

Oregon's Integrated Water Resources Strategy
2016-17 Policy Advisory Group
June 28, 2016 Meeting Notes
DRAFT – Needs Approval



Members Present:

Robert "Will" Collin
Suzanne DeLorenzo
Arlene Dietz
Allan Elliott
Ron Foggin
Rebecca Geisen

TJ Hansell
Valerie Kelley
Gayle Killam
Craig Lacy
Hiram Li
Tracey Liskey

Peggy Lynch
Curtis Martin
Craig Pope
Brent Stevenson
Stan van de Wetering
Mary Wahl

Staff / Presenters / Commissioners:

Brenda Bateman, WRD
Bob Baumgartner, WRC
Tom Byler, WRD
Danette Faucera, ODFW

Alyssa Mucken, WRD
Wade Peerman, DEQ
Anna Packenham-Stevenson, ODFW
Racquel Rancier, WRD

Ken Stahr, WRD
Karen Tarnow, DEQ
Doug Woodcock, WRD

Audience Members:

Neil Crescenti, Willamette Partnership
Adam Meyer, Oregon Conservation Network
Sarah Mitchell, Oregon Farm Bureau
Linda Modrell, Willamette Water 2100 Project
Mary Anne Nash, Oregon Farm Bureau
Kimberley Priestley, WaterWatch of Oregon
Carrie Sanneman, Willamette Partnership

Lisa Seales, OSU Cascades
Lauren Smith, Oregon Water Resources Congress
April Snell, Oregon Water Resources Congress
Gail Snyder, Coalition for the Deschutes
Jeff Stone, Oregon Association of Nurseries
Basil Williams, Governor's Natural Resources Office

Opening Announcements

- Please continue to move around get coffee as needed.
- The WIFI password for today's meeting is on the white board.
- See Lorri Cooper to turn in reimbursement forms for mileage, etc.
- Leave name tents behind after each meeting.

I. Welcome and Introductions

Facilitator Brenda Bateman opened the meeting and noted that while the group has lost a member since the initial appointments were made (Winnie Lam), the group has gained a member from Carlton Plants (Allan Elliott). Ron Foggin from City of Dallas introduced himself for the first time as well. Returning members, staff, Commissioner Baumgartner, and members of the public also introduced themselves.

II. Agenda Review

The group conducted a review of the agenda; five additional information items were added: (1) a report-back on [June 2016 IWRS Open Houses](#), (2) an update on the [Place-Based Planning Grants](#) recently awarded to four pilot-project communities, (3) an [update of water conditions](#) in Oregon (the Department will add all PAG members to the listserve), (4) mention of a new on-line [library of resources](#) built for this Policy Advisory Group, and (5) the [annotated workplan](#), requested by members during the last meeting. Click on hyperlinks for more information on each of these topics.

Resources for this and other Policy Advisory Group meetings are available on the state's IWRS webpage: http://www.oregon.gov/owrd/Pages/law/integrated_water_supply_strategy.aspx

The Drought Task Force established by HB 4113 was also just appointed with its meeting calendar set. For more information about this entity, its schedule, and work products, visit WRD's Work Groups [webpage](#).

III. Review and Approval of March Meeting Notes and PAG Protocols

The group reviewed meeting notes from March 2016, and added "as reported by the agency" to the three sections on "successes." These are on the bottom of page 2. With these changes, the group approved the March 2016 notes. Staff will make these changes and post to the website.

The group took another look at the [PAG Protocols](#), modified during the previous meeting. The group approved the final version without further modification.

IV. Discussion of Brainstorming Exercise

Set-Up. Staff set the context for the discussion, reminding members that the 2017 IWRS update will be "surgical in nature," leaving intact the original IWRS principles, objectives, and critical issues. The Policy Advisory Group will focus its work on the set of "recommended actions" contained in the IWRS. Without re-writing or re-wording the majority of the existing recommended actions, the PAG is asked to identify and develop those water-related policy areas that are thin or altogether missing in the original IWRS. One member noted that maintaining a "surgical" approach will remain a challenge throughout, particularly for those new to the process.

