



**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Water Resources Commission

**FROM:** Alyssa Mucken, IWRS Coordinator *AM*  
Brenda Bateman, Technical Services Division Administrator *BB*

**SUBJECT:** Agenda Item B, January 26, 2017  
Water Resources Commission Meeting

**Update on Oregon's' Integrated Water Resources Strategy**

**I. Introduction**

During this agenda item, Department will update the Commission on development of the 2017 Integrated Water Resources Strategy (IWRS). Staff will share the final recommendations coming from discussions of a citizen-member Policy Advisory Group. The project timeline and associated next steps for the 2017 IWRS will also be discussed.

**II. Background**

The Water Resources Department is responsible for updating Oregon's Integrated Water Resources Strategy every five years. Last adopted in 2012, the Commission will be presented with an updated IWRS in mid-to-late 2017. Other boards and commissions will be notified, prior to adoption of the 2017 IWRS.

Department staff began working on the 2017 update in late 2015 with development of a workplan to guide the process and provide the public and stakeholders opportunities for engagement. The Department designed this update to be narrow in scope, recognizing that the original goals, objectives, and critical issues outlined in the document are still relevant today. In light of the severe drought conditions experienced in recent years, addressing drought resiliency is both a key focus area and required element for the 2017 IWRS.

Thus far, updating the IWRS has been focused on adding new recommended actions, where needed, or shoring up existing recommended actions. This includes evaluating progress made through implementation since adoption in 2012.

The Department has been working with several natural resource agencies as part of this update. The Department of Environmental Quality, Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the Department the Agriculture have continued their involvement and are core partners in this update process.

Agency partners recently contributed to reviewing and revising the original IWRS, attended open houses earlier in the year, and participated in the Policy Advisory Group meetings.

### **III. Overview of the 2016 Policy Advisory Group**

The Policy Advisory Group (PAG) that was convened to support development of the 2012 IWRS was instrumental in laying the foundation of the IWRS and helped shape its content. The Department felt it was important to convene a new Policy Advisory Group for the 2017 update process. The Department selected members that represented a diverse geography, expertise, and interest. A list of members is included as part of Attachment 3 of this staff report.

The PAG met on four occasions in 2016, beginning in March and concluding in December. The Department maintained a section of its website where meeting agendas, protocols, materials, and meeting notes were posted. The final meeting agenda (Attachment 1) and PAG protocols (Attachment 2) are attached to this report. Meeting reminders were sent to the public through the Department's electronic mailing list. All-day meetings were held in Salem and open to the public. Each meeting included time set aside for public comment.

### **IV. Perspectives and Recommendations from the Policy Advisory Group**

The 2016 PAG held its final meeting on December 6-7, 2016, focusing discussions the first day on drought resiliency, water use efficiency and conservation, and other topics that had not yet been discussed at previous meetings. During the second day, the PAG used a consensus approach to prepare a set of overarching statements, new recommended actions, and supporting statements to share with the Water Resources Commission and to recommend for inclusion in the 2017 IWRS.

During the meeting, the Policy Advisory Group acknowledged the work of the 2016 Drought Task Force and incorporated many aspects of Task Force's report into its own thinking. The PAG lent its support to several Task Force recommendations, while noting that many have broader implications than drought alone. Support was given for increasing and enriching water-related data, providing resources for risk assessment, as well as outreach and communication, funding for additional watermasters, and additional programs for streamflow restoration. Attachment 3 of this staff report is a memo from the PAG's offering overarching statements, new recommended actions, and supporting or confirming statements. Members were asked to review and approve this memo by email following the December 6-7 meeting. Attachment 4 of this staff report includes the email responses sent by all 18 of the PAG members.

The PAG offered six new recommended actions. These new actions address: preparing for extreme events, ensuring that necessary data and assessments are in place to prepare for and respond to water scarcity, ensuring public safety, providing adequate field presence within IWRS agencies, providing adequate permitting staff within IWRS agencies, and developing a plan for sustainable groundwater management.

The PAG also spent time shoring up existing recommendation actions, developing several supporting statements around data and measurement, water and land-use, water and wastewater infrastructure, water use efficiency and conservation, built and natural storage, and climate change adaptation and resiliency. Throughout the meeting, PAG members spent considerable time revising statements to reach consensus.

Appendix B of Attachment 3 includes a summary of recommendations and statements in areas where the PAG did not reach consensus. In some instances, there was not sufficient time to fully discuss all of the proposed statements for consideration. Some members felt that certain proposed statements were too narrowly focused for inclusion in a statewide strategy. In other instances, some members felt a proposal was not necessary because the topic or idea was already adequately reflected in the original IWRS. Appendix B includes rationale and observations offered by members, describing why they may have voted no on certain statements.

#### **V. Timeline and Next Steps**

Project staff members are writing a draft 2017 IWRS with plans to make it publicly available for comment in February or early March. The public and stakeholders will be given ample opportunity to comment on the draft 2017 IWRS.

In late spring, the Department plans to hold informational meetings with the Board of Agriculture, Environmental Quality Commission, and the Fish and Wildlife Commission. The Water Resources Commission is required to notify these boards and commissions prior to adoption of any revisions to the IWRS. Staff anticipate that the Commission will be presented with a revised IWRS during the August 2017 Commission meeting.

#### **Attachments:**

Attachment 1: December 6-7, 2016 PAG Meeting Agenda

Attachment 2: 2016 PAG Protocols

Attachment 3: January 26, 2017 Memo from the Policy Advisory Group

Attachment 4: PAG final comments and responses, sent via email

Alyssa Mucken

503-986-0911

Brenda Bateman

503-986-0879



# Oregon

Kate Brown, Governor

**Water Resources Department**

725 Summer St NE, Suite A

Salem, OR 97301

(503) 986-0900

Fax (503) 986-0904

## **Development of the 2017 Integrated Water Resources Strategy: Policy Advisory Group (PAG) Meeting #4 and Final**

Oregon Water Resources Department, Room 124

(North Mall Office Building)

725 Summer St., NE, Salem, OR 97301

---

### **Agenda**

#### **Day 1: Tuesday, December 6**

**I. (1:00 pm) Welcome and Introductions**

Brenda Bateman, Facilitator

**II. Two-Day Agenda Review**

**III. Review and Approval of September Meeting Notes**

Group Discussion

**IV. Following-Up Previous Requests**

Group Discussion

2017-19 agency budget requests, maps and resources requested in previous meeting

**V. (2:00 pm) Continuation of September Discussion; Sketching Out Next Steps**

Please bring the 25-page document, "2017 IWRS Update : Workspace for PAG Members"

Major topics left unaddressed during previous meetings were (1) water -use efficiency and conservation and (2) final recommendations from Oregon's Drought Task Force. The group will pick up its discussion with these topics.

