

Policy Advisory Group Meeting
Integrated Water Resources Strategy
January 19, 2010
Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife Headquarters
Salem, Oregon

Staff and Speakers

Phil Ward
Dick Pedersen
Roy Elicker
Lisa Charpilloz Hansen
Brenda Bateman
Christine Svetkovich
Bruce McIntosh
Ray Jaindl
Ken Stahr
Alyssa Mucken
Rick Kepler
Cynthia Solie, Facilitator
John Jackson,
WR Commission Chair

Members

Tracy Liskey
Mike Seppa
Dennis Doherty
Richard Wells
Lorna Stickel
Patrick Griffiths
Janet Neuman
Anita Winkler
Glenn Barrett
Teresa Huntsinger
John DeVoe
Eric Quaempts
Michael Campbell
Todd Heidgerken
Joe Whitworth
Tod Heisler
Bill Gaffi
Peggy Lynch

Audience

Jeff Stone, OAN
Erika Wolters, OSU
Kirsten Winters, OSU
Nithin Josi, City of Salem
Mary Meloy, WRC
Helen Moore, Water for Life
Karen Homolac, OBDD
Phil Donovan, CTUIR
Curtis Martin, OCA
Michael Schmidt, OWRC
Ken Bierly, OWEB
Dan Eisenbeis, LOC
Gil Riddell, AOC
Rob Hallyburton, DLCD
Jerry Schmidt, OGWA
Patricia Farrell, City of Salem
Kimberly Priestly, WaterWatch

Agenda Item I, Welcome and Thank You

Director Ward, Director Pedersen, Director Elicker, and Deputy Director Hansen welcomed the Policy Advisory Group Members and thanked them for their participation. Water Resources Commissioner John Jackson also welcomed members and further described his hopes for the Policy Advisory Group and process overall.

Agenda Item II, Agenda Review

Cynthia Solie, Executive Director of Oregon Cascades West Council of Governments, is providing facilitation services for the Policy Advisory Group meetings. Ms. Solie welcomed everyone and outlined the agenda.

Agenda Item III, Self Introductions

The Project Team and members of the Policy Advisory Group (“Members”) introduced themselves. As part of the introductions, they described their hopes for Oregon’s future water resources and goals for this process. Cynthia asked members to imagine when people look back fifty years from now, what do we hope they see, and what legacy do we want to leave?

Responses follow:

- Be part of an effort that leaves our children with abundant, clean, and safe water. We want our children to be able to live in a state where their water needs are reasonably well supplied because we did our jobs 50 years ago.
- Think of water all together (quantity, quality, and ecosystem needs, etc.).
- Come to terms with the challenge that scarcity of water is the defining issue of the west.

- Balance needs.
- Bring science to the table.
- With population growth projections we may see in the next 20-30 years, we need to make sure that the use of water for agriculture is protected, allowing us to produce food for people while also maintaining adequate water for streams, cities, etc.
- To bring the coastal watershed experience to the table as an example that restored the fish runs over time while still being able to log and farm and still have a good environment.
- Use a collaborative process with lots of communication.
- There is more than enough water available in Oregon to meet everyone's needs and it is a matter of working together and coming to consensus on how to do that. Any solution will have to involve additional water storage, both surface water and groundwater. We need to look at all of the possibilities.
- A conservation commission report from 1909 addresses conservation of water for irrigation, navigation, power, water supply, and fisheries for human use. What is not in here is what my wish is for the future: a more sustainable view of what water resources can and will be able to support. My hope is that when people look back, either in 50 or even 100 years from now, they will see that we figured out how to address a difficult, thorny knot and were able to cut through that onion of layers and layers of stuff that surrounds how we use water. I hope they see how we cut our way through them to have sustainable rivers, sustainable fisheries, and places where people still want to go and places where we still want to live while still having a healthy and vibrant economy.
- Collaboration is key. "Litigation over natural resources is irrational."
- Create a flexible framework that is adaptable and works for our kids.
- Water defines Oregon across that state. How we do our jobs will define the future our state. Collaboration can be hard. To have a water resource that is healthy itself and can support a healthy economy and a healthy lifestyle in Oregon.
- Produce something that will be useful and will help guide decisions.
- This strategy is a way to set priorities and set up a process. I hope in 50 years from now, the process is so engrained that we never have to go through this process again and its developed into the culture of how we manage and think about water. My dream would be that some of those battles we have in front of the legislature go away. We need to be in a situation where we can move forward together on Oregon's water supply and not have some of the fights we have right now.
- An organic process that moves forward.
- What's innovative now becomes standard and that innovation automatically falls into the process.
- Co-existence is key. Figure out a way that agriculture can stay viable for food production and the economy and to also provide for fish, wildlife, and other environmental issues. We need a can-do attitude.