During their March meeting, members were asked to propose issues that need to be added to or modified in the 2017 IWRS. The group spent the bulk of its June meeting discussing those ideas first brought forward during the March "brainstorming exercise." The result is a 25-page document entitled, "[2017 IWRS Update: Workspace for PAG Members](#)." This document contains an initial list of the PAG's proposed issues to address in the 2017 IWRS.

Each row contains one proposed topic name or description from previous PAG input. Staff noted whether there are corresponding recommended actions from 2012 IWRS; if was no corresponding recommended action, staff noted where this might fit. Agencies then provided a summary of progress to date. (More agencies & partners can still fill this in). If there was no known progress, it was left blank. There is space is for PAG members to make notes such as—

- If the topic area reflects what members shared in the first meeting or if you want to refine the topic.
- Whether this is a request for additional information, or a request for action.
- Whether existing recommended actions address members' concerns.
- Whether or not members want to prioritize tackling this topic.

Discussion Process. Although the group will have time to go into a little more depth in this meeting, most of these issues will not be fully discussed or brought to closure in this forum. Much of the debate or detail may need to take place during budget negotiations, legislative hearings, administrative rule-making or other venues. The Policy Advisory Group should do its best to ensure the IWRS "sets the table" or creates the public policy space to address these issues.

To help manage the time, members were asked to use their name tents to indicate they wanted to speak. The facilitator set a timer and encouraged members to place post-it notes with more detailed thoughts directly on the flip charts if the group ran out of time.

This meeting will continue to function like a brainstorming discussion, capturing for the record ideas that are voiced. Unless members are specifically asked whether they agree to a particular discussion point, assume that the group has not lent its support to the bullets below.

Discussion Content (topic *not* in the workspace document)

- **Place-Based Planning.** The group discussed the state's new Place-Based Planning grants program, particularly the four pilot-areas awarded grants by the Water Resources Commission in February 2016. Members asked that meeting announcements and locations for these four pilots be posted to WRD's website. Discussion points included:
 - ~ Why are there no additional funding requests in the pipeline for the 2017-19 Legislative Session?
Response: stakeholders have asked the Department to refrain from making any additional requests until final reports have been submitted and analyzed, and the four-year pilot programs have proven themselves.
 - ~ Discussion revolved around the dollar amount (\$750K total in grants for four years and four pilots), and the 16 applications originally received. Questions included (1) how to put budget requests on the table sooner than 2019 and (2) how to maintain support for communities' interest.
 - ~ Members noted that much of the activity that takes place in the IWRS (measuring and monitoring—particularly of groundwater, project planning, and project implementation) will need to take place at the local level, and will need strong place-based partners to be successful. The four pilots programs may serve as proving grounds for some of these activities.
 - ~ One member noted that low-income communities need funds such as these and are ripe for environmental justice assistance.
 - ~ Group members showed strong interest in adding this topic to their recommendations, including advocating for a long-term program / investment in this area. Use the word "ongoing." Sprinkle the PBP throughout all of the PAG's discussions / recommendations.

Additional Discussion Content (refer to workspace document).

- **Measurement and Monitoring** (combined conversations for pp. 3-5 of the workspace document)
 - ~ There's limited capacity, \$ and resources to collect, process, and use data.
 - ~ GW monitoring takes place in both public and private organizations. Seek partnership with utilities, universities and others that are collecting data for different purposes.
 - ~ How can individuals help?
 - ~ Local knowledge could really inform studies, particularly with regard to seasonality. This is a good example of where "place-based" approach adds value.
 - ~ Use information coming in through the water-use reporting program.
 - ~ Soil moisture is an emerging science with useful indicators.
 - ~ Consider using more of NASA's emerging satellite data.
 - ~ Long-term, baseline data is critical for understanding conditions.
 - ~ Need more data / studies about instream flows, baseline flows, ecological flows, pulse flows and connectivity to wetlands.
 - ~ Need to define the above terms. Staff committed to developing a definitions one-pager.
 - ~ Can Dept. of Agriculture do more to help irrigators make crop choices that fit their water supplies?
 - ~ Do we need more information about conservation's effect on recharge?
 - ~ How can we get better data on industrial water use and discharge?
 - ~ Shouldn't we be measuring everything?
 - ~ Keep an eye on purpose; don't measure just for the sake of measuring.
 - ~ When measuring, know what thresholds are relevant to look for (e.g., when chemical levels exceed safe, when demand outstrips supply, contaminant levels in wastewater exceed allowable).
 - ~ Even when using hydrologic models, need to collect and process data to calibrate models and equipment.
 - ~ Underground Injection Control (UIC) program. DEQ has updates to add to the annotated workplan.
 - ~ Exempt use wells. In times of drought, should we find a way to tease out the water use from domestic (exempt) wells compared to other (permitted) wells?
 - ~ Good data is necessary to make land-use decisions.
 - ~ Need data to evaluate the efficiency of systems (for loss, leaks, etc.)
 - ~ Must have good data to defend regulatory decisions, particularly if there's an economic impact.
 - ~ Agencies should bring copies or summaries of their monitoring strategies to the next meeting.

