Big Issues & Tools Matrix – NOTES FROM PT DISCUSSIONS TO DATE

April 25, 2025

Process Steps:

Step 1. Clarify/Finalize Shared Understanding/Create Common Baseline.

Make sure that all understand the Issue and the Tools in the same way – resolve confusion, technical considerations, legality, etc.

Step. 2. Specify/Detail Positions and Interests

Make sure we fully understand all stakeholder positions and their underlying interests as they relate to the Issue and the Tools. We can also propose potential resolution here ("based on your knowledge of other's interests"). Lots of "what?" questions then "why?" questions.

Step. 3. Matrix everything and discuss options – drive towards resolution

Organize all info in a table like the one below. Group meetings to discuss/vet proposed solutions.

Big Issues

Statement of Issue	**#1 - Desire from some stakeholders to ensure permanent protections for instream water using the state's "alternative pathway" for conserved water**			
Relevant Tool	**District Canal Piping**			
Stakeholder	**Positions on Issues – What?**	**Underlying Interests – Why?**	**Suggested Solutions – How together?**	**Notes**
PT Instream Members	Alternative pathway was not developed collaboratively. Should be certainty to secondary water right through alt. pathway – designated as instream use only and not instream and irrigation. New pathway should meet same criteria as ACW – viewpoint would have been voiced more in	Tod Heisler (TH) – health of the river; quantity and quality, health of aquatic ecosystems for fisheries, other aquatic species Kimberley Priestley (KP) - need for certainty into the future for fish and aquatic species; beyond the people in the room Funding commitments for permanent water instream	Could still regulate secondary instream right similarly to ACW so NUID isn't harmed; rather than a dual-use right that is conditioned Amend alternative pathway so that it is a secondary water right for instream use only Legislation to adapt ACW is another approach; current focus on alt pathway memo	

Statement of Issue	**#1 - Desire from some stakeholders to ensure permanent protections for instream water using the state's "alternative pathway" for conserved water**			
Relevant Tool	**District Canal Piping**			
	development of pathway if involved			
PT Municipal Members	Need to be able to do long-term water system planning – want opportunity to create pathway that feels permanent with flexibility to create credits (both perm. and temp.) Focus on Middle D, possibly shifting to Upper D	Owen McMurtrey (OM) – water supply security for citizens into the future; synergy between land use changes/urbanization and flow restoration to generate credits for municipal interests	Ways to create some kind of municipal benefit from this without taking away from other beneficiaries Future once there is sufficient water to meet Upper D flows, think about recharging excess for GW supply	
PT Agriculture Members	Do not be prescriptive for on-farm improvements – private laterals and on-farm efficiency are not being put through alternative pathway Alt. pathway is a better plan for the Basin than previously, though not perfect; open to improvements	Mike Britton (MB)/Craig Horrell (CH) - Alt. pathway meant to be expeditious, money was being held up for projects – may not have finalized pathway on time if every stakeholder was involved Intent is not to harm/take away CH - Open to making permanent in future, COID comfortable but need to make sure NUID is too	Make instream water going through the alternative pathway permanent in future	Kate Fitzpatrick (KF) – intention was permanent, did not get reflected in final legal wording; legal reason for keeping irrigation use on water right Jon Skidmore (JS) - Note that pathway has barely been tested
Other PT participants (e.g. Chairs; State)	Opportunity for a city to fund conservation and claim mitigation credits from it?		OWRD – pathway process designed to be continually updated; can have these conversations earlier without holding up funding; talk to Jeremy about regulation question	

Statement of Issue	**#1 - Desire from some stakeholders to ensure permanent protections for instream water using the state's "alternative pathway" for conserved water**
Relevant Tool	**District Canal Piping**
Solution(s) Proposed by Group	Ad hoc meeting with districts, instream rep's, cities, OWRD, USFWS, BOR, ODFW, Tribes to discuss possible amendments to alt. pathway memo or other legislative route

Statement of Issue	**#2 - District canal piping is currently underway, but what actions can be taken in the near-term (on parallel track) to enable beyond-the-POD (private lateral and on-farm) conservation and water marketing approaches for medium- and long-term implementation?**			
Relevant Tool	**Private Lateral Piping**			
Relevant Tool	**On-Farm Irrigation Efficiency**			
Stakeholder	**Positions on Issues – What?**	**Underlying Interests – Why?**	**Suggested Solutions – How together?**	**Notes**
PT Instream Members	Private lateral piping should occur simultaneously with main canal piping, or at least there should be a concerted effort to plan for future private lateral piping; desire to put some of that conserved water instream Support for main canal piping, how to add private lateral/on-farm when capacity is constrained	TH – flow enhancement for aquatic ecosystems and fisheries; ensuring that agricultural land stays in agriculture (junior farmers) Jeremy Austen/KP – opening up additional opportunities to enhance flows	More formal partnership with technical expertise to make coordinated plan around building capacity for and ramping/scaling up current private lateral activities	
PT Municipal Members	Want to be able to generate mitigation credits from these types of projects as they are completed	Interest in future water supply; opportunities for synergy between these activities and municipal supply	Cities are an instream buyer, redirect funds for instream purpose for restoration	
PT Agriculture Members	Priority of districts is to pipe main canals first with existing funding Districts are already implementing private lateral piping/on-farm - $1M USDA	CH – committed to beyond-the-POD, just a slower go for now; need to consider both COID and NUID systems' capacity to handle additional water delivery	Prioritize problem rotations; more strategic planning session around private laterals – step-wise sequence of piping private laterals that would optimize opportunities for leasing, transfers, etc.	MB – grant for modeling to optimize use of Haystack when receiving large volume of water from COID conservation/storms