- We will have a plan for making sure that our water resources can meet our needs, both instream and out of stream. Hope that the plan will integrate water quality and quantity and ecological needs.
- Hope that Oregon would be recognized as a leader in the west and across the nation in aggressive water management, water conservation, water efficiency, instream flow protection that includes a suite of flows, not just base minimum flows for fish, but also ecological flows for different species and geomorphologic flows for river health. Integrate climate change into water planning in more than advisory role but rather incorporate it into the decision-making process. I would also hope that in looking back at this process, we will have engaged in scenario planning, and as a result of that scenario process, we are reasonably close with one of those scenarios. It is amazing to look back at a 1955 House Water Committee report and find that a lot of it is entirely relevant today. Collaboration is often most successful when risk is involved as a result of litigation. I believe sometimes it is important to create that risk to bring people to the table in the first place.
- Collaboration is important. Integrate science and various cultures to create a stable water supply for Oregon. Acknowledged that water quantity and quality are linked and that we need to acknowledge the linkages between surface water and groundwater.
- To add a water quality perspective to this process. Have a policy that makes sense in both environmental and economic terms and that everyone around the table can support.
- With water, there is conflict. With water, there is competing demand. Recognize the fact that there will always be tension amongst various water users and how we approach the allocation of that resource. My hope and desire for this process, and for 2050, is that we will have laid the groundwork so that informed decisions can be made between now and then using some of the framework that we had an opportunity to develop. If people are able to look back with a greater understanding of water and how it is used in Oregon by all water users, then we will have succeeded.
- Water is the defining issue of this century in terms of natural resources. Water is the uniquely unifying characteristic around the landscape, across the west and around the world. I would like to look back on this process and have it be on equal stature to what Oregon did in land use during the 1970's with regard to its land use laws. I hope we can set the bar a little higher and think longer term.
- Find balance between agriculture, municipal, and environmental interests.
- Create a policy framework that is flexible with an incentive based system to help us strike a balance.
- Fifty years from now, I hope people look back on this effort and recognize it as a game-changing effort in terms of how organizations became aware of, developed respect for and helped to advance one another's efforts together, not at the others' expense. I think there is a real opportunity here to do this.
- That Oregonians better understand the issues that we hear around the table and help us identify solutions.
- We need to look more at the nexus between land-use planning and water planning.
- Clean water now and forever.
- If people really hear one another, we realize we're not all that different. As we go about our business here we need to think about ourselves as the rancher, the farmer, the dairy person, the folks that care about the

Agenda Item IV, Putting this Effort into Context

Brenda Bateman, Project Manager, gave an overview of the Strategy to provide the statutory and historic foundation and to define the strategy in terms of vision, goals, and objectives. The presentation used for this portion of the meeting is available online at http://www1.wrd.state.or.us/pdfs/Morning_Session.pdf.

Goals and Objectives. Members discussed Goals 1 and 2 and the objectives pertaining to each, saying.

The Strategy should ensure that the action items that relate to particular objectives are, in fact, integrated and that they inform one another. We may also need a goal that simply says “write a strategic plan” that pulls the various actions and policies together. This will help us to integrate the issues and make updates in the future. Maybe we need a better statement of what a “strategy” is. Goal 2 is not mentioned in the sample Table of Contents (workplan), although these goals are what stitch everything together. There was a concern that the sample table of contents does not promote integration related to water resource needs.