(3:00 break)

**VI. (4:00) Public Comment**

Group Discussion

**VII. (4:15) Meeting Recap and Feedback**

Facilitator

Reconvene Wednesday, December 7, 2016 at 9:00 am

**VIII. Adjourn**

**No Host Dinner at 6:00**

**We've made reservations at Urban Alley, 350 Chemeketa St., NE**

## Day 2: Wednesday, December 7

(8:45) Danish and Coffee Available for PAG members and staff

Room 124 (across from coffee cart)

### I. (9:00 am) Welcome and Introductions

Brenda Bateman, Facilitator

### II. Agenda Review

### III. Review Member Roles, PAG Protocols & Decision-Making

Group Discussion

### IV. Walk through Draft PAG Report

Group Discussion

Action Item

“New” Recommended Actions, “Adjusted” Recommended Actions, Additional Items

(10:30 break)

12:00 Lunch for PAG members and staff

### V. (12:30 pm) Continued Walk through Draft PAG Report

(2:30 break)

### VI. Next Steps / Timeline

Group Discussion

### VII. (3:45) Public Comment

### VIII. (4:00) Meeting Recap and Feedback

Facilitator

### IX. Adjourn

#### Meeting Objectives:

- Take care of business items
- Complete discussion of brainstorming results
- Review report of the Drought Task Force
- Come to agreement on content of PAG report

#### Questions about travel reimbursements, parking, or food? Contact:

Lorri Cooper

503-986-0875

lorri.l.cooper@wrд.state.or.us, and please copy →

Cindy Smith

503-986-0876

cindy.s.smith@wrд.state.or.us

#### IWRS Coordinator:

Alyssa Mucken

725 Summer St., NE

Salem, OR 97304

Tel: 503-986-0911

alyssa.m.mucken@state.or.us

**2017 Integrated Water Resources Strategy Update  
Policy Advisory Group  
Proposed Decision-Making Process and Meeting Protocols**

**Proposed Decision-Making Process**

- A. The Policy Advisory Group agrees that consensus has a high value and that the Group should strive to achieve it. When possible, decisions on Policy Advisory Group recommendations will be made by consensus of all present participating members. Consensus means the willingness to go along with recommendations, either in active support of it or in not opposing it.
- B. The commitment to work for consensus means that members will participate in the give and take of the process in a way that seeks to understand the interests of all and will work together to find solutions workable for all.
- C. If no consensus is reached on an issue, the meeting notes will so note without attributing comments to specific members. The notes will describe the differing views, and note whether a majority held a particular position.
- D. Agreements made on some of recommendations will be considered tentative until all of the recommendations are put together.
- E. While consultation and information sharing with employers and affiliate organizations is welcome and valuable, individual Policy Advisory Group members function as citizen members and do not speak for nor formally represent their employers or membership associations.
- F. The Project Team and facilitator will draft meeting notes that outline the issues discussed, the areas in which there is consensus, and any remaining issues on which consensus was not reached. Members will have the opportunity to review, make corrections, and then sign-off on meeting notes at the following meeting
- G. The Oregon Water Resources Department will be responsible for writing the final Integrated Water Resources Strategy. The Water Resources Commission will be responsible for its adoption, after consultation with its partner boards and commissions.

**Proposed Meeting Protocol**

- A. All meetings of the Policy Advisory Group will be open to public attendance.
- B. At the close of each meeting, the facilitator may allow time for public comment, taking into consideration the length of the agenda and the opportunity for Policy Advisory Group members to speak on all issues.

- C. Members will treat each other with respect throughout the process. They will listen to each other to seek to understand each other's perspective, even if they disagree. One person will speak at a time. Members will participate fully in letting the group know their perspective on issues, their concerns, and their differing points of view. At the same time, members will respect time constraints and will share the speaking time with others.
- D. All members act in good faith in all aspects of these discussions. This includes being honest and refraining from undertaking any actions that will undermine or threaten this process.
- E. Members shall make every effort to bring all aspects of their concerns about these issues into this process to be addressed. Members shall refrain from generating controversy in the press and from publicly criticizing or misstating the positions taken by any other participants during the process.
- F. All Policy Advisory Group members agree to maintain the respectful tone of the meetings outside the formal meetings, including all email correspondence. Any reporting to constituents, the media, or other parties will focus on issues and not individuals.
  - a. Members are reminded that all e-mail messages should be considered public documents.
  - b. E-mails meant for the entire group will be distributed via the Project Team.
- G. All participation in this process is voluntary and may be withdrawn. However, members agree that before withdrawing they will discuss the reason for their withdrawal with the facilitator and the other members and will give the Project Team the opportunity to understand the reasons for withdrawal and to encourage continued participation, if appropriate.



**Oregon**  
Kate Brown, Governor

**Water Resources Department**  
725 Summer St NE, Suite A  
Salem, OR 97301  
(503) 986-0900  
Fax (503) 986-0904

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** The Oregon Water Resources Commission

**FROM:** The 2016 IWRS Policy Advisory Group

**DATE:** January 26, 2017

**SUBJECT:** Over-Arching Statements, New Recommended Actions, and Supporting/Confirming Statements from the 2016 Policy Advisory Group

### Over-Arching Statement:

Water is a finite resource with growing demands; water scarcity is a reality in Oregon. Water-related decisions should rest on a thorough analysis of supply, analysis of demand / need for water, the potential for increasing efficiencies and conservation, and alternative ways to meet these demands.

### New Recommended Actions:

1. Prepare for Extreme Events (related to water).
2. Ensure the necessary data, vulnerability assessments, and documentation of impacts to better prepare for, respond to, and mitigate water scarcity.
3. Ensure Public Safety.
4. Provide Adequate Field Presence in IWRS Agencies.
5. Provide Adequate Permitting Staff in IWRS Agencies.
6. Develop a Long-Term Plan for Sustainable Groundwater Management with Clear Objectives and Metrics.

### New Supporting Statements on Drought Resiliency and the Drought Task Force Report:

1. The Policy Advisory Group calls for integrated solutions for building drought resiliency.
2. The Policy Advisory Group acknowledges the hard work of the Drought Task Force and has incorporated many aspects of the Task Force report into its own thinking.

### Confirming Statements on Drought Task Force Recommendations (wording kept from DTF report):

- A. The State should continue to increase and enrich water-related data collection to inform water use decisions, conservation, and management, as well as better anticipate and respond to drought.<sup>1</sup>
- B. Provide resources for assessments of drought impacts, risks, and vulnerabilities on instream and out-of-stream sectors in order to better prepare for, respond to, and recover from drought.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Members also noted that these Drought Task Force recommendations may have broader implications than drought.



- E. Provide OWRD with staff resources to do outreach and communication. Develop communication tool box to educate all sectors and elected officials about existing tools, water conservation, drought conditions and preparedness, and help small communities respond to drought.<sup>1</sup>
- G. Provide funding for additional watermaster staff and tools to make water distribution more efficient.<sup>1</sup>
- L. The Legislature should consider additional programs to facilitate restoration of streamflows through voluntary means during times of drought.<sup>1</sup>

**New Supporting Statements Regarding Already-Existing Recommended Actions:**

**Data and Measurement (Already-Existing Recommended Actions 1-3):**

- Improve agency capacity to collect and analyze data.
- Improve data availability using emerging technologies.
- Improve coordination of data sets.

**Water and Land-Use (Already-Existing Recommended Action 6A):**

- Improve coordination and provide technical guidance, resources, and assistance to local governments for land-use permitting decisions with regard to water.

**Water and Wastewater Infrastructure (Already-Existing Recommended Action 7A):**

- Develop funding and technical support for low income and small communities to maintain and operate water and wastewater-related infrastructure.
- Advocate for federal funding for water and wastewater infrastructure and resiliency.

**Water-Use Efficiency and Conservation (Already-Existing Recommended Action 10A):**

- Establish a water-use efficiency and conservation program that provides technical assistance to water users in all sectors.

**Built and Natural Storage (Already-Existing Recommended Actions 10B and 11A):**

- Investigate and consider non-traditional projects, such as small-to-medium size projects, locations off-channel or underground, and stored water used for both instream and out-of-stream purposes.

**Climate Change Adaptation & Resiliency (Already-Existing Recommended Action 5A):**

- Understand the effects of climate change on streamflow.

[Consensus on 23 statements and actions, as of December 16, 2016]

## Appendix A: The 2016 Policy Advisory Group

---

**Robert "Will" Collin**  
Environmental Justice Advocate  
Salem, Oregon

**Suzanne DeLorenzo**  
Clackamas River Water District  
Clackamas, Oregon

**Arlene Dietz**  
Rice Farms  
Eugene, Oregon

**Allan Elliott**  
Carlton Plants LLC  
Dayton, Oregon

**Ron Foggin**  
City Manager  
City of Dallas, Oregon

**Rebecca Geisen**  
Portland Water Bureau  
Portland, Oregon

**TJ Hansell**  
Hansell Farms  
Hermiston, Oregon

**Valerie Kelley**  
(retired hydrologist)  
Portland, Oregon

**Gayle Killam**  
River Network  
Portland, Oregon

**Craig Lacy**  
(retired fly-fishing outfitter)  
Bend, Oregon

**Hiram Li**  
(retired biologist)  
Corvallis, Oregon

**Tracey Liskey**  
Liskey Farms  
Klamath Falls, Oregon

**Peggy Lynch**  
League of Women Voters of Oregon  
Corvallis, Oregon

**Curtis Martin**  
Oregon Cattlemen's Association  
North Powder, Oregon

**Craig Pope**  
Polk County Commissioner  
Dallas, Oregon

**Brent Stevenson**  
Santiam Water Control District  
Stayton, Oregon

**Stan van de Wetering**  
Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians  
Siletz, Oregon

**Mary Wahl**  
Wahl Ranch  
Langlois, Oregon

**All meetings took place in Salem, Oregon, on the following dates:**

March 30, 2016  
June 28, 2016  
September 14, 2016  
December 6-7, 2016

**Meeting agendas, materials, and notes are available here:**

[http://www.oregon.gov/owrd/Pages/law/integrated\\_water\\_supply\\_strategy.aspx#2016 Policy Advisory Group](http://www.oregon.gov/owrd/Pages/law/integrated_water_supply_strategy.aspx#2016_Policy_Advisory_Group)

## Appendix B: Statements Not Reaching Consensus

---

### Statements from the Drought Task Force Report:

- C. The State should review the drought declaration process and tools to ensure drought declarations are effective to assist with emerging drought response. (13-5)<sup>2</sup>
- D. The Legislature should look at establishing a drought emergency fund for instream and out-of-stream needs. (13-4)
- F. The Legislature should look at establishing a fund for drought planning to help communities be better prepared and more resilient to drought. (12-4)
- H. Need to address lack of planning, support, resources, and technical assistance for small water systems to be better prepared for drought. (14-2)
- I. Assemble a group of experts to evaluate and identify existing infrastructure programs and evaluate barriers to accessing infrastructure funding. Provide technical assistance or capacity building grants to help individuals and communities identify, apply for, and access infrastructure funding to improve drought resiliency. (13-3)
- J. Evaluate management options for stored water to better address current and future instream and out-of-stream needs. (15-2)
- K. The Legislature should look at measures and incentives to promote water conservation and efficiency. (15-3)<sup>3</sup>
- M. Oregon should continue to encourage water reuse activities throughout the state, while giving due consideration to the protection of instream flow, water quality, public health, and drinking water sources. (15-2)

*Members who did not support these statements cited a variety of reasons, including: some language is too detailed for this group, some language is too sweeping, and implementation may be problematic.*

### Overarching Statement on Place-Based Planning:

The state and its partners should take the opportunity to capitalize on the place-based planning efforts currently underway, using these venues as a testing ground for recommended actions contained in the IWRS. (12-2).

*Although members discussed potential revisions to this statement, they could not reach consensus on revised language. Discussion included substituting "consider and evaluate" for "capitalize" and acknowledging local / community efforts in other locations and time periods. Members withholding support suggested waiting to see what the outcomes of Oregon's four pilot-programs will be, and wanting to see more better representation of diverse interests at the table.*

### Overarching Statement Regarding Connections between Elements:

The 2017 Integrated Water Resources Strategy should make stronger connections between elements called out in the original IWRS. (11-3).

*The PAG worked on developing the following revised statement, however, members were not able to reach consensus, as one member felt this was redundant and unnecessary. Potential Revised Statement: The 2017 IWRS should make strong connections between all elements. Such connections include groundwater – surface water interactions; supply and demand analyses; instream needs and consumptive demands analysis; water quality and water quantity challenges; land-use and water management, etc. (17-1). The rationale for opposition was this: "I really felt the proposed language was so broad that it appeared to diverge from what I personally thought our direction was."*

---

<sup>2</sup> Numbers in parentheses show result of PAG vote.

<sup>3</sup> However, the PAG did support a related statement, "establishing a water-use efficiency and conservation program that provides technical assistance to water users in all sectors."

