

Upper Grande Ronde River Watershed Partnership Place-Based Integrated Water Resource Planning Stakeholder Meeting

Meeting Minutes

September 19, 2018

OSU Extension Office Conference Room

10507 N. McAlister, La Grande, OR

ATTENDANCE: Tim Bailey, Steve Parrett, Kyle Carpenter, Donna Beverage, Mike Burton, Rodger Huffman, Darin Walenta, Larry Larson, Jim Webster, Tim Wallender, Curt Ricker, Adrienne Averett, John Dadoly, Dana Kurtz; via phone: Margaret Matter, Rachel Lovellford.

The Steering Committee met prior to the Stakeholder meeting at 3:00 pm and discussed field trip options for the November 8 meeting, as well as the intended focus of the stakeholder meeting.

I. **Welcome**

- a. Donna opened the meeting at 4:10 p.m. and brief introductions took place.
- b. Dana shared the purpose of the Stakeholder meeting and a general overview of Place-based planning. This group continues to work through Step 3 and move towards Step 4. The agenda and meeting guidelines were reviewed.
- c. Dana provided an overview of the August 15 meeting.
- d. Donna stated that the Ford Family Leadership Partnership will visit Union County in November. The November stakeholder meeting will be held in Cove at noon, followed by a tour via school bus and dinner.
- e. In the review of the August 15, 2018 meeting minutes, the attendance of Rodger Huffman and Steve Perrett was not reflected. Multiple requests were made to correct the minutes to include comments and discussion that took place regarding in-stream leases potentially adversely affecting other water rights holders.

II. **Step 4 Matrix Work Session**

- a. Dana explained that smaller groups would be formed to test the revised matrix; hypothetical projects would be scored and categories would be added as needed. Once a final revision of the matrix is agreed upon, it will be used to score potential projects and determine which will be supported and moved forward.
- b. Three groups were formed and worked collaboratively to determine how the scoring matrix could be improved. Suggestions and notes made by the groups are as follows:
 - Natural hazards & climate should be on separate lines
 - Include a legend with better explanation of scoring numbers
 - Add the word "improve" to Natural hazards and climate change
 - "Certainty of benefit" could be scored on a 0-4 scale
 - Space for more explanation of impact/number of sub basins
 - Include space to list funding sources, i.e. ongoing & one-time

- Consider higher score for more funding sources
- Better definition of funding sources (traditional vs. other)
- Include Impact scale & how to define
- Broad community support may be unknown
- Space to list unknown negative consequences
- Project description should ask for critical issue being solved by project
- Sub basin priority is unclear & may be too high
- Add measureable impact to in-stream / positive or negative
- Add project's season/timing of year to reflect effect of project
- Yes/No questions are too vague & difficult to assess
- Add ecological benefit
- Wider range of scoring needed
- More definitions needed
- Include cumulative impact to maximize benefits
- Add number of problems the project is addressing
- Include economic benefits, such as jobs retained/created by project
- Short term vs. long term purpose

III. Step 3 Report

- a. Dana provided a summary of comments received and revisions made for Step 3. A revised copy will be sent after this meeting for more changes and then reviewed at the November meeting. The goal of the November meeting will be to get a consensus of report's conclusions for each of the sub watersheds, for a particular demand category. Major revisions were as follows:
 - The summary was expanded to include more definitions.
 - Assumptions and limitations sections will be expanded; it does not fully explain the data set, but it is the best information available for the available budget and timeframe.
 - Due to the report growing beyond 150 pages, a statement will be included to allow for additional information in appendices.
 - More consistency is needed between reports generated by different demand groups.
 - The demand summary will include information from the different working groups.
 - The high/moderate/low descriptions were expanded for each of the sub watersheds and ranked for use to address the vulnerability of the sub watershed on a whole.
 - Natural hazards section was expanded to include information from the Blue Mt. Adaptation Plan.
 - The main summary will be updated to reflect comments about water resources and water demand not being distributed equally in the water shed. That will feed directly into the matrix in ranking certain watersheds if there is more water use, pressure in the water, more prioritization.

Steve commended Dana for her work and noted that it is difficult to formulate a report from a multitude of comments.

Dana stated that she would provide the latest revision within a week or two.

IV. OWRD Groundwater Method

- a. Rachel Lovellford, Oregon Water Resources, provided a presentation to address questions about groundwater reports in Step 3 and possible next actions steps (see attached presentation).
- b. Discussion and consensus of path forward:
Dana asked the group if there was interest in reopening Step 2 to include additional groundwater information or if it should be kept in the Step 3 report. Donna suggested leaving Step 2 as is, adding the information to Step 3, and then adding any future work to Step 4. Jim commented that additional groundwater data should not be left out of Step 2. Steve asked if the same information would be added to Steps 2 and 3, or if it would be separate subject matter. Rachel stated that would follow the lead of the group in deciding where to place the data; the Step 3 report does not currently include supply numbers. Dana noted that the group could decide where it fits best once Rachel creates stronger groundwater reports. Adrienne noted that having it included would help consistency for the solutions and potentially assessing risk.

There was some support of holding an October meeting, but the general consensus was to review information from Rachel once available prior to deciding upon a meeting in October. Dana will send a poll via email to collect responses about a potential meeting in October.

Dana stated that the question about a well monitoring network would be tabled and addressed after more time is given to think about it. She noted that other groups are doing it, but it is controversial and can be scary to share in the group.

V. Conclusion

- a. Next meeting is November 8, 2018, 12-2PM, tentatively in Cove with field trip and dinner to follow
- b. Other comments: No other comments were offered.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:05PM

Respectfully Submitted,

Cinda Johnston
Union County Planning Department Specialist