- ~ Agencies should be able to share information and connect on issues where they have responsibility, using new tools / technologies.
 - ~ Is there a way to show current water demands when producing water conditions reports?
 - ~ Is there a way to tie demand forecasting and supply forecasting more closely together?
 - ~ Instream needs should be forecast, the way consumptive demands have a long-term forecast.
 - ~ More work is needed to quantify and characterize the groundwater – surface water connection.
 - ~ One strong theme here is making connections between programs or themes that are already in full swing.
- **Available Water** (p. 6). “Water Availability” is a term of art for WRD. The state’s water availability program, established in the 1990s, serves as a hydrological accounting system, gives water right holders reasonable predictability, and prevents over allocation of basins in the future. It quantifies the natural streamflow conditions in the watershed and subtracts allocations—both instream and out-of-stream—to determine whether water is available to allocate to new permittees. Where applicable, WRD has included groundwater withdrawals into its water availability model; older withdrawals that were not evaluated for impacts to surface water were not included. That body of work is not complete. The Water Availability program is available to the public on-line. Discussion included the following:
 - ~ About 1500 stream reaches have agency-initiated instream water rights on them
 - ~ During the course of a year, about 8 percent of the state’s overall water resource is allocated for a beneficial purpose, including instream uses, consumptive uses, and storage (*2012 IWRS Executive Summary*).
 - ~ Water right owners know that this is a prior appropriation system and that they may get regulated off the system in times of water shortage.
 - ~ This system was designed to make decisions about new allocations; it wasn’t designed to track system inefficiencies or improvements.
 - ~ DEQ could apply for instream water rights to help protect streams that are on the 303(d) list.
 - ~ What about other sources of water, like re-use, conservation, and unallocated (but already stored) water.
 - ~ One role for the state might be to produce a map where the water availability model shows that water is available to allocate and store, where other agencies show opportunity for water resource projects as well. Important to get this information, because it takes decades to bring a storage project on-line.
 - ~ Match that with local knowledge about where the need is.
 - ~ Avoid creating speculation.
 - ~ Support smaller storage projects, off channel, or underground.
 - ~ Storage can be used to release water in late season for instream needs, both water quality & water quantity.
- **Baseflow Studies** (p. 7)
 - ~ What’s the goal of baseflow studies? If one is worried about streamflow health, look at temperature, water quality, parasites too. Just adding flow doesn’t always help.
 - ~ These studies are needed to make defensible decisions about storage and water allocation.
 - ~ These studies are needed to understand the interaction between groundwater and surface water, because groundwater contributes to baseflow.
 - ~ Again, a vital piece of the puzzle, baseflow studies would contribute to Place-Based Planning.
 - ~ Again, need to define terms (the biological use of the word “baseflow,” meaning the minimum flows that fish need during their lifecycle, versus hydrological use of the word “baseflow,” the lowest flows during the year receiving the bulk of their volume from groundwater contributions).
 - ~ Baseflow studies are currently underway at ODFW, although staff dedicated to this are limited duration. Would need to request again. [Editor’s note: instream staff are included in ODFW’s policy option package request for 2017-19.]
 - ~ Even consumptive water users have environmental and conservation on their minds, while continuing to search for water that can be utilized out of stream.
- **Will Instream Needs Change, with Higher Temperatures?** (p. 8) Part of Oregon’s temperature standard was recently invalidated, which called into question whether the TMDLs that have been developed

are accurate. DEQ is waiting for a decision on that in federal court. EPA approves Oregon's standards/TMDLs. Discussion included the following:

