

Summary of Non-Study Specific General Comments and Department Response

1. Comment – Eileen Stein, City Manager for the City of Sisters, and Adam Sussman, GSI Water Solutions, indicated that the Application Review Team inappropriately added a criterion not to fund “required” plans, such as Water Management and Conservations Plans.

Response – The Department concurs that it was inappropriate for the Application Review Team to add a filter that was not described in the original grant application materials. Three applications were affected: Water Management and Conservation Plans from City of Sisters, City of Florence, and Heceta Water District.

These three applications were forwarded to the 2008 Oregon Water Supply Conservation Initiative (OWSCI) Community Match Funding Program to be considered for funding along with other similar grant applications submitted to that program.

2. Comment – Kimberley Priestley of WaterWatch indicated that a number of the studies associated with storage projects recommended for funding do not comply with the law.

Response – Applicants who indicated that the associated project will impound surface water on a perennial stream or divert water from a stream that supports sensitive, threatened or endangered fish or divert more than 500 acre-feet of surface water annually, indicated by signing the grant application they are committing to include the following statutory required elements in their planning study: (a) Analyses of by-pass, optimum peak, flushing and other ecological flows of the affected stream and the impact of the storage project on those flows; (b) Comparative analyses of alternative means of supplying water, including but not limited to the costs and benefits of conservation and efficiency alternatives and the extent to which long-term water supply needs may be met using those alternatives; (c) Analyses of environmental harm or impacts from the proposed storage project; (d) Evaluation of the need for and feasibility of using stored water to augment in-stream flows to conserve, maintain and enhance aquatic life, fish life and any other ecological values; and (e) For a proposed storage project that is for municipal use, analysis of local and regional water demand and the proposed storage projects relationship to existing and planned water supply projects.

However, to ensure that the applicant is aware of these criteria and has a plan to meet them, the Department recommends that these applications be funded contingent on contract negotiations to ensure that all statutory provisions are met.

3. Comment – Ms. Priestley indicated that it was unclear how the Application Review Team used the evaluation criteria.

Response – Application Review Team members were asked to: 1) score each application, 2) provide comments on how the application addressed the evaluation criteria, and 3) comment on the overall strengths and weaknesses of the application. The team then discussed the merits

of each application. Attachment 3 - Application Summaries provides more detailed information on how the Application Review Team evaluated each application and applied the evaluation criteria.

4. Comment – Ms. Priestley indicated that as part of the review process, WRD and the Application Review Team should undertake a “rudimentary review” of the proposals to ensure that the “proposed project would be in compliance with existing laws, and also that the applicant is currently meeting current permit conditions.”

Response –Department field staff provided input to the Application Review Team on water availability, water supply, and water right issues that could affect the proposed studies and associated projects.

5. Comment –Ms. Priestly indicated that a higher percentage of the funding should be dedicated to water conservation and reuse studies.

Response – When making funding recommendations, the Application Review Team was true to the recommendation of the Rules Advisory Committee to recommend funding the best studies, without regard to type of application. Although more Water Conservation and Reuse applications were recommended for funding than storage applications, the storage applications were recommended to be funded at a higher dollar amount.

The staff recommendation adds funding to support four additional studies. Three of these are for Water Conservation or Reuse for a total of \$73,355 and one is for storage for \$20,000. Additionally, three Water Conservation applications have been forwarded to the Oregon Water Supply Conservation Initiative Community Match Funding Program for funding consideration. Also, if not all funds are used by grant recipients, staff are requesting that the Commission authorize staff to fund additional Water Conservation or Reuse applications consistent with the program.