

Upper Grande Ronde River Watershed Partnership
Place-Based Integrated Water Resource Planning
Stakeholder Meeting No. 34

Meeting Minutes
November 18, 2020
Conference Call

ATTENDANCE:

Steve Parrett, Brett Moore, Donna Beverage, Jesse Steele, Winston Morton, Adrienne Averett, Jim Webster, Dana Kurtz, Curt Ricker, Bill Gamble, Anton Chiono, Jed Hassinger, Gretchen Sausen, Matt Insko, Larry Larson, Rodger Huffman, Tim Wallender, Kyle Carpenter, Cheryl Murchison, and Dave Johnson.

I. WELCOME

a. Introductions

b. Meeting Guidelines

Dana reviewed meeting guidelines: mute your microphone until ready to speak, state your name when speaking, and use the chat function for comments/ideas while others are speaking. Dana reviewed the timeline:

Nov. 18, 2020	Review draft Step 5 (and vote on Step 4)
Dec. 9, 2020	Revisions to Step 5 report
Jan. 2021	Revisions to Step 5
Feb. 2021	Adopt DRAFT Step 5
Mar. 1, 2021	Need to submit plan to allow 30-60 days for agency review (ODA, ODFW, OWRD, DEQ)
Apr. 2021	Wait/work implementation
May 2021	Wait/work implementation (presentation of final plan to the OWRD commission)
Jun. 2021	Grant extension expires

c. Recap of October 14, 2020 Stakeholder meeting

i. Step 4 report revisions

The Step 4 Report was further reviewed, discussed and revised. Members volunteered to join Step 5 sub-groups (implementation).

ii. Step 5 discuss Catherine Creek Underground Storage work and Feasibility Study Application

Brett explained the feasibility study multi-step process.

iii. Storage Feasibility Study was successfully submitted, and needed no revisions

Dana reported that since the October meeting, the Catherine Creek underground storage project was successfully submitted and needed no revisions. Steve explained the review process; a multi-agency team will discuss and review projects, assign points using criteria, and order in prioritization to fund or not fund. It will be spring before it makes it to the Water Resources Commission for a decision.

Upper Grande Ronde River Watershed Partnership
Place-Based Integrated Water Resource Planning
Stakeholder Meeting No. 34

II. Wallowa Dam Rehabilitation Project Letter of Support (15 minutes)

- a. Anton shared that the dam has fallen into disrepair over the years and hasn't been able to hold full capacity due to needed repairs since the late 70s. The Irrigation District has been trying to raise funds for years. The State Legislature saw this project as a good investment of public dollars as a result of the public benefits and diversity for stakeholders. The Oregon economic forecast in 2020 was dismal and it looked as if the state would cancel that funding as it is one of many projects. He suggested the partnership submit a letter of support; it would be good for the Legislature to hear from eastern Oregon and the Wallowa Dam project parallels the partnership's work.

A vote was taken to submit a letter of support and passed unanimously. Yes votes were submitted by Anton, Donna, Bill, Jed, Jesse, Jim, Matt, Larry, Rodger, Tim, Cheryl, Kyle, Dave. Adrienne, Gretchen, and Steve abstained. Rodger suggested adding signatures for Brett Moore and the County Commissioners.

III. Step 4 Report (30 minutes)

a. Revisions sent out

Dana noted that the partnership has been struggling to agree on some Step 4 Report details. The Steering Committee recommended a review of the Governance Agreement. It states:

- Consensus will be determined to be reached when all Stakeholder Committee members present at the meeting agree to one of the following statements:
 - 1) I agree with the decision and will publicly support it;
 - 2) I agree with the decision but will refrain from publicly supporting it; or
 - 3) I can live with the decision (and will not disparage it in public).
- If there is disagreement, the disagreeing member is required to offer a constructive alternative that seeks to meet the needs of all participants involved.
- If a consensus-based decision cannot be made, the areas of disagreement will be clearly recorded in any Partnership reports. The disagreeing member(s) of the Stakeholder Committee must submit, in writing, the nature of the disagreement, and an agreement of all parties (with a maximum of two dissenters) allows the process the move forward."

b. Voting Discussion

Are you prepared to vote yes? If not, what changes are needed?

Donna called for an informal vote to indicate everyone's general position on the current version of the Step 4 Report, whether they would vote yes or support it if a formal vote was held today. The following members said they would support it: Adrienne, Anton, Donna, Bill, Jed, Jesse, Jim, Matt, Gretchen, Steve, Curt, