Attachment 2

Summary of Public Comments The Department received 31 comments on eight proposals; some letters contained comments on several applications.	
Public Comment	WRD Response
WaterWatch of Oregon – general comments WaterWatch continues to be concerned that a number of grant applications are not complying with the underlying law on these grants. While this threshold for funding is clear both in the statute and the rules, and the application for that matter, it appears that a number of applications that the WRD has recommended funding for do not meet this standard (at least by virtue of the information provided in the applications posted on-line).	All applications were reviewed for compliance with the administrative rules. However, some of the responses from the applicants lacked clarity or required reference to another document. Due to these expressed concerns the Department will consider changing the application forms to request additional information which may include a brief description of the outcomes of any previous work and the methods involved in the analysis. No grant award contracts will be offered without a scope of work that specifically addresses the statutory requirements. If there is a previous grant, this scope of work will include a detailed list of accomplishments to date and work products for the current grant that would be needed to show and enhance the progress of the analysis.
WaterWatch of Oregon – general comments For proposals to study "conservation projects" that claim to have a benefit to streamflows yet don't call out the Conserved Water Statute, does the WRD check in with the applicant to better understand their intent?	The Department initiated dialog with applicants related to "implementation strategy" and "related WRD programs" during the grant process. Due to this expressed concern, the Department will consider the inclusion of clarifying language in the scope of work for grant awards. Future grant application materials may include a specific question on all related Department programs including but not limited to streamflow restoration.

Attachment 2

Summary of Public Comments The Department received 31 comments on eight proposals; some letters contained comments on several applications.	
Public Comment	WRD Response
WaterWatch of Oregon – general comments • Is the WRD doing an independent water availability analysis on streams where applicants are applying for state funding to assess storage supplies? Such a review is important because if a stream is fully allocated year round, the public should not be funding a study for a project that would be attempting to get around existing water allocation policies. • Is the WRD ensuring that applicants that are seeking to enlarge existing reservoirs are complying with existing permit/certificate conditions on their existing project? • Is the WRD assessing applications to study the feasibility for conservation projects to ensure compliance with existing laws • Is ODFW conducting a review to determine whether the project would be at all capable of meeting Division 33 and other fish standards?	• The application review team (ART) included Region Managers, State Engineer and the Dam Safety Engineer from the Department. The interagency representation was from OFDW, DEQ, Dept of Agriculture, Parks and Recreation, and IFA. The local knowledge from the Region manager was valuable in more than just water availability. Issues such as existing water rights, Scenic Waterways, other infrastructure and water quality were also part of the source water criteria. • The local knowledge from the Region manager and the Dam Safety Engineer was valuable in areas of compliance. • WRD assesses the applications and particularly the chosen projects for compliance. Knowledge of requirements is a point criteria and also will be a condition of any grant agreement. Input from OFDW, DEQ, Dept of Agriculture, Parks and Recreation and IFA was valuable to understand a broader view of regulatory compliance as well. • The ODFW staff involved is very knowledgeable at all Div 33 levels, DEQ staff is involved in source water protection .
WaterWatch of Oregon – general comments The proposed allocation of 1069 grant dollars continues to be inordinately weighted towards storage projects, with at least 45% of Tier I dollars recommendations directed to storage projects. This imbalance in the proposed grants should be addressed.	The ART continues the past practice of recommending funding what it deems are the best studies, without regard to type of application.

Attachment 2

Summary of Public Comments The Department received 31 comments on eight proposals; some letters contained comments on several applications.	
Public Comment	WRD Response
Polk County (Valsetz) The Department received 15 comments requesting the Polk County proposal not be funded. The major themes of the comments were dealing with sensitive and listed endangered fish species, water quality concerns, ecosystem functions, water supply needs, minimum qualifications of the application, post dam operations (invasive species) use of out of state consultants, and some of the comments reflected a desire for alternative source analysis (including conservation).	The application met the minimum qualification to be reviewed, however, this project did not score as well as Tier One applications in technical merit or statewide priority with the ART. The source water issues were difficult. Based on the previously funded project there were concerns about the cost and benefit of this project because of the mitigation needs for the impacts to aquatic and terrestrial features of the reservoir site. There were also concerns about the clean up of the former Mill site as well. The application would have benefited by building a stronger connection to progress being made on the SB 1069 requirements.
Hood River County The Department received one comment from WaterWatch of Oregon. There was concern about the level of detail in the application particularly in the issue of peak and ecological flows. WWO points out that ODFW would be the key agency to identify such flows and not WRD. WWO had further concerns about the Middle Fork Irrigation District being a partner in the HRWPG due to a protest of a conversion the Parkdale hydro-electric license to an instream water right.	The application met the minimum qualification to be reviewed and the ART scored this application mid range in the Tier One group for both technical merit and priority. The application could have been strengthened by better description in the organizational aspects and the technical expertise. MFID is only one of the partners. One of the strengths of the Hood River Water Planning Group is partnerships. The secured match with the BOR WaterSMART Program was very indicative of the type of support this project has. Partnerships described were good representation of the basin and support project goals. SB 1069 requirements for source water assessments will be assessed by a variety of experts under the contract. ODFW is one of the group's participants.

Attachment 2

Summary of Public Comments The Department received 31 comments on eight proposals; some letters contained comments on several applications.	
Public Comment	WRD Response
East Valley Water District The Department received comments from Dickman Farms and the Oregon Seed Council expressing support for the project and one comment from WaterWatch of Oregon expressing concerns. There was concern about the level of detail in the application particularly in the issue required responses.	The application met the minimum qualification to be reviewed. The ART scored this application mid range in the Tier One group for both Technical merit and priority. The application could have been strengthened by better description of previous efforts. The applicant used knowledge from previous Department grants. Due to public comment by WWO, Department staff did a special review of the application and previous technical reports to determine that progress was made on SB 1069 requirements and further progress will be made with this study.
WISE The Department received letters of support for this project from WaterWatch of Oregon, Oregon Wild, and the Cities of Ashland Jacksonville and Medford.	No response necessary.
City of Dundee The Department received a comment expressing support for this project from WaterWatch of Oregon.	No response necessary.
Walla Walla Basin Watershed Council The Department received two comments expressing support for this project. One from the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board encouraging funding if funds are available and one from the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation.	No response necessary.
Tri City Water & Sanitary Authority The Department received a comment expressing support for this project.	No response necessary.

Attachment 2

Summary of Public Comments The Department received 31 comments on eight proposals; some letters contained comments on several applications.	
Public Comment	WRD Response
Fessler Nursery The Department received a comment expressing support for this project.	No response necessary.