Vision. Members discussed the vision statement as follows:

“Tools” and “Implementation” are not mentioned in the vision. Implementation is so important that you would expect to see it mentioned in the vision. We need to be anchored in a clear vision in what we are trying to accomplish and that is, to some degree, measurable. The vision is fairly generalized and we may need a “scenario vision” outlining what we hope to see in our future water resources and that will help us reach implementation.

Agenda Item V, Policy Advisory Group (PAG) Housekeeping

The PAG charter and meeting protocols were provided in the meeting materials as Appendix C and D and can be accessed here: http://www1.wrd.state.or.us/pdfs/Meeting_Materials.pdf

Several members are unable to attend the July meeting as scheduled and asked the Project Team to issue a Doodle® to identify an alternate date.

Members asked questions about their particular role as Advisory Members, such as whether they are a sounding board or here to give recommendations on specific actions. One member’s view is that the role is to comment on policy proposals, provide input, and keep in mind that some things are outside the scope of the PAG; it is not the PAG’s role to develop the vision statement and we do not want to push our role out so far that it becomes too big and unmanageable.

Director Ward answered member questions regarding the difference between a strategy and a plan and described the member’s role as helping to shape the strategy by providing input and guiding policies on an advisory level.

Concerns were raised regarding item C, in Appendix D, currently written as:

“If no consensus is reached on an issue, a simple majority of the Policy Advisory Group can forward recommendations to the Directors of the Water Resources Department, Department of Environmental Quality, Department of Fish and Wildlife, Department of Agriculture, the Water Resources Commission, and on-line community. The various views on the issue will be forwarded to the Directors.”

Some members were opposed to employing a “simple majority” while another questioned whether reaching consensus is a realistic approach for this group. Members agreed to strike reference to a simple majority vote, documenting the majority and minority views expressed. Those views are to be recorded in the meeting notes and shared with all the other products of the committee. Staff will revise Section C accordingly.

Issue Papers. During the afternoon, the Project Team discussed the draft Issue Papers with members, highlighting some of the basic challenges and opportunities discussed in each paper as well as some of the changes that will be made as a result of public comments received through Fall 2009.

Water Quantity (presented by Brenda Bateman): Following the presentation of the water quantity paper, members wanted to ensure that certain issues were discussed within the paper, such as the management of exempt wells, discussion of floodplain storage, the interaction between surface water and groundwater, the many recognized beneficial uses, the value of wet meadows and passive storage. Another suggestion was to include a map of gaging stations or water measurement points.

Water Quality (presented by Christine Svetkovich): Members wanted to ensure that this paper included discussion of decentralized water systems, common impairments such as temperature, various adaptation plans in place that address water quality such as agriculture water quality plans, municipal plans, and stormwater plans, etc. Members requested a map showing the level of contaminants, and/or possibly how many basins have TMDL’s completed.

Ecology and Ecosystems (presented by Bruce McIntosh): One member noted that the first mention of the role of forests is found in this paper, although this discussion should also be included in the quantity and quantity chapters. Members also wanted to ensure that certain pieces were included in the paper, such as a discussion of invasive species, restoration successes (Oregon has a lot), figures on sport fishing and tourism. One suggestion was to show the value that agriculture provides (e.g. open spaces, habitat for waterfowl) as well as the value that water and waterways adds to property. Maps showing designated municipal watersheds and fish populations in trouble would also be helpful. It is also important to incorporate the work of this strategy into ODFW’s Conservation Strategy updates.

Economy (presented by Ray Jaindl): Following the presentation, members suggested a few improvements for the economy chapter, such as providing a better explanation of farm gate value and providing the per capita water use in relation to gross domestic product, and to show consumptive use in comparison to the total amount of water available for use. Members noted that the municipal piece is weak and needs some work. They also suggested exploring whether it is possible to depict the productivity of irrigated lands. Considering that agriculture represents the largest water demand, it would also be helpful to explore whether it is realistic to expect irrigators to make transitions to more efficient methods and what effects efficiency has on late season streamflows. The Strategy should try to highlight some of the successes in water use efficiency and explore if data exists on various application methods, such as flood vs. sprinkler, to help illustrate the potential for conservation.

Cultural, Public Health, and Environmental Justice (presented by Christine Svetkovich): One member requested the posting of the audio from the State-Tribal Water Forum held at ODFW. Christine noted that the Project Team is working with the DHS-Drinking Water Program to bring in more discussion on public health issues and that this paper replaces the social issues paper released last fall.

Coming Pressures (presented by Brenda Bateman): Members stressed the importance of addressing how climate change may affect groundwater dependent areas, and the need to highlight not only population growth but also shifts in density. When addressing pressures, it’s important to include a discussion of issues related to use of exempt, domestic wells and how land use changes affect water use,

potentially decreasing demand for water. Members pointed out that the water and energy connection, such as the costs of moving water around – pumping water, transporting through pipes, etc, should be considered. One member stated that the climate change map used in the presentation is too startling.

In closing, the Project Team noted the function of the issue papers as high level in nature, to give a sense or flavor of what the status of Oregon's water resources are today. A series of suggestions followed. One member noted that these are not answer papers, but simply a way to identify potential issues. An "opportunities" paper might be worthwhile, as well as a paper on the institutional missions and jurisdictions of those making decisions on water issues. Along with opportunities, the papers should address barriers. Concerns were raised about the issues being addressed independently and therefore furthering silos within management. To help integrate concepts and management of the resource, it was suggested that the overview/introduction paper could provide guidance. Start looking at trade-offs and opportunities right up front.

Agenda Item VII, Public Involvement Plan

Brenda discussed the draft Public Involvement Plan and highlighted the 2010 spring open houses providing the purpose and format of these events.

Members suggested taking stakeholder input gathered from workshops to the open houses and use big displays with thought-provoking ideas to encourage discussion at the events. For outreach and advertisement, the Project Team should contact Soil and Water Conservation Districts, Watershed Councils, League of Oregon Cities, and Association of Oregon Counties. To encourage public participation, it is important to explain how information gathered will be used and to know your audience ahead of time. Also, provide as much clarity with what a strategy is, which will help direct input. Also, consider hosting more open houses in Eastern Oregon.

Agenda Item VIII, Public Comment

Patricia Farrell, Natural Resources Specialist for the City of Salem mentioned a project on the North Santiam River and wondered if there was an opportunity to present the project at an open house, or other venues. Ms. Farrell asked the Project Team what other types of projects are wanted at these open houses, more specifically she wanted to know whether they were projects that have already shown success or currently in development.

The goal is to showcase a wide variety of projects focusing on water resource projects that have already demonstrated multiple benefits and multiple partners.

Agenda Item IX, Other Business

Cynthia invited comments from members regarding any announcements, issues, or proposals not discussed previously during the meeting.

One member shared a story regarding the lack of understanding and coordination among natural resource agency authorities in hopes that it will inspire us to better integrate water management.

One suggestion was to host a social event, such as a BBQ, following the July meeting.

Agenda Item X, Meeting Recap and Feedback

The Project Team will send out a Doodle to re-schedule the July meeting in which a number of members are currently unable to attend. Project Team members will revise the decision making process described in the PAG charter and will provide it to members for feedback prior to the April meeting. The Project Team will create a scenario/future-oriented vision of where the strategy may take us and provide it to members for comment. The

Project Team will look into suggestions related to the goals and objectives, table of contents, and a number of other items.

Members asked to receive documents in advance of the meeting for action related items. The room set up should be adjusted to allow a better view of Project Team, other members, and the presentation screen. At times, it was difficult to hear everyone. Members offered beverage suggestions. The Project Team should consider a meeting in Eastern Oregon to aid travel for some folks. Cynthia encouraged members to call or email with any thoughts, questions, or feedback.