- ~ All the data that we've gathered already goes out the door with climate change. How do we gather the data, to better prepare for tomorrow?
 - ~ Most important thing is to have baseline data and the continuous capture of data.
 - ~ DEQ regularly captures water quality data and does more targeted studies in specific areas, relying heavily on partnerships, like the US Forest Service.
 - ~ Could OWEB funds help monitor stream temperature change?
 - ~ Land-use changes shape temperature, through decisions made by FEMA, NOAA, ODF (Forest Practices Act), ODA (pesticides, nutrients, etc.), developers / impervious surfaces, DEQ's NPDES permits.
 - ~ Willamette Water 2100 has modeled high temperatures in the Willamette, even when removing all diversions from the system.
 - ~ One important role the state could play would be to identify areas vulnerable to climate change, particularly loss of snowpack; this could include groundwater with decreased recharge.
 - ~ Again, use the four PBP pilots to see how they are tackling temperature standards, NPDES process and more.
 - ~ Topography controls hydrology; snowmelt contributes to streams; higher temperatures reduce snowpack / natural storage; recent floods have been devastating. There must be a way to divert that water to groundwater storage.
 - ~ Temperature affects out-of-stream uses too.
 - ~ Some water rights define the season of use; for our District irrigation season ends Sept. 30. What if the seasons themselves change in the future? Irrigators can ask to have it extended, but just for a little bit.
 - ~ Demands could change dramatically; the period of peak use could change dramatically.
 - ~ Want to underscore the urgency of having a good Climate Plan. Botswana has a better one than we do. If they don't get it right, people die. Drought in eastern Oregon is a drought in all of Oregon, affecting the food we eat and the water we drink. We owe it to future generations; if we are wrong, let's consider the consequences.
 - ~ We need to update the Climate Resiliency Plan (2010, OEM).
- **Quantify / Monetize Value of Water Instream** (p. 8)
 - ~ Travel Oregon and others have data on the importance of recreation. See <http://www.rco.wa.gov/documents/ORTE/EconomicAnalysisOutdoorRec.pdf>, pg. 11.
 - ~ One of the problems with those studies is that if we remove the land from production, you lose more economically that isn't always accounted for (tax base, related ag services, etc.).
 - ~ It may not be worth spending the time on this one.
 - ~ May be a good topic for public discourse or a research project for university students.
 - ~ Words mean things. The use of the phrase protection of instream water almost puts us in a contentious spirit between. I think "protection" is the wrong word. Maybe "augmentation."
 - ~ There are replacement cost, opportunity cost, or willingness-to-pay studies. What about property values along a healthy stream? There may be studies out of Colorado or Montana.
 - ~ Some studies have looked at the property values on restored habitat, but it's not the same as instream water rights (EcoNorthwest).
 - ~ There's water quality & water quantity value to releasing stored water instream late in the season.
 - ~ What is the economic value of removing a diversion of 10 cfs? In Wolf Creek we eliminated 6 diversion structures; they are no longer there. Try to determine that cost share value. There was no place we could go to put a dollar figure on that.
 - ~ There's value in augmenting or protecting water instream in order to avoid ESA listings; there are economic penalties to not meeting environmental standards.
 - **Anticipate and prepare for effects of extreme events** (p. 9)
 - ~ Currently there are no recommended actions in the strategy about public safety and health during extreme events. Group gives a thumbs up to write one up and look at it again.

