ideas on the table. Additionally, a listening session was used to hear ideas. It is likely that this list is not anyone’s ideal order, but we agreed to the order and also to prioritize the top 5 strategies. We will work on them concurrently in step 5
 - **Desire for additional discussion about the pros and cons of each strategy** - Some stakeholders feel that the Step 4 process has been rushed. Discussions have occurred over the past 1.5 years we have been working on Step 4 and these discussions are reflected in the document. It is the preference of the Steering Committee to continue these discussions in Step 5 when specific details are available.
-



III. Conclusion



-
- Step 4 report – Incorporate decisions from this meeting and send draft to stakeholders in 1 week
 - Your additional comments will be due 1 week after
 - Next meeting is October 14, 2020 5-7 (Location TBD)
 - Will let you know by October 7 if a vote is planned
-



UGRRW

