

# WATER RESOURCES COMMISSION

## WORK SESSION

MARCH 11, 1993

### MINUTES

#### MEMBERS:

Lorna Stickel  
Cliff Bentz  
Hadley Akins  
Roger Bachman  
Mike Jewett  
Jim Howland

#### STAFF:

Martha Pagel  
Diane Reynolds  
Cindy Smith  
Doug Parrow  
Rick Cooper  
Adam Sussman  
Steve Brown  
Fred Lissner  
Danielle Clair  
Rick Bastasch  
Amin Wahab  
Becky Kreag  
John Borden  
Virginia Gabert  
Bernadette Williams  
Barry Norris  
Ken Weese  
Steve Applegate  
Randy Selig  
Steve Sanders

#### OTHERS:

Dale Jutila  
Alan Fletcher  
Karen Russell  
Gene Clemens  
Joe Hobson  
Todd Heidgerken  
Dale Hile  
Jack Nicholls  
Richard Whitman  
Stanley Wallulis  
Gail Achterman  
Roberta Jortner  
Barton Stue  
Stephanie Burchfield  
Jan Boettcher  
Tom Simmons  
Audrey Simmons  
Mike Rosenberger  
Dave Winship

The staff reports presented at this meeting, which contain the Director's recommendations mentioned in these minutes, are on file in the office of the Director of the Water Resources Department, 3850 Portland Road NE, Salem, Oregon. Written information submitted at this meeting is hereby made a part of this record and is on file at the above address. Audiocassette recording tapes of the meeting are also on file in the Water Resources Department office.

Lorna Stickel asked to be excused during the first item due to a conflict of interest.

1. INFORMATION REPORT ON PORTLAND'S REGIONAL WATER SUPPLY PLAN, PHASE II

The Portland Water Bureau led a panel presentation on Portland's Regional Water Supply Plan, Phase II. The intent of this presentation was to inform the Commission where the Bureau is regarding regional supply work for the past 2 years and where they are headed in the next 2 years. Mike Rosenberger, Portland Water Bureau, gave an overhead presentation explaining Phase I of the plan. Rosenberger stated that Phase I began in January 1992 with a 27 member committee (Regional Providers Advisory Group).

Alan Fletcher, Clairmont Water District, discussed the interim public involvement program that was used during the spring and summer of 1992. This group of people provided the Bureau with the priorities that should be looked at as Phase II of the Plan moves forward. Fletcher gave an overview of the 10 issues that evolved from the interim program.

Dave Winship, City of Beaverton, gave a brief synopsis of the consultant selection process for Phase II of the Plan. A briefing was held on July 16, 1992, to present the scope of work and answer questions of consultants. A formal request was issued to consultants, Bearcat & Chamberlin; CH2M Hill; and Echo Northwest in August 1992. Bearcat & Chamberlin were chosen.

Mike Rosenberger said the project will cost approximately \$2.2 million that will be shared among the region.

Roberta Jortner, of the Portland Water Bureau, reported the phased implementation strategies from the time of plan to completion would be approximately April 1995 to the year 2050. Jortner did a breakdown of the cost involved for Phase II.

Dale Jutila, Clackamas Water District, discussed intergovernmental agreements. Jutila stated that this process of development gives an opportunity to evaluate a number of sources at one time: conservation, public acceptability, rationale, etc.

2. INFORMATION REPORT ON WATER AVAILABILITY PROGRAM PROGRESS FOR 1993

Rick Cooper, WRD, reported that in May 1991, three reports were issued detailing work accomplished under the Water Availability Program up to that time. In the methodology described in those reports, 80 percent exceedance streamflows were based on mean monthly flows. Subsequent to the reports, staff recommended that the exceedance flows be based on mean daily flows, that a new methodology be defined, and that the water availability database be recalculated. The Commission concurred with the recommendation, and work on a new methodology was initiated in February 1992.

The methodology is now defined, and the tools necessary to implement the methodology in Western Oregon have been developed. A draft progress report describing the new methodology has been prepared for the 1993 Legislature. The staff report serves as an introduction to the progress report, briefly highlighting the differences between the new methodology and the previous one.

The Commission discussed how the 80 percent exceedance flow was calculated.

Chair Stickel directed staff to consider using different municipal consumptive use coefficients for summer months and for the rest of the year.

Doug Heiken, WaterWatch, commented. (Tape 3, Mark 468)

Gail Achterman, Attorney, commented. (Tape 4, Mark 31)

In response to comments released by WaterWatch and Gail Achterman, the Commission requested a follow-up report from the department to be presented at the next Commission meeting or work session.

#### DIRECTOR'S RECOMMENDATION

This was an informational report only. Staff asked for comments on the draft of the progress report to the Legislature.

### 3. INFORMATION REPORT ON BASIN PROGRAM REVISION PROCESS

Doug Parrow, WRD, reported that in July 1992, the Commission adopted the state policy on water allocation. A major component of the allocation policy is an 80% exceedance water availability standard. This standard and the methodologies used to estimate water availability are the topic of Agenda Item 2 of this Commission work session. The 80% exceedance standard for water availability is currently used in the Department's permitting activities.

One of the implementing strategies in the allocation policy is the revision of basin program classifications. The overall intent of the revision process has been to better reflect the relationship between water availability and allowable uses in basin programs. Staff presented an informational report on the revision process at the Commission's July 17, 1992, meeting in Hermiston. The Commission concurred with the general framework of the process at the July meeting. However, since the July meeting several issues concerning the process have surfaced. Based on the nature and scope of these issues, postponement of basin program revision was recommended. Postponing would allow staff to evaluate the structure of current basin programs and address how program revision can be integrated with other Commission policies and department activities. Additionally, time is needed to explore development of a more comprehensive, solution-oriented planning approach.

Staff asked to come back at the April Commission meeting with a proposed workplan which addresses: public information about water availability; a review of approaches used in basin program development; completion of work on revised water use definitions; and petitions for basin program modifications.

Karen Russell, WaterWatch, commented. (Tape 4, Mark 536)

Gail Achterman, Attorney, commented. (Tape 5, Mark 1)

Chair Stickel and Roger Bachman will work with staff on the proposed workplan that will be brought back to the Commission in April.

DIRECTOR'S RECOMMENDATION

This is an informational report only and no Commission action was required. In the absence of Commission direction to the contrary, the director and staff proposed to delay initiation of the basin program revisions to re-evaluate the revision process specifically and other water supply issues in general.

Chair Stickel called an Executive Session immediately follow the work session.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,



Cindy Smith  
Commission Assistant

3-11-93.WS