- ~ Emergency response mechanisms. We need more emergency preparation for rural and vulnerable populations (in homes, day care centers, senior care centers). Connect to reverse 911 systems that can tell citizens how fast, how soon something is coming.
- ~ There are secondary responses too. Benton County has program that allows distribution of six months' worth of prescriptions. Lack of preparation affects rural and vulnerable communities.
- ~ Infrastructure improvements and place-based planning should be tied to the Oregon Resiliency Plan (2013) and referenced in the IWRS. Update the Oregon Resiliency Plan. The ORP describes the need to prepare a seismic assessment during water system master plans, the need to protect public health after an event, and need to relax regulations where appropriate after an event. To improve ability to deliver emergency water for drinking and for firefighting, water systems should have redundancy built in and should be regionally inter-connected; citizens should be personally prepared, there should be access to fuel. Take another look at land-use role (e.g., impervious surfaces exacerbate flooding). The Plan includes strategies for preparing for extreme events. Pull some of those in.
- ~ Connect to Infrastructure Finance Authority for funding help.
- ~ Need to call out and address, in separate recommended actions: fire, flood, drought, seismic, tsunami. Put them under an extreme events umbrella and then address each one in turn. Give these a separate recommendation number than climate change. Another thumbs up from the group to proceed with this.
- ~ Update the inter-agency Oregon Climate Change Framework, led by DLCDC (Dec. 2010, State of Oregon).
- ~ Consider storage as a regional response / preparation for many of these extreme events.
- ~ It exemplifies a need for place-based approaches. Think about the way in which impervious surfaces play in to water. Pringle Creek has impervious surfaces everywhere. You look at a flooded road, a flooded mall. The floodplain maps have never really been updated. When we don't have a floodplain, a flood picks up all sorts of things. With all of the paving, it will create water we can't use or hold.

- **Drought Response and Resilience** (p. 10)

- ~ There are no recommended actions in the 2012 IWRS specific to drought resilience.
- ~ WRD could be more flexible when it comes to drought for things like water transfers, moving water from one use to another. In our basin, we have three large reservoirs that could be managed more efficiently. For example, one leaks quite a bit, so use that one first. Water right holders who want to lease water instream if they have decided to not use their water that year—do they have the flexibility they need?
- ~ Drought declarations are too slow. Water users have to wait for counties to request drought declarations from the Governor before drought tools are unlocked.
- ~ Santiam Water Control District just completed a WaterSmart drought contingency planning process and had some interesting conversations. Right now the process of declaring drought is kind of rigid. Munis hesitate to have counties request drought declarations because it triggers regulatory actions. Maybe there's another step before that.
- ~ Create a standard or requirement to have a back-up plan to provide drinking water. Think ahead; be more self-sufficient.
- ~ That includes clearing areas around houses to prevent fires. There are no hydrants in rural areas.
- ~ Set up local systems that could create banks of water and supply each other.
- ~ More regional systems could use economies of scale.
- ~ We'll start to see more rain events and less snow.
- ~ Storage might be one way to prepare for drought. Consider having the state as an owner of infrastructure projects, the way California is.
- ~ Even below-ground storage is complicated. Where do you find the land? How do you make aquifer storage and recovery pencil out? How do you meet water quality standards for underground injection? Again, this is where place-based planning fits.
- ~ Storage takes a long time to put into place. In the meantime, develop water from other sources like conservation / efficiency, re-use, reverse osmosis, prevent evaporation of reservoirs...keep exploring.
- ~ Could we have a better definition of "waste"? The state should stop waste. It may look different in different parts of the state. Determine best practices.
- ~ But be aware that more efficient water systems could decrease recharge to groundwater and return flows to surface water.

