

WATER RESOURCES COMMISSION

WORK SESSION

PENDLETON

MAY 10, 1990

MINUTES

Commission members present:

Bill Blosser, Chair
Lorna Stickel, Vice-Chair
Dierdre Malarkey
Cliff Bentz
Jim Howland
Mike Jewett
Hadley Akins
Commissioner-elect Roger Bachman

Water Resources staff:

Bill Young
Jan Shaw
Beverly Hayes
Becky Kreag
Tom Kline
Mike Mattick
John Borden
Steve Sanders
Fred Lissner
Ken Weese
Mike Ladd
Steve Applegate
Bud Bartels

Others:

Audrey Simmons
Sharon Timms
Chris Rauch
Deane Seeger
Jan Boettcher
Steve Brown
David Childs
Pat Wortman
John Howard
Karl Niederwerfer
Jill Zarnowitz
Kevin Campbell
Lee Wallace
Harold Otley
Rick George
Mike Farrow
Representative Chuck Norris
Lynn Beaton

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.

Chairman Blosser introduced Commissioner-elect Roger Bachman to the group. Commissioner Bachman will begin his term of office on July 1, replacing Bill Blosser, who is resigning.

1. CONCURRENCE WITH ACTION PROPOSALS FOR THE 1991-93 BIENNIAL WATER PROGRAM

At the March 30, 1990 meeting, the Commission endorsed the Department's proposal to hold a public workshop on the draft Biennial Water Program.

The workshop was held on April 24 at the state capitol. Approximately 60 people attended representing private interests, local governments, federal agencies and various user groups. The workshop consisted of an orientation session and two 50-minute work sessions where seven work groups met to discuss one or two of the proposed 1991-93 Biennial Water Program topics. Each work group included a facilitator and one or more resource people who also served as recorders.

The work sessions provided a forum for participants to comment on:

1. Each of the proposed issues under a particular topic.
2. The goal related to each issue.
3. The action proposals associated with each issue.

Participants were encouraged to suggest modifications to proposed issues, goal statements and action proposals. Participants also could suggest the addition or deletion of an issue or action proposal. The participants prioritized the issues under each topic and the actions under each issue. The comments gathered at the workshop will be summarized and used to further revise the draft Biennial Program.

Prior to May 10, staff forwarded a revised version of the actions and proposals to the Commission. Staff will be seeking concurrence with the action proposals contained in this draft.

The action proposals will then be presented to the Strategic Water Management Group (SWMG) at its May 22 meeting for endorsement. The fiscal aspects of the action proposal could then be used in the development of 1991-93 budgets.

The final 1991-93 Biennial Program report and summary will be presented to the 1991 Legislature after the action proposals are reviewed by SWMG. Agencies and the Commission will have an opportunity to modify the draft with a commitment to the basic actions and priorities approved by the WRC and SWMG.

Director's Recommendation

The staff recommended that the Commission concur with program activities and priorities for the purpose of preparing budgets and legislation. Approval of a final report and summary will be requested at a later Commission meeting.

1991-93 BIENNIAL WATER PROGRAM SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT

This supplemental report was prepared to assist the Commission in its work session on the 1991-93 Biennial Water Program. The elements in the Biennial Program, if approved by the Commission, Governor, and the Legislature, will define the majority of the activities of the Resource Management Division and some of the activities of the other divisions in the 1991-93 biennium. An edited version of the program was distributed at the work session. It is based on workshop comments and additional analysis. The same basic activities will remain in the revised version as in the workshop draft.

This report focused only on the base budget items in the biennial program. The Commission's discussion on budget decision packages will help shape the other elements in the two-year program. Staff completed a detailed review of actions for the Planning Section in particular and modified some of the proposed time commitments. Activities in the base budget category will fully commit the resources of the planning section. In addition, the agency has a number of ongoing responsibilities not specifically listed in the biennial program but often required by statutes, rule, or executive order. Some of these activities include review of other agency permits, completion of the review of USFS forest plans, the expected review of BLM forest plans and participation in issues identified by the Governor or the Legislature. Therefore, some activities currently identified in the biennial program will have to be deferred, reduced, or eliminated to meet the unscheduled actions.

Director's Recommendation

The staff recommended that the Commission discuss the proposed biennial program and recommendations on priorities for activities in the next biennium. The staff also recommended that the Commission concur with use of the revised biennium program as a budgeting document. Final reports will be recommended to the Commission in August.