### **Statements on Public Safety:**

- Require Emergency Action Plans for all high hazard dams, not just the new ones. (13-4)
- Adopt applicable model statutes/rules available from the American Society of Dam Safety Engineers. (9-6)
- Develop a funding program to repair dams and wells that don't meet construction standards. (11-4)

*Reasons provided here included: unsure about this, seems too detailed, do not have enough information about what these mean, the language is not strong enough, or the state should not be responsible for funding these repairs / there would need to be a clear public interest.*

### **Statements on Data and Measurement:**

- Use agencies' Monitoring Strategies, or similar methods, to design and maintain monitoring networks. (10-5)
- Develop or update decision-support tools such as: a Drought Early Warning System (DEWS), the Surface Water Supply Index (SWSI), the water availability program, instream flow studies, evaluation of instream water rights, water quality monitoring programs, floodplain restoration monitoring programs, and NOAA Atlas 14. (13-4)

*Rationale noted here included: need more background/context before supporting, should spell out pros and cons for each, should add the names of more tools.*

### **Revision to Place-Based Planning Recommended Action:**

- IWRS Rec. Action 9a. Undertake [and Continue] Place-Based Integrated Water Resources Planning Efforts. (8-4)  
*See discussion of place-based planning on previous page.*

### **Statements on Instream Flows:**

- Establish [or adjust] instream water rights where needed to protect flows. (9-7)
- Expand the use [and timing] of voluntary programs to restore streamflow. (16-2)
- Hire full-time, permanent district biologists to conduct flow assessments. (9-9)

*These specific statements were not discussed in detail during the meeting. Written comments included: aren't these current agency actions?, needs more discussion / detail, citizen monitors could help here.*

### **Statements on Water Use Efficiency and Conservation:**

- Require water management and conservation plans (WMCPs) from more drinking water providers. (10-7)  
*Note: Discussed replacing "require" with "encourage"; no consensus reached.*
- Require water management and conservation plans (WMCPs) across more sectors. (10-8)  
*Note: Discussed replacing "require" with "encourage"; no consensus reached.*
- Allow low-income & smaller communities to develop a WMCP-lite version, using a template provided by WRD. (16-2)  
*No further discussion occurred during the meeting.*

### **Additional statements proposed during the water use and efficiency discussion.**

Consensus was not reached; vote count not recorded.

- Fund instream leasing during times of drought.
- Pursue a statement "about use it or lose it" during times of drought.
- Report water data during times of drought.

- Spend more time defining waste, defining it at a sub-basin level, creating standards within a sub-basin.
- Use existing measurement authorities.
- Get baseflow studies done, with the needed staff.

*Staff noted some of the concerns that were shared during the Drought Task Force meeting on these same topics.*

**Statement on Water Reuse:**

- Define the regulatory process for water re-use more clearly. (14-4)
- No further discussion occurred during the meeting.*

**Statement on Education and Training:**

- Provide technical assistance and funding for succession planning. (9-7)
- No further discussion occurred during the meeting.*

**Contents:** This document includes email responses received from the following IWRS Policy Advisory Group members, including the original request from staff sent to members:

- Original Request, sent from Brenda
- Craig Pope
- Peggy Lynch
- Arlene Dietz
- Will Collin
- Craig Lacy
- TJ Hansell
- Tracey Liskey
- Allan Elliot
- Ron Foggin
- Suzanne DeLorenzo
- Stan van de Wetering
- Brent Stevenson
- Mary Wahl
- Valerie Kelly
- Gayle Killam
- Rebecca Geisen
- Curtis Martin
- Hiram Li

---

**Original Request, sent from Brenda**

**From:** BATEMAN Brenda O \* WRD

**Sent:** Thursday, December 22, 2016 10:13 AM

**To:** Allan Elliott; Brent Stevenson; Robert (Will) Collin; Arlene Dietz; Gayle Killam; Hiram Li; Craig Lacy; Mary Wahl; Peggy Lynch; POPE Craig; Rebecca Geisen; Ron Foggin; Suzanne Delorenzo; Stan van de Wetering; Tracey Liskey; TJ Hansell; Valerie Kelley; Curtis Martin

**Cc:** Brenda Bateman; FAUCERA Danette L; TARNOW Karen E; MATTER Margaret A; RANCIER Racquel R; JAINDL Raymond G; BYLER Thomas M; PEERMAN Wade; MUCKEN Alyssa M \* WRD; STEVENSON Anna P; WOODCOCK Douglas E \* WRD

**Subject:** Follow-Up to PAG Meeting: Action Requested by Jan. 9

Dear PAG Members-

As we wrapped up the final PAG meeting on December 7, we talked about addressing the few remaining items on the flipcharts / tally sheets that were close to, but not at, consensus (e.g., Drought Task Force Statements E, G, and L). The group ran out of time to discuss these remaining concerns, and there was an interest in seeing if the group could reach consensus on them. During the past couple of weeks, staff has been on the phone with PAG members to see if additional consensus was a possibility. As a result, these statements (E, G and L) have been added to the PAG's consensus memo.

**Action Needed: PAG Memo to the Water Resources Commission.** Without changing any of the wording since its last meeting, the PAG now has consensus on 23 statements for its memo to the Water Resources Commission. These are a combination of over-arching statements, new recommended actions, and supporting / confirming statements that relate to already-existing recommended actions. It's a testament to the discussions you had and the time you spent together, that this group has 23 consensus statements to forward to the Water Resources Commission as it begins to draft the 2017 IWRS. **Please review "Attachment 1: Draft PAG Memo to the Water Resources Commission" and "reply all" by January 9 as to whether you approve of its content.** After we receive your feedback, we can forward the memo to the Water Resources Commission in time for its January 26 meeting.

**Information Only: Resulting Tallies.** If you would like to see the final tallies from the PAG's work, all of the documentation is in "Attachment #2: Results of Exercises." This includes the results of Exercise 1 and Exercise 2 from your December 7 meeting. It also shows the revised statements that you worked on during your final meeting, and it includes input from Craig Pope (absent on December 7), and new tallies for Drought Task Force

Statements, based on individual phone calls. A robust record of the group's meetings, including the notes, can be found here:

[http://www.oregon.gov/owrd/Pages/law/integrated\\_water\\_supply\\_strategy.aspx#2016\\_Policy\\_Advisory\\_Group](http://www.oregon.gov/owrd/Pages/law/integrated_water_supply_strategy.aspx#2016_Policy_Advisory_Group).

We continue to work on drafting meeting notes from your December 6 and 7 meeting. We plan to have these to you for review and approval during the next couple of weeks.

**Next Steps in the IWRS:** After the PAG memo has gone to the Commission, agencies will get to work writing additional text around these new recommended actions and statements, providing background, statistics, graphs / maps, etc. A draft of the 2017 IWRS will go out for public comment in early 2017, so partners, PAG members, other stakeholders, and the public will have an opportunity to comment or provide suggestions during the Spring. After addressing these public comments, staff will prepare a final draft of the 2017 IWRS. Adoption of the 2017 IWRS is scheduled for the Commission's August 2017 Meeting.

Thanks again for your time and efforts to provide thoughtful input into the 2017 IWRS. Happy Holidays to you and your families.

Best Regards,  
Brenda B.