- ~ The five-year “use it or lose it” requirement means irrigators are out watering in a drought, afraid they’ll forfeit their water rights if they don’t. Could there be some kind of reprieve in times of drought, or way to stop the clock.
- ~ Transfer development rights? Expedite instream leases? Look more closely at the economics of these tools. If you want water instream, you’ll have to figure out how to pay for it.
- ~ The 2015 Legislature authorized \$50 million in bonding for loans that would need to be paid back. Do we know the status of that? That’s not enough money to fund storage. What’s the true cost of storage projects? Response: \$30 million was put toward WRD’s Water Development Loan Fund. Why would anyone go after a loan when they can get a grant? The loan program was put into the state constitution in the 1970s, and may not be as modern as it needs to be. We are in the very early stages of developing long-term solutions. Storage projects are complicated, they take a long time. We didn’t expect to see much storage come through the door today. It’ll take time to build social capital. \$30 million or even \$50 million is nowhere near what’s needed. Washington provided \$200 million 10 years ago.
- **Oregon Resiliency Plan** (p. 10)
 - ~ Skipping this, since the group already talked about it, above.
 - ~ There needs to be a nexus here with the Infrastructure Finance Authority. That’s where the money would come from.
- **Land-use and Water Nexus** (p. 11)
 - ~ Climate refugees and population forecasting. On June 24, there was a workshop at Portland State University’s Population Center around this issue. See [Symposium Links](#). We are not facing pressures as terrible as other parts of the world. In the near future, the overall consensus at the conference was that there would not be any measurable population growth that could be attributable to long-term climate change.
 - ~ Disagreement. We see people moving here because they’re tired of drought in California.
 - ~ Land-Use Goal 5 (Water). DLCD needs to do more rulemaking around this, to strengthen development decisions related to water. For example, houses can be built before securing a water source. Then it becomes a financial hardship not to get permission to use water, even when the system is fully appropriated.
 - ~ The interaction between urbanization and irrigation districts, related to water delivery, is becoming more contentious. For example, the new state police building has paved over an easement for an irrigation ditch.
 - ~ The land-use conversation needs to take place at the state, county, and other levels.
 - ~ Place-based planning could help us test information (for example, groundwater critical areas, locations of septic tanks).
 - ~ Land-Use is bigger than low impact development. Change in use of the land affects everything.
 - ~ Property with water has a greater value than property without. (Compare \$1800/acre to \$200/acre in some areas.) Water moved instream changes the value of the property. It decreases the improvement or production of the ground.
 - ~ Federal programs like CREP are also removing water from the land.
 - ~ Ag has a difficult time competing with urban areas for the price of water. The result is reduction in productive land, less able to produce food for the population.
 - ~ DLCD is not embracing this process. The requirements for periodic review of comprehensive plans and was halted a few years ago. As a result, comp plans are out of date. The agency could still develop guidance, if not rules (e.g., new guidance on tsunamis for coastal towns).
 - ~ Yes, but water left instream also protects the land by avoiding a “taking” under the Endangered Species Act. There are economic reasons water should be left instream.
 - ~ The NOAA / FEMA flood insurance program will intersect with water.
 - ~ State agencies have State Agency Coordination Plans. DLCD and WRD put ours together more than 20 years ago. We haven’t had a chance to update. DLCD has partnered with others, but we’re low in the queue. It’s a staffing issue (DLCD keeps getting asked to do other things).

- ~ Fish are food too, coming back in large numbers. Could we compensate the landowners for helping the fish? I know ranchers who have spent their own money and are excited about certain fish.

- **Infrastructure, Including Storage** (p. 11)

- ~ Dam Safety. WRD is working with owners to develop Emergency Action Plans for dams, but they aren't required for already-existing dams. The Department is working on that. It's also working on inspections. We have very blunt tools at the state and don't have the ability to be nimble when emergencies arise. We will be putting together some recommendations on dam safety, and would like to bring those to you later. Members expressed interest in this.
- ~ Natural infrastructure/storage. Beaver dams and artificial beaver dams have benefits like salmon pools, groundwater recharge, hold back floods, hold back cooler water for longer, low cost. Task Force underway now. Controversial.
- ~ Advocate for the State Revolving Loan Fund and WIFIA. Some of our pipes are leaking and breaking. A lot these funding options can help smaller systems. In some cases you need to show there is a direct public health benefit. People do access it; it has been a resource for a lot of drinking water providers. Infrastructure if it's seismically retrofitted, can help with resilience. DEQ clarified that were two SRF funds: Clean Water @ DEQ and Safe Drinking Water @ OHA. These are low interest loans, which may be no one has tried to access WRD loans yet.
- ~ Infrastructure is a great category to attach a performance measure. Take a look at the Infrastructure Report Card from the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE). What's an acceptable grade for our infrastructure?
- ~ Integrate funding for maintenance and operations with funding from other programs. (e.g., tie the rehabilitation of aging tide gates up and down the coast to conservation and restoration work needed on these same ranches. For urban areas, tie vegetative swales to stormwater and temperature efforts.)
- ~ Forcing integration comes up with better solutions and a cascade of benefits.
- ~ Takes too long to get funding and permission to develop storage, even underground.

- **Public Education** (p. 13)

- ~ How do I get customers to understand the true value of water? We all get it, but we work on it every day.
- ~ Everyone feels water should be free, but it costs money to treat it and move it. We talk about doing these great projects and programs, but moving the public along with us is tricky. I'm posing to all of you... what ideas do you have?
- ~ The IWRS involves not just legislators but everyone; this involves social change.
- ~ Local watershed councils have been given OWEB money to help with high school education programs. Target support to programs like Salmon Watch and Outdoor School.
- ~ Support additional water-related curriculum development for middle and high school classes.
- ~ There is an urgency to what we are doing. How do we get the buy in from the general public?
- ~ Getting people's attention is difficult. They don't appreciate the value of water until the well goes dry. It needs to be news grabbing. Get society focused to recognize the need for planning, because any of these solutions will take time to get implemented.
- ~ With so much new technology and innovation, it should be easy to make the knowledge accessible and exciting. Use more social media, on-line apps, video games, weather sensing equipment (when to water and when to not).
- ~ Need to develop literacy in this topic; represents a cultural change. Hard to get the attention of adults; in the long term, focus on the kids.
- ~ Local newsletters and newspapers still have strong readership.
- ~ Allowing the media to deliver the message resulting in inaccuracies. Deliver directly.
- ~ The state could really take a lead role when it comes to communication—best practices information, water conservation, general language that everyone can draw upon.
- ~ Do people here support OWRD to have a public outreach capacity? California has 8 public information officers, and we have zero. I see this as a gap here at OWRD; this is the group to ask for help.
- ~ Do a better job of centralizing resources and creating information clearinghouses. Partner with the Oregon Farm Bureau, the Grange, and others.

- ~ Do a better job of describing the “new normal” and preparing people for it.
 - ~ Partner with other states on water education campaigns / messaging, like “Slow the Flow.”
 - ~ Use TV, radio and on-line commercials / PSAs to get visceral response.
 - ~ Run contests like “what would you do if you were in charge of water for the day”?
- **Interaction with Federal policies** (p. 14). **Didn’t talk through this section; come back to this.**
 - **Water conservation and efficiency** (p. 15). **Didn’t actually talk through this section; come back to this.**
 - ~ How many WMCPs do we have? How many people are actually covered under those? We should use these existing planning processes, rather than create something new.
 - ~ Tout Best Management Practices, like drip irrigation.
 - ~ Shouldn’t water users have to demonstrate system efficiency before getting any new water right permits?
 - **Water reuse** (p. 16). **Didn’t talk through this section; come back to this.**
 - **Other sources of water** (p. 17). **Didn’t actually talk through this section; come back to this.**
 - ~ Small systems are signing intergovernmental agreements with neighboring communities to share water in emergencies, without keeping in mind that they often share the same water source. How to diversify even further?
 - **Burden of proof** (p. 17). **Didn’t talk through this section; come back to this.**
 - **Balance instream protections & economic development** (p. 18). **Didn’t talk through this section; come back to this.**
 - **Water right transfers and reviews** (p. 18). **Didn’t talk through this section; come back to this.**
 - **Ensure adequate field staff** (p. 19)
 - ~ Got thumbs up from the PAG on including this as a recommended action.
 - ~ Field staff includes watermasters and assistants, hydrologic technicians, well inspectors, etc.
 - ~ Make sure it applies to all IWRS agencies; put in combined agency budget requests.
 - ~ Consider describing funding sources (General Fund, Fees, Federal Funds, County Funds). Which are stable?
 - ~ Field personnel are the fulcrum. They know the people and the watershed. They could be the face of monitoring, of place-based planning, etc.
 - **Ensure adequate permitting staff** (p. 19)
 - ~ Got thumbs up from the PAG on including this as a recommended action.
 - ~ Again, include all IWRS agencies in budget requests.
 - **Instream protections** (p. 20) **Didn’t actually talk through this section; come back to this.**
 - ~ The process for issuing instream water rights may be broken. Two agencies that can request these rights don’t. ODFW hasn’t requested new ones in 20 years. If there is a protest, it takes a long time to get through the approval process.
 - **Groundwater protection** (p. 21)
 - ~ Groundwater protection (quality and quantity) is absent in the strategy as a recommended action. In statute, we have the authority to protect groundwater, but it’s not mentioned in the Strategy. Streamflow protection is in there; would be helpful to have a parallel.
 - ~ Define “protection” before going any further. Want to make sure we’re not setting up a system of winners and losers. Decide whether making a value statement would be enough, or say something more specific?

