Deschutes Basin Water Collaborative

Planning Team Meeting Draft Notes

Friday, June 7, 2024 | 10:30-12:30 | Hybrid

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

Members: Owen McMurtrey, COCO; Kimberley Priestley, WaterWatch of Oregon; Tod Heisler, Central Oregon LandWatch

Others in Attendance: Jessi Talbott, COID; Juliana Cartright, Becky Powell, Oregon League of Women Voters; Jim Powell, citizen; Mike Britton, NUID; Carolyn Sufit, OWRD

Staff: Scott Aycock, Lauren Street, COIC; Lisa Seales, DRC; Alex Ehrens, Andrew Purkey, AMP Insights.

Action Items and Decisions:

Come back to list of concerns and ideas in the next Planning Team meeting: Create a separate document with list of concerns and ideas and get that back out to the Planning Team and discuss structure and consensus.

Send out the parking lot list to Planning Team.

Updates:

The next Planning Team Meeting will be on August 2 from 10:30 – 12:30.

The next Working Group Meeting will be September 27 from 10:30 – 12:30.

---

1. **<u>Welcome & April Meeting Recap</u>** *Scott Aycock, COIC*
   Attachment A April Meeting Notes
   Scott opened meeting up with April meeting recap. There was no May Planning Team meeting to have the Ad Hoc meeting. In April, a high-level review of chapter 3 and discussion around carry water and chapter 4 took place. This carried over into the Ad Hoc meeting. Outcomes included making time for multiple reviews at the end of the process and everyone committed to having the ad hoc meeting.

2. **<u>Recap Working Group Meeting</u>** *DBWC Staff*
   Scott recapped the notes from the Working Group Meeting:
   - Anatomy of a water right: this discussion was very enlightening and educational.
   - Questions came up around the way that the state currently splits up a water right.

- How is carry water determined and how does water recharge play into the plan.
- There was discussion on the upcoming draft commission presentation and the concerns around that.
- Discussion on the memo that is not final yet.

3. **<u>Water Resources Commission Presentation</u>**
   - Discussion of Proposed Talking Points: Kate covered the commission presentation outline and overview.

   Discussion Points:
   - DBWC Overview (Chairs)
     - History
     - Goals
     - Membership
   - Basin Context (DRC)
     - Geography
     - Water Management
     - Shortages/strategies (Basin Study)
   - Perspective from each leg of the stool
     - Agriculture (retain historic reliability; drought; HCP obligations)
     - Instream (flows in UD, MD, Tumalo Creek)
     - Muni (secure groundwater mitigation credits)
   - Place-Based Planning Process
       - Where we are in the process
     - State support
       - Capacity (ex. Emelie's positions)
       - Funding
       - Clarity around how the state interacts with Place-Based Planning

The Planning Team asked if staff knows who is on the commission. Kate discussed where all information can be found in the commission package. The DRC can deliver contextual information to the commission. It will be noted that this is Phase I which focuses on the Upper Deschutes. Mike mentioned that Craig should be the ag voice for the commission presentation. Tom and Kimberley will make sure that instream messaging is on the same page. There will be slides with talking points during the commission presentation which will include maps of the basin and the different phases. The Planning Team agreed that it would be beneficial to have handouts to give the commission. The group asked if Emilie's position is permanent and that was confirmed. Kate stated that it will be important to express how helpful it has been to have this position and how it would be beneficial for other basins to have similar positions.

4. **<u>Co-Chair Discussion</u>** *DBWC Staff*

This discussion is coming from Steve's exit. Staff discussed this a few times and right now there is good progress happening with the plan build process. Scott stated that we do not want to distract folks from this progress with the co-chair discussion. Mike raised the issue of filling this position based on optics and having all three legs of the stool covered. He acknowledged that it might be problematic if we do not have an agricultural co-chair represented. Scott stated that with Bobby and Phil, their positions are varied and cover all three legs and represent all interests. Lisa stated that from the beginning it was not in the charter to have a representative from all three legs of the stool, but it just happened that way. Phil stated that we are progressing with the plan build process, however we want buy-in from everyone. He posed the question "will this affect us in the long term if we don't have a co-chair agriculture representative"? Mike stated that there are agriculture representatives at all levels of the plan build process. Maintaining the way that the process is working now works for Mike and agricultural interests, and Jessi agreed. Scott stated that the idea that once we have Chapter 5 it seems like that would be a good time to push for a co-chair.

5. **<u>Chapter 4 Review</u>** *DBWC Staff*
Attachment B Chapter 4

- Discussion items
    - Approach of moving strategy action language to Chapter 5
    - Any substantive concerns/comments at this point
    - Embedded comments as appropriate
- Detailed review period – 2 weeks

Alex asked if anyone had any additional comments about Chapter 4. Kimberley stated that we need to be consistent with messaging around duty reduction. Kimberley brought up the parking lot list and making sure that those items don't get lost. Kimberley stated that we need to stay consistent with what we highlight and what we do not highlight. Scott mentioned that it could be beneficial to build Chapter 5 and then come back to sections that it might affect. Lisa stated that we could flag things in Chapter 4 to come back to once we build Chapter 5. Lisa invited the Planning Team to share ideas and additional items to include in the Plan because now is the time and the opportunity. Kimberley stated that it needs to be clearly expressed when an idea is brought forward in included verses being a collaborative effort and agreed upon. Lisa mentioned that it might be beneficial to have an attachment or a document that states all ideas that are brought forward from all interests. Scott asked if we are tracking ideas "outside the current law" in this chapter, or separately. Tom covered his comments on Chapter 4 from ideas that are within the current law to outside the current law ideas that would need policy change. The Planning Team agreed to add a list of ideas for all interests to have in the document, it will be clearly stated that these ideas have not been agreed upon or have consensus from the group. Lisa stated that this is the first attempt of staff to put a draft of Chapter 4 out and asked the Planning Team to send

ideas forward so that staff can be added/discussed within the group. Tom stated that efficiency standards are under current law, and they should be discussed. Scott asked the Planning Team to discuss how we frame Chapter 4. The group had a brainstorm/discussion about items and ideas. Make a list of "art of the possible" and another list of "concerns". Lisa stated that we could draft Chapter 4 with both ideas and concerns and then moving into Chapter 5 we can pick which ones will be prioritized for implementation and resolution. This does not have to be included in the Plan, staff just want to make sure that we capture these ideas and concerns and then capture that discussion.

White Board:

- Ideas: Minimum flows, efficiency standards, tiered pricing, water bank concepts (generate/movement/transactions, coordination for that), mitigation.
- Concerns about groundwater recharge/aquafer recharge. There are issues with aquafer recharge outside of aquafer recharge.
- Public interest review on transfers.
- Exempt municipal wells – groundwater impacts.
- Regulate exempt wells.
- Water reuse/recycling.

Owen stated that we need to discuss and mention the winter flows in Chapter 4. Also defining the "waterbank" and what all that encompasses. Tom stated that all these items are related to each other and should not be "listed" as individual items. Staff stated that the end goal is to have something cohesive, not individual items.

6. Roundtable Updates and Sharing