Brenda Ortigoza Bateman, Ph.D.  
Administrator, Technical Services Division  
Oregon Water Resources Department  
725 Summer St., NE  
Salem, OR 97301-1271

---

Craig Pope

**From:** Pope, Craig

**Sent:** Thursday, December 22, 2016 2:01 PM

**To:** BATEMAN Brenda O \* WRD

**Cc:** Allan Elliott; Brent Stevenson; Robert (Will) Collin; Arlene Dietz; Gayle Killam; Hiram Li; Craig Lacy; Mary Wahl; Peggy Lynch; Rebecca Geisen; Ron Foggin; Suzanne Delorenzo; Stan van de Wetering; Tracey Liskey; TJ Hansell; Valerie Kelley; Curtis Martin; Brenda Bateman; FAUCERA Danette L; TARNOW Karen E; MATTER Margaret A; RANCIER Racquel R; JAINDL Raymond G; BYLER Thomas M; PEERMAN Wade; MUCKEN Alyssa M \* WRD; STEVENSON Anna P; WOODCOCK Douglas E \* WRD

**Subject:** Re: Follow-Up to PAG Meeting: Action Requested by Jan. 9

Thank you Brenda. I approve of the content as provided.

Craig

---

Peggy Lynch

**From:** Peggy Lynch

**Sent:** Thursday, December 22, 2016 7:08 PM

**To:** BATEMAN Brenda O \* WRD

**Cc:** Allan Elliott; Brent Stevenson; Robert (Will) Collin; Arlene Dietz; Gayle Killam; Hiram Li; Craig Lacy; Mary Wahl; POPE Craig; Rebecca Geisen; Ron Foggin; Suzanne Delorenzo; Stan van de Wetering; Tracey Liskey; TJ Hansell; Valerie Kelley; Curtis Martin; Brenda Bateman; FAUCERA Danette L; TARNOW Karen E; MATTER Margaret A; RANCIER Racquel R; JAINDL Raymond G; BYLER Thomas M; PEERMAN Wade; MUCKEN Alyssa M \* WRD; STEVENSON Anna P; WOODCOCK Douglas E \* WRD; Peggy Lynch

**Subject:** Re: Follow-Up to PAG Meeting: Action Requested by Jan. 9

I want to object to the inclusion/distribution of the "Results of Exercises". Many of us added written comments to these "exercises", did not understand that you were only going to tally votes and frankly I objected to this process that short-circuited a full discussion of the issues.

I assumed this exercise would provide us the basis for a conversation and debate about the items on the pages. As I've shared, I was most disappointed by the lack of debate around the many items listed.

.....

the memo:

Place Based Planning: **I thought we had agreed to substituting "consider and evaluate" for "capitalize"**

Public Safety: **Add to the comments under this section something that doesn't imply we (the state) are responsible for funding these repairs. We didn't talk about details--in some cases, the state might want to help, but we should not be funding private investments unless there is a clear public interest. Develop a funding program to repair dams and wells**

Data and Measurement: **I hope staff will recommend the tools listed when you provide the WRC with your staff report---I get that we didn't have a chance to explain all these tools & respect that others wanted a better understanding, but these are critical tools for water management....the NOAA Atlas 14, for instance may help with flooding notices/public safety.**

**Perhaps the most telling are the comments under the last two items--noting that these items weren't discussed.**

**I look forward to comments from others and for a chance to have these issues raised during public hearings before the WRC. I appreciate having been asked to participate in this process, but it truly was too little time for substantive discussions on a really critical set of issues. The Drought Task Force had 7 meetings while we had only four. The DTF was made up of "stakeholders" who deal with these issues regularly. We had a great group of people with a variety of experiences, but who were not intimately involved in the issues considered. Had we all had time to listen, learn and share points of view, we might have provided more substantive advice for the IWRS update.**

**Peggy Lynch**

---

**Arlene Dietz**

From: Arlene Dietz

Sent: Monday, January 02, 2017 7:32 AM

To: BATEMAN Brenda O \* WRD; Allan Elliott; Brent Stevenson; Robert (Will) Collin; Arlene Dietz; Gayle Killam; Hiram Li; Craig Lacy; Mary Wahl; Peggy Lynch; Rebecca Geisen; Ron Foggin; Suzanne Delorenzo; Stan van de Wetering; Tracey Liskey; TJ Hansell; Valerie Kelley; Curtis Martin

Cc: FAUCERA Danette L; TARNOW Karen E; MATTER Margaret A; RANCIER Racquel R; JAINDL Raymond G; BYLER Thomas M; PEERMAN Wade; MUCKEN Alyssa M \* WRD; STEVENSON Anna P; WOODCOCK Douglas E \* WRD

Subject: Re: Follow-Up to PAG Meeting: Action Requested by Jan. 9

Team

I appreciate Peggy's comments, especially the limited time for substantive discussions. However, I do want to acknowledge what was quite effective in helping us collectively grasp the complexities of the issues: These were the many experts brought in to educate us and staff's suggestions that we talk to each other directly about issues where disagreement was clearly present. We would not have had the discussions we did without the expanded background from experts and enlightenment from fellow members. Trade offs of time, yes. Could we have limited some folk's grandstanding? Probably.

The Tally sheets helped us focus. I agree, again with Peggy, that we thought that our notes and "votes" were the beginning of a discussion, not a vote to necessarily eliminate, but a vote to express concern that we needed more discussion. The follow-up phone calls helped us express ourselves and a couple tallies were changed. It is true that



the group and staff did not benefit from hearing about the dissenters' concerns and their needs for reasoned discussion or debate.

Time, I more than respect the limits placed on staff in carrying out such a group effort. I have been on other advisory groups within Oregon (and elsewhere in the nation) and found this to have been fair, and the most professionally facilitated group in which I have been involved.

I vote to approve the contents of the presented DRAFT.

Arlene

---

Will Collin

**From:** Robert Collin  
**Date:** January 8, 2017 at 12:22:41 PM PST  
**To:** BATEMAN Brenda O \* WRD  
**Subject:** Re: Checking in officially PAG

Hi Brenda,

I have reviewed the report and vote **Yay**.

It was nice to work with you. Hope our paths cross again.

Best

Bob or Will Collin

Sent from my iPad

---

Craig Lacy

**From:** Craig Lacy  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 08, 2017 3:34 PM  
**To:** BATEMAN Brenda O \* WRD  
**Cc:** Allan Elliott; Brent Stevenson; Robert (Will) Collin; Arlene Dietz; Gayle Killam; Hiram Li; Mary Wahl; Peggy Lynch; POPE Craig; Rebecca Geisen; Ron Foggin; Suzanne Delorenzo; Stan van de Wetering; Tracey Liskey; TJ Hansell; Valerie Kelley; Curtis Martin; Brenda Bateman; FAUCERA Danette L; TARNOW Karen E; MATTER Margaret A; RANCIER Racquel R; JAINDL Raymond G; BYLER Thomas M; PEERMAN Wade; MUCKEN Alyssa M \* WRD; STEVENSON Anna P; WOODCOCK Douglas E \* WRD  
**Subject:** Re: Follow-Up to PAG Meeting: Action Requested by Jan. 9

Brenda,

In the spirit of compromise, I reluctantly approve the content.