Statement of Issue	**#2 - District canal piping is currently underway, but what actions can be taken in the near-term (on parallel track) to enable beyond-the-POD (private lateral and on-farm) conservation and water marketing approaches for medium- and long-term implementation?**			
Relevant Tool	**Private Lateral Piping**			
Relevant Tool	**On-Farm Irrigation Efficiency**			
	Give credit for work already underway Water savings from private lateral/on-farm improvements will not be put through alternative pathway	JS – current approach is opportunistic, following funding; may be interest in developing a coordinated plan for beyond-the-POD conservation Incentives are most effective for encouraging patron buy-in Patron interests		
Other PT participants (e.g. Chairs)	Multi-partner work - doesn't necessarily need to center around districts (DSWCD could help with on-farm conservation)	Benefits to ag and instream	Feasibility study/analysis	To address in planning exercise: need predictability around funding availability, landowner interests – value proposition for private landowner less clear
Solution(s) Proposed by Group	Coordinated planning for scaling private lateral/on-farm conservation that address the issues raised around funding, patron interest, technology, operational concerns for COID/NUID systems, etc. Perhaps a feasibility study first for other considerations			

Pilot Water Bank Program Tools:

Organizing Function	**Pilot Water Bank Program**			
Tool	**Split Rate/Split Duty**			
Tool	**Pool Fallowing Acres**			
Tool	**Instream Leasing and Temporary Transfers**			
Tool	**Permanent Water Transfers**			
Stakeholder	**Positions on using this Tool – What?**	**Underlying Interests – Why?**	**Suggested Solutions – How together?**	**Notes**
PT Instream Members	JA – supportive of water bank and split rate/split duty and all listed tools above with right sideboards, comfortable with what is in the bill KP – WW neutral on bill based on having sideboards in place, including ODFW review; concerns with split rate/split duty unless there is a required instream component, which Bank has – willing to give it a try in pilot; prefer to keep split rate/duty under the Pilot	Health of the river; quantity and quality, health of aquatic ecosystems for fisheries, other aquatic species		Disconnect between timelines of this Plan and pilot Water Bank Note for Alex – write up Pilot Water Bank Program as it exists with sideboards described
PT Municipal Members	OM – supportive of the pilot program, would prefer it to become permanent OM – improvement in understanding of how this could work, still have details to work out. What are ingredients of mitigation credit (reduction of consumptive use, protection instream) – synergy between growing muni	Ensuring that the resources the city has go towards the most critical restoration objectives for the basin Cities benefit from restoration work, apart from getting mitigation credits – create more efficient pathway through pilot bank for the money cities have for their water	Fallowing/artificial recharge as potentially two components that can generate a credit Two potential/denied proposals for generating mitigation credits: - Crescent storage releases - Limited licenses for recharge from Upper Tumalo reservoir (studies were not done, can't	OM – concern about mitigation program sunset, risk that there may be a missed opportunity with available muni funding; if bill to extend program doesn't pass in 2027, that gives ~1.5 years before sunset to use available funds for restoration benefits

Organizing Function	**Pilot Water Bank Program**			
Tool	**Split Rate/Split Duty**			
Tool	**Pool Fallowing Acres**			
Tool	**Instream Leasing and Temporary Transfers**			
Tool	**Permanent Water Transfers**			
	demands and restoration goals in Basin built into Mitigation Program; thinking about Pilot Water Bank in the same way given changing restoration goals/priorities	supply to go towards more valuable restoration work Cities need long-term water planning; timing of mitigation program and pilot bank makes this difficult	protect recharge water instream)	
PT Agriculture Members	CH – COID supportive of trying this, DBBC were a no on forbearance for every transaction; more discussions needed with smaller districts to get to a level of comfort Jessi Talbot (JT) – House Bill about state fee increases, wouldn't want pilot bank transactions to take away from instream leases and temp/perm transfers (COID pays $16k per year for transfer fees (not incl. leasing), would be $204k per year with increase and without DRC grant) MB – mechanics need to be sorted out (ex: transactions submitted by March 1st), requires a lot of work and administrative effort; budget concerns	Smaller district concerns – Boards wouldn't understand taking water rights away in a good water year Reviews became cumbersome, hoping this bank simplifies process – trying it as a pilot can inform recommendations for improvement	Pilot the bank program; take out ODFW review, 21-day notice Remind other districts that this is part of the HCP	

Organizing Function	**Pilot Water Bank Program**			
Tool	**Split Rate/Split Duty**			
Tool	**Pool Fallowing Acres**			
Tool	**Instream Leasing and Temporary Transfers**			
Tool	**Permanent Water Transfers**			
Other PT participants (e.g. Chairs; State)	OWRD capacity Jim Powell – consider 50/50 instream rather than 75/25 to districts, pilot program concept needs to be part of the DBWC Plan Becky Powell – taxpayer burden Yancy Lind – support for anything that can improve shoulder season flows		Jeremy Giffen – 25% instream from pool of fallowed acres to potentially address shoulder season flow issues in Middle D	
Solution(s) Proposed by Group				