Deschutes Basin Water Collaborative

Planning Team Meeting Draft Notes

Friday, March 1, 2024 | 10:30-12:30 | Hybrid

Tri-Chairs: Phil Chang, Deschutes County Commissioner; Bob Brunoe, Confederated Tribe of Warm Springs

Members: Owen McMurtrey, COCO; Emilie, OWRD; Tod Heisler, Central Oregon LandWatch;

Others in attendance: Jessi Talbott, COID; Becky Powel, Oregon League of Women Voters; Jim Powel, citizen; Jeff Shaw, Portland Citizen; Anona Dutton, EKI

Staff: Scott Aycock, Jenn Greco, Lauren Street, COIC; Kate Fitzpatrick, Lisa Seales, Jim Bond, Gen Hubert, DRC; Alex Ehrens, Andrew Purkey, AMP Insights.

Action Items and Decisions:

Owen will get the Chapter 3 municipal demands language to the DRC by next Friday, March 8th.

DRC will discuss Chapter 5 with Jessie NUID around the level of detail in the Plan and the amount of water saved and some of the on-farm water savings estimates.

When staff sends out Chapter 4 to the Planning Team, they will send out the tables and spreadsheets in Chapter 5 or an intro to Chapter 5.

Staff will add a closing date to the comment periods.

Updates:

The next Planning Team Meeting will be on Friday, April 12 from 10:30 – 12:30.

Draft Notes

1. **Welcome & February Meeting Recap** *Scott Aycock, COIC*
   Attachment A February Meeting Notes

The Planning Team discussed the February Planning Team meeting. Conversations on the Deschutes Basin rule making committee have paused to wait on the State's rule making process. Staff will not be sending Chapter 2 out for a vote until a later date. Conversation around a legislative group that is not under the umbrella of the DBWC would be of interest to the Planning Team. This group would update their work to the DBWC.

2. **Plan Process & Plan Level** *Scott Aycock, COIC*
   Attachment B DBWC Plan Build Process

Scott shared a Deschutes Basin Water Collaborative Plan-Build Process document. Bobby stated that he likes the idea of an appendix and the level of detail that could go into them. The Plan needs to be digestible for general consumption. Scott covered the suggested change to the process: drafts go out to the agencies for review, then to the Planning Team for review, and then to the Working Group three weeks before the Working Group meeting. Instead of voting on the chapter, the group will now wait until the entire Plan is completed to vote and approve it. This will allow the staff to expedite the process. The goal is to have open comment periods and to have comments only come in during those periods. Tom requested a "closing date" to the comment period. Owen stated that there must be some kind of acknowledgement from voting entities that they state somewhere that they are formally accepting the changes that are being made to the plan. It could be the add-hoc group that gives the draft chapters "thumbs up" or "I do not oppose moving forward" to the content as it is created. Resolutions will be tracked in the comment sections.

3. <u>Chapter 4 – Sections 4.1 & 4.2</u> *DBWC Staff*

a. Excerpts from Chapter 4 for review and as an example to discuss level of detail desired in plan.

Attachment C Sections 4.1 and 4.2

Much of the content that was sent in the most recent Chapter 4 sections were sent out roughly a year and a half ago to the group for feedback. This is the first look that we have taken at this section in nine months. The reason these sections were shared was to provide an example of the level of detail for the rest of the plan.

Staff stated that once this Plan is written, a "summary" version will also be produced to take forward to legislators and other parties for general consumption. There seems to be disagreement on the level of the plan and how deep the Plan should go into detail. Chapter 2 has taken a long time to get to this point, it sets the technical and data level for the rest of the plan. Planning Team members stated that the Plan needs to have this amount of detail, if not more. There was conversation around the importance of the analysis and data to tell the rest of the story. Jessie stated that it's difficult to move forward when we continue to get stuck on the finer details as we are trying to hit a moving target. Commissioner Chang stated that we need to use appendices and asked what material can be put into an appendix, we could have a full report with all details, a "summary" report that is slightly higher level, and an executive summary.

There was discussion about the OWRD Pathway memo and that discussions are moving forward in a productive way. This can then be reflected in the Plan as well in future grant opportunities from OWRD. The OWRD is working primarily with irrigation districts, CRD, and with applicants directly. Issues that are unable to be resolved will be stated in the Plan. The sections of Chapter 4 are not final and will address the OWRD Pathway Memo resolutions as they come up.

Owen mentioned having sideboards in the plan around the OWRD groundwater mitigation program which leaves a lot of flexibility. Tod stated that we need to have a Plan that

explains the benefits of doing the different implementable practices, such as private lateral piping. Tod expressed the need for a Plan that includes water banking and on-farm practices, and private laterals that are just as aggressive as the Irrigation District piping practices and projects. DRC staff stated that staff can continue to make estimates about the water that will be saved and can make assumptions if we are very clear about what those assumptions are around estimated water benefits. Over time Staff will get a clearer vision of the savings as we implement the on-farm practices. There needs to be a conversation around Chapter 5 outside of the Planning Team meeting that helps the irrigation districts look at the finer details and the amount of water saved and some of the on-farm water savings estimates. Emilie encouraged laying out all the savings that occur through the plan, not just savings that can be moved elsewhere. A feasibility studies can be put into Chapter 5 around groundwater recharge and can be named as an implementation item.

Commissioner Chang expressed concern about exempt wells pulling water that they did not assist in putting back into the ground. There could be a framework around groundwater recharge that is fee related like what ODFW does with the fish passage program. Not directly related to the exact exempt well but a communal benefit. Emilie stated that this framework does not exist today, however if it builds towards the goals of Chapter 3 the state could pick it back up again. There was discussion around how to incentivize exempt well owners to contribute to groundwater recharge in home.

4. <u>Meeting Schedule & Upcoming Dates</u> *Scott Aycock, COIC*

Scott covered upcoming dates in the date document.

5. <u>Roundtable Updates and Sharing</u>