Happy New Year,  
Craig Lacy

---

TJ Hansell

**From:** Tyler Hansell  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 08, 2017 3:55 PM  
**To:** Arlene Dietz  
**Cc:** Allan Elliott; Brent Stevenson; Robert (Will) Collin; Arlene Dietz; Gayle Killam; Hiram Li; Mary Wahl; Peggy Lynch; POPE Craig; Rebecca Geisen; Ron Foggin; Suzanne Delorenzo; Stan van de Wetering; Tracey Liskey; TJ Hansell; Valerie Kelley; Curtis Martin; Brenda Bateman; FAUCERA Danette L; TARNOW Karen E; MATTER Margaret A; RANCIER Racquel R; JAINDL Raymond G; BYLER Thomas M; PEERMAN Wade; MUCKEN Alyssa M \* WRD; STEVENSON Anna P; WOODCOCK Douglas E \* WRD  
**Subject:** Re: Follow-Up to PAG Meeting: Action Requested by Jan. 9

Brenda I also support the draft.

TJ

---

**Tracey Liskey**

**From:** Tracey Liskey  
**Date:** January 9, 2017 at 6:42:52 AM PST  
**To:** Brenda Bateman  
**Subject:** Re: Follow-Up to PAG Meeting: Action Requested by Jan. 9

It sounds OK to me, thanks for sending it again Tracey

---

**Allan Elliott**

**From:** Allan Elliott  
**Date:** January 9, 2017 at 7:11:40 AM PST  
**To:** BATEMAN Brenda O \* WRD  
**Subject:** RE: Checking in

Hi Brenda,

Yes, and best wishes with the remainder of the process.

Allan Elliott

---

**Ron Foggin**

**From:** RON FOGGIN  
**Sent:** Monday, January 09, 2017 7:45 AM  
**To:** Arlene Dietz  
**Cc:** Allan Elliott; Brent Stevenson; Robert (Will) Collin; Arlene Dietz; Gayle Killam; Hiram Li; Mary Wahl; Peggy Lynch; POPE Craig; Rebecca Geisen; Ron Foggin; Suzanne Delorenzo; Stan van de Wetering; Tracey Liskey; TJ Hansell; Valerie Kelley; Curtis Martin; Brenda Bateman; FAUCERA Danette L; TARNOW Karen E; MATTER Margaret A; RANCIER Racquel R; JAINDL Raymond G; BYLER Thomas M; PEERMAN Wade; MUCKEN Alyssa M \* WRD; STEVENSON Anna P; WOODCOCK Douglas E \* WRD  
**Subject:** Re: Follow-Up to PAG Meeting: Action Requested by Jan. 9

Brenda,

I support the draft.

Thank you,



**RON FOGGIN, ICMA-CM**  
city manager

187 se court st. • dallas, or 97338  
971.208.5347 cell • 503.831.3502 office  
503.623.2339 fax  
[www.dallasor.gov](http://www.dallasor.gov)



---

Suzanne DeLorenzo

**From:** Suzanne DeLorenzo  
**Sent:** Monday, January 09, 2017 7:47 AM  
**To:** RON FOGGIN  
**Cc:** Allan Elliott; Brent Stevenson; Robert (Will) Collin; Arlene Dietz; Gayle Killam; Hiram Li; Mary Wahl; Peggy Lynch; POPE Craig; Rebecca Geisen; Ron Foggin; Suzanne DeLorenzo; Stan van de Wetering; Tracey Liskey; TJ Hansell; Valerie Kelley; Curtis Martin; Brenda Bateman; FAUCERA Danette L; TARNOW Karen E; MATTER Margaret A; RANCIER Racquel R; JAINDL Raymond G; BYLER Thomas M; PEERMAN Wade; MUCKEN Alyssa M \* WRD; STEVENSON Anna P; WOODCOCK Douglas E \* WRD  
**Subject:** Re: Follow-Up to PAG Meeting: Action Requested by Jan. 9

I approve.

Suzanne DeLorenzo, PhD

---

Stan van de Wetering

**From:** Stan van de Wetering  
**Sent:** Monday, January 09, 2017 8:31 AM  
**To:** BATEMAN Brenda O \* WRD; Allan Elliott; Brent Stevenson; Robert (Will) Collin; Arlene Dietz; Gayle Killam; Hiram Li; Craig Lacy; Mary Wahl; Peggy Lynch; POPE Craig; Rebecca Geisen; Ron Foggin; Suzanne DeLorenzo; Tracey Liskey; TJ Hansell; Valerie Kelley; Curtis Martin  
**Cc:** Brenda Bateman; FAUCERA Danette L; TARNOW Karen E; MATTER Margaret A; RANCIER Racquel R; JAINDL Raymond G; BYLER Thomas M; PEERMAN Wade; MUCKEN Alyssa M \* WRD; STEVENSON Anna P; WOODCOCK Douglas E \* WRD  
**Subject:** Re: Follow-Up to PAG Meeting: Action Requested by Jan. 9

Brenda

I approve the content.

Stan van de Wetering  
Biological Programs Director  
Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians

---

Brent Stevenson

**From:** Brent Stevenson  
**Sent:** Monday, January 09, 2017 8:45 AM  
**To:** Stan van de Wetering  
**Cc:** BATEMAN Brenda O \* WRD; Allan Elliott; Robert (Will) Collin; Arlene Dietz; Gayle Killam; Hiram Li; Craig Lacy; Mary Wahl; Peggy Lynch; POPE Craig; Rebecca Geisen; Ron Foggin; Suzanne DeLorenzo; Tracey Liskey; TJ Hansell; Valerie Kelley; Curtis Martin; Brenda Bateman; FAUCERA Danette L; TARNOW Karen E; MATTER Margaret A; RANCIER Racquel R; JAINDL Raymond G; BYLER Thomas M; PEERMAN Wade; MUCKEN Alyssa M \* WRD; STEVENSON Anna P; WOODCOCK Douglas E \* WRD  
**Subject:** Re: Follow-Up to PAG Meeting: Action Requested by Jan. 9

I approve the content.