1991-93 BIENNIAL WATER PROGRAM SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT #2 - RANKING OF ISSUES AND ACTIONS BY AGENCIES AND WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

Attached to this report were tables displaying priority rankings of the issues and actions contained in the Draft Biennial Program.

A table was prepared for each topic. The table listed the issues on the left and the agencies across the top. Each agency which has a lead or coordinating role in any of the actions pertaining to a topic was asked to rank that issue as a high, medium or low priority for their agency. The method to complete the Average Rating column did not give extra weight to the lead agency's rating. Therefore, an issue which may be a high priority for a lead agency may have a medium "Average Rating." It is expected that this information will be useful to the lead agencies as a measure of the coordinating agencies' enthusiasm for addressing particular issues.

The second column from the right, Work Group Ranking, listed the issues the workshop participants felt were most important or needed the most discussion. For example, the majority of people attending the watershed and riparian management workshop endorsed the first issue, rehabilitation, as the most important. Alternatively, the high ranking of the standards issue, under the conservation topic, reflects the desire of the participants to discuss the need for and method of setting standards and should not be construed as

endorsement. Because of this inconsistency, this column indicated more about the level of interest than the priority.

The last column, Written Comments Ranking, reflected the average ranking each issue received from the worksheets turned in. The Department received 21 written comments from participants on 19 worksheets. This information can be used by state agencies to judge the public perception of the importance of each issue.

The lower portion of each page listed each action proposal and the number of participants who ranked that action as a high, medium or low priority for the state. This can also be used by the lead agencies as an indication of each action's importance.

Director's Recommendation

This report was supplemental to two previous reports. It was not intended to modify previous recommendations but was provided to assist in the discussion of agency priorities.

The Commission discussed this item at length. There was general concurrence with the activities and priorities of the next biennium, using the revised biennial report as a budget document and in preparation of legislative concepts.

The Commission recommended moving some of the land use and biennial program activities to a decision package status and put more of the conservation activities in the base budget. They further urged the Department to develop an executive summary shorter and with more energy.

2. 1991-93 DECISION PACKAGES

The Department is currently developing its budget for the 1991-93 biennium. Budget requests for new activities are submitted as separate decision packages to the Governor for approval. The agency's requested budget also includes spending for existing programs.

In March, the Commission received a schedule for budget development from the Department. Commissioners Lorna Stickel and Jim Howland volunteered to work with Department staff members in developing a list of decision packages.

For purposes of Commission discussion at the May meeting, Department staff members developed nine decision packages. These packages were the first estimate of what will be needed to accomplish what staff believes are the highest priority goals and policies of the Commission, the Governor, and the Legislature. The Department did not attempt to rank them. Realistically, the decision packages would need to be scaled down substantially. Given other state priorities, it is clear that the Department could not get legislative approval to double its current budget and add 60 new employees. The full package was being presented to the Commission, however, so the work session would have the broadest range of options to consider.

The decision packages presented provided funding for personal services, supplies, and equipment needed to do the work outlined in the narratives. The decision packages used a combination of general funds and other funds. Revenue generated from a variety of Department fees and from contract services were used to fund some of the proposed activity. Legislation passed in 1989 allows the Department to retain many of the fees collected. Other federal, state, and local governments will be a source of funds through service contracts.

Two attachments accompanied the staff report. The decision packages were described in one attachment and the cost of each package and the number of new full-time equivalent (FTE) positions were displayed in the second attachment. The stream restoration decision package anticipated new legislation that would provide matching funds for restoring streams and watersheds. The \$5 million is an expenditure limitation for the other funds if money was obtained from various sources described in the proposed legislation.

After discussion with the Commission on May 10, the Department expected to be back with a final list of ranked decision packages at the Commission's June meeting.

Director's Recommendation

This was an informational report only and no action was required. However, the Department invited the Commission discussion at the May 10 work session on budget priorities and direction on which of these decision packages should be forwarded to the Governor for consideration.

The Commission discussed this item at some length and, by turn, passed on to the Department their direction for budget priorities and decision packages. The consensus tally will be submitted by the Department to the Governor.

This work session continued into the next day and was concluded just before the start of the Commission's regular meeting.

There being no further business on the work session agenda, the session was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,



Jan Shaw
Commission Assistant

JS:dkh

1144D