- ~ How do we plan for continued future growth, while making sure groundwater supplies are sustainable for the future? Benton County requires developers to conduct pump tests and make sure water is adequate. Can't stop building, but can require water tanks to help with timing issues.
- ~ DLCDC could provide some type of guidance to counties, requiring tests before new exempt wells are drilled.
- ~ Could system development charges, new home fees, domestic well fees, or other sources of income help monitor groundwater levels in expanding areas?
- ~ DOGAMI is partner.
- ~ There's 1988 research, showing a correlation between groundwater protection and property values. Higher protections lead to higher property values.
- ~ See also the Real Estate Transaction data – these are compiled from required water quality testing of wells at the time of real estate sales. There's a connection between property values and groundwater quality.
- ~ With regard to quality, note that Oregon has stricter water quality standards than other states, assuming that all groundwater is a future potential source of drinking water. Water injected underground must meet drinking water standards. UIC is regulated.
- ~ That's not true for stormwater infiltration standards. For swales and other things, water quality may not be a consideration for those types of projects. Keeping pollutants out of surface water and off the land can keep them out of the groundwater.
- Issue of septic tanks. N. Albany, their water supplies were being contaminated by their own septic systems. Also big issue in the McKenzie and LaPine areas. If we are going to protect groundwater we need to deal with septics. EWEB is paying for a lot of septic systems.
- ~ 2016 Legislature just authorized loans for landowner septic system repairs.
- ~ We should specify what type of groundwater we are talking about. In Milton-Freewater the district did a lot of piping and irrigation efficiency projects, now they have a groundwater recharge, and septic issues. So there are unintended consequences.

- **DEQ's toxics reduction strategy, pesticide programs at Dept. of Agriculture (p. 21). Didn't talk through this section; come back to this.**

- **Protect Vulnerable Populations / Environmental Justice (p. 23)**
 - ~ Determine where groundwater contamination is.
 - ~ Protect low income and disadvantaged populations who have potentially contaminated sources (contaminated groundwater, lead pipes, etc.). Protect public spaces too. Schools (don't forget RURAL schools), prisons, libraries, galleries.
 - ~ Help these communities with grant programs.
 - ~ Tie to place-based planning, outreach programs, language translation programs, diversity, equity, involvement, public process plans, messaging.
 - ~ Be cognizant that cultural practices may lead to higher exposures (e.g., fish consumption).
 - ~ In redeveloping brownfield sites, ask: what's in the soil? what type of facility will go here?
 - ~ Need more money to rehabilitate septic tanks / fields in low income areas. These are areas where DEQ is the lead agency.
 - ~ Affordable housing expanding to rural areas; need to be able to ensure safe wells.
 - ~ Small water systems, with little to no ratepayer base, need help understanding and meeting new requirements, performing operations and maintenance, creating interties (interconnections), a diversity of sources, developing water management and conservation plans.
 - ~ Note sure if vulnerable populations is the right term. If you don't involve all sectors that might need the water, use the water, have access to it, then it's not really a full strategy.

- **Public funding programs (p. 24). Didn't talk through this section; come back to this.**

- **Agency Funding (p. 25). Didn't talk through this section; come back to this.**

V. Public Comments

The facilitator invited public comment at 4:47, but none was offered.

VI. Meeting Recap and Feedback

The facilitator invited feedback from the members about how process time and content might be improved if future meetings. Members also asked for an electronic copy (MS Word doc) to fill in thoughts and send to the Department. Staff will provide this, but would also be happy with a scan or picture of hand-written notes. Please email to the facilitator by July 30 (brenda.o.bateman@state.or.us).

The facilitator asked whether planned meeting dates would work for the majority of participants. Members asked for a doodle poll to determine the dates of the next two meetings.

The next meeting will also last a full day. Consider a BBQ as a lunch option.

VII. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 5:05.