Brent Stevenson  
Manager  
Santiam Water Control District  
Sent from my iPhone

From: Mary Wahl

Sent: Monday, January 09, 2017 12:16 PM

To: BATEMAN Brenda O \* WRD

Cc: Allan Elliott; Brent Stevenson; Robert (Will) Collin; Arlene Dietz; Gayle Killam; Hiram Li; Craig Lacy; Peggy Lynch; POPE Craig; Rebecca Geisen; Ron Foggin; Suzanne Delorenzo; Stan van de Wetering; Tracey Liskey; TJ Hansell; Valerie Kelley; Curtis Martin; Brenda Bateman; FAUCERA Danette L; TARNOW Karen E; MATTER Margaret A; RANCIER Racquel R; JAINDL Raymond G; BYLER Thomas M; PEERMAN Wade; MUCKEN Alyssa M \* WRD; STEVENSON Anna P; WOODCOCK Douglas E \* WRD

Subject: Re: Follow-Up to PAG Meeting: Action Requested by Jan. 9

Brenda,

This was an important effort, and I appreciate being included on the PAG. Here is my response to the report:

1. This was a good committee, and dedicated, talented staff ran the group. I'd echo Peggy's comment that this is a critical set of issues that needed more substantive discussions in order to provide meaningful advice.
2. I concur that the items in the report were ones the PAG considered and agreed to, but I continue to have the following concerns about the report and our advice:
  - a. "Consensus" implies more substantive discussions about the items included in the report than we had. My thumbs-up, and this may hold for others on the PAG, should be translated as saying "yes" to an item being a good thing to do. It was not, however, a meaningful discussion of how important that item was to meeting state water resources goals, nor agreement that item rather than another item should be the state's strategy. This is an important distinction.
  - b. Consideration of how the state's water resources strategy should be amended in the face of climate change needed to happen. In Oregon's history, elected officials have taken bold steps to protect Oregon's water resources. Examples include conserving Bull Run as a drinking water source, the Willamette River cleanup, and creating an in-stream water protection program. There was no discussion of whether any such steps could or should be taken in the face of climate change.
  - c. Since PAG members brought up the need to make headway on the long list of stream segments awaiting action to protect in-stream water levels several times, and we heard a presentation on it, that could have been made into a statement for PAG consideration.
  - d. We didn't get to a substantive PAG discussion of conservation, in spite of numerous requests to do so, and in spite of the fact Oregon is facing ongoing drought conditions, increased demand for water, decreased supply of water, and climate change.
  - f. We lost the chance to capitalize on the huge potential for conserving water in agricultural operations, which use the bulk of the state's water resource. This came up several times in the discussion, and at least two committee members with substantial experience in this arena talked about how important these solutions are, but this is reflected in the report only as a statement that solutions should be integrated. That statement carries little meaning unless it is clear we are talking about assuring we achieve water conservation goals as an integral part of the other actions. Those dual-goal actions are the ones that make place-based implementation work.

Thank you for the chance to be on the PAG, and this opportunity to comment.

---

Valerie Kelly

**From:** Valerie Kelly

**Sent:** Monday, January 09, 2017 5:05 PM

**To:** Mary Wahl

**Cc:** BATEMAN Brenda O \* WRD; Allan Elliott; Brent Stevenson; Robert (Will) Collin; Arlene Dietz; Gayle Killam; Hiram Li; Craig Lacy; Peggy Lynch; POPE Craig; Rebecca Geisen; Ron Foggin; Suzanne Delorenzo; Stan van de Wetering; Tracey Liskey; TJ Hansell; Curtis Martin; Brenda Bateman; FAUCERA Danette L; TARNOW Karen E; MATTER Margaret A; RANCIER Racquel R; JAINDL Raymond G; BYLER Thomas M; PEERMAN Wade; MUCKEN Alyssa M \* WRD; STEVENSON Anna P; WOODCOCK Douglas E \* WRD

**Subject:** Re: Follow-Up to PAG Meeting: Action Requested by Jan. 9

I agree with Mary's comments wholeheartedly, especially considering that we were explicitly asked to consider how Oregon can deal with the expected effects of climate change in how we manage our water resources. We hardly discussed that issue at all, and I would argue danced around the implications of what is projected quite seriously. I did not stress the issue enough, I'm afraid. With that in mind, however, I also recognize that water is a very difficult topic and there are many points of view to consider, each critical in their own way--I suppose that implies that we could have benefited from more time. The perennial complaint! Still, I am happy that I was asked to participate with this group of very thoughtful folks, and agree with the statements in the memo. And want to add that we have more work to do!

Best wishes to all--Valerie

But there come times--perhaps this is one of them--  
when we have to take ourselves more seriously or die.

--Adrienne Rich

---

Gayle Killam

**From:** Gayle Killam

**Sent:** Monday, January 09, 2017 9:00 PM

**To:** BATEMAN Brenda O \* WRD; Allan Elliott; Brent Stevenson; Robert (Will) Collin; Arlene Dietz; Hiram Li; Craig Lacy; Mary Wahl; Peggy Lynch; POPE Craig; Rebecca Geisen; Ron Foggin; Suzanne Delorenzo; Stan van de Wetering; Tracey Liskey; TJ Hansell; Valerie Kelley; Curtis Martin

**Cc:** Brenda Bateman; FAUCERA Danette L; TARNOW Karen E; MATTER Margaret A; RANCIER Racquel R; JAINDL Raymond G; BYLER Thomas M; PEERMAN Wade; MUCKEN Alyssa M \* WRD; STEVENSON Anna P; WOODCOCK Douglas E \* WRD

**Subject:** RE: Follow-Up to PAG Meeting: Action Requested by Jan. 9

Hi Brenda,

It's still January 9<sup>th</sup>!! The school off day in Portland complicated my plan today.

I appreciate being invited to participate on the PAG, and I appreciate those who have offered their thoughts about the final product and the process.

I agree with what others have said. The PAG is comprised of thoughtful and intelligent people, and I enjoyed getting to know everyone a little. However, I believe that it may have been the wrong decision to bring new people in for this abbreviated update. I am sure it was frustrating for those who spent many more months on the original strategy. It was also frustrating to try to play catch up, because at the last meeting it finally felt as though we had sufficient background, baseline and update information from agencies on key topics of interest, and more importantly, that we had developed some understanding and trust of each other to allow for rich exchange of ideas. Successful stakeholder processes are all about building understanding and trust. I appreciate all the time and energy that was spent on the presentations to the group, and I learned a great deal about the state of our water resources and what we know and don't know about them. I also appreciate your effort Brenda to work with such a big and diverse group with such a short timeline. You worked very hard to understand everyone's perspectives.

Regarding the process, I thought the tally sheets were a skillful tool to help us focus our attention in the last meeting. However, I echo others' statements about the fact that I did not realize that the votes were going to be the deciding factor about whether we talked about a particular statement or not. It is unfortunate that the most controversial, and perhaps most important topics that needed discussion, did not get it because the votes were split. Most notably, from my perspective of course, the statements on instream protections were three of the four in the tally sheets "not discussed." In addition, there wasn't even one statement regarding measurement and monitoring of water use that was presented in the tally sheets to draw a vote. They were shifted early on to the appendix.

Regarding the appendix, the statements described as "unsupported by PAG" misrepresent the tally. In all but one tie, the votes in favor of including these statements in the report are greater than that against doing so. Therefore, it is more accurate to represent the tally as "majority supported but consensus was not reached," and in some cases, not even attempted. I also don't understand why the group of statements was called out at the bottom of page 5 as particularly not supported when, to my knowledge, none of them was brought up for a vote or much of a discussion (besides "baseflow studies" which we talked about in the first meeting).

While I understand the limited staff time (and participant time) for this process, perhaps there could have been (or could still be?) some way to put options together for email or a conference call discussion. I hope that the items that have been identified by the PAG in the report and the appendix for more discussion can catalyze those discussions, not only within the Commission but also within the agencies who will read this report and consider whether and how to make any substantive changes to their policies and procedures in the interest of a better integrated water resources strategy for Oregon.

In response to the question posed, I will say that the memo accurately represents the statements that ultimately, with some revisions, received zero "no" votes on our tally sheets. A few specific items I would raise about the summary are the following:

- I believe we discussed including stormwater in the Water and Wastewater Infrastructure recommendation.
- I don't know what it means to "understand" the effects of climate change on streamflow.
- I don't think that Appendix B accurately or fully represents the topics that were raised but not discussed, or discussed but on which no consensus was reached.

Thanks,

Gayle

---

**Rebecca Geisen**

**From:** Geisen, Rebecca

**Sent:** Tuesday, January 10, 2017 11:24 AM

**To:** BATEMAN Brenda O \* WRD; Allan Elliott; Brent Stevenson; Robert (Will) Collin; Arlene Dietz; Gayle Killam; Hiram Li; Craig Lacy; Mary Wahl; Peggy Lynch; POPE Craig; Ron Fogg; DeLorenzo, Suzanne (Clackamas River Water); Stan van de Wetering; Tracey Liskey; TJ Hansell; Valerie Kelley; Curtis Martin

**Cc:** Brenda Bateman; FAUCERA Danette L; TARNOW Karen E; MATTER Margaret A; RANCIER Racquel R; JAINDL Raymond G; BYLER Thomas M; PEERMAN Wade; MUCKEN Alyssa M \* WRD; STEVENSON Anna P; WOODCOCK Douglas E \* WRD

**Subject:** RE: Follow-Up to PAG Meeting: Action Requested by Jan. 9

I support the draft PAG memo but echo much of what has been said about the process and amount of time we had to really have a meaningful discussion on some weighty topics. I would add that I would have liked to talk more about groundwater, drought, and climate change. I appreciate that there is a new recommended action to develop a long-term plan for sustainable GW management, but there was not much discussion about what that means. I had notes ready to add to this discussion that never happened (or I missed my opening). My hope is that groundwater will be given the same attention in the IWRS as surface water when it comes to water quality concerns and that the focus isn't primarily on quantity. I felt like we also didn't get much of a chance to discuss drought outside of the

drought TF recommendations (after being told our roles were very different) or climate change for that matter. That said, we did accomplish a lot in our brief time together and I look forward to hearing the public and other stakeholder perspectives as it goes through the review process.

It was great to meet you all, thank you to WRD staff, and thank you for the opportunity to participate. Rebecca

---

Curtis Martin

**From:** V P Ranch  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 12, 2017 12:26 PM  
**To:** Brenda O Bateman; RANCIER Racquel R \* WRD  
**Cc:** Tom Byler; V P Ranch  
**Subject:** Fwd: Follow-Up to PAG Meeting: Action Requested by Jan. 9

Really am apologetic for not getting back in a timely manner.

I have reviewed the summary, and am fine with it going forward to the board of OWRD Commissioners. I would like to know when it will be on their next meeting's agenda, as I would like to attend, if my scheduling allows.

I do think, again if possible that an updating as to actionable items are being implemented. Thanks to all of your efforts, it is/was a very diverse group, and was challenge to keep on track for a reasonable review of the IWRS.

Again, thank you for your hard work!

Curtis W. Martin

---

Hiram Li

**From:** Hiram Li  
**Sent:** Friday, January 13, 2017 6:57 AM  
**To:** Geisen, Rebecca  
**Cc:** BATEMAN Brenda O \* WRD; Allan Elliott; Brent Stevenson; Robert (Will) Collin; Arlene Dietz; Gayle Killam; Craig Lacy; Mary Wahl; Peggy Lynch; POPE Craig; Ron Foggin; DeLorenzo, Suzanne (Clackamas River Water); Stan van de Wetering; Tracey Liskey; TJ Hansell; Valerie Kelley; Curtis Martin; Brenda Bateman (brenda.o.bateman@state.or.us); FAUCERA Danette L; TARNOW Karen E; MATTER Margaret A; RANCIER Racquel R; JAINDL Raymond G; BYLER Thomas M; PEERMAN Wade; MUCKEN Alyssa M \* WRD; STEVENSON Anna P; WOODCOCK Douglas E \* WRD  
**Subject:** Re: Follow-Up to PAG Meeting: Action Requested by Jan. 9

Whereas, the procedure was efficient, Important aspects of the discussion were left out. We had very interesting discussions that highlighted different points of view. These were not completely resolved and raised issues that if fully reported would provide a starting point for others (agencies, communities) to consider and to resolve. I can give three or four examples: (1) issues of value systems as it affects decision making. Money is but one issue. Craig Lacey brought up good points about sustainability of wild resources. We did not resolve how to weigh that value vs. dollars. (2) The populations of Clark County WA and the Metro 5 will increase energy demands. How will we resolve for these needs in terms of hydroelectricity generation? More dams? Change release schedules that might hinder native salmonids migrating through the system? Retain electrical generation through burning fossil fuels? We should plan for temporal water scarcity, greater demand for electricity may well be a critical factor (3) What happened to the issue of the necessity to include the Precautionary Principle when uncertainty is high? (4) Can we use predictions of flooding events to recharge the acquires that have been badly depleted aquifers in Irregon. I think that rebuilding wetlands is favorable to off channel storage, but something will have to be done to prevent the agricultural hub of Eastern Oregon from disappearing. (5) We left on the table the discussion that was raised by small cattle ranchers and their needs for water. Yet they claimed that if all parties could assemble as a community, they found that they could conserve water and prosper. Was that Curtis? If so, I would like them to tell us how they managed that situation. It would be something that those interested in Place Based Planning would appreciate.

The procedures did lead to recommendations from DWRD, but it also left out a rich source of ideas. We needed to leave a trail ideas for others to mine. I join Peggy Lynch in my disappointment in the process. Peggy Lynch has become a source of inspiration for me. She was on top of all the issues and, indeed, understood the issues better than I. I will now become a regular donator to the League of Women Voters.

However, if this does lead to more boots on the ground and funds the two landscape geographers who work on predicting drought and on issues important to ODFW's mission, I will yield to the system devised, however much I was disappointed. I noted from the comments of my fellow members that I am not alone. To my fellow committee members, I have nothing but admiration. I will continue to find documents that should interest you and I am building a list of scientists from U Dub, Utah State, Idaho State, and ODFW that will be happy to answer your questions. They are all world class scientists.

Until we meet again,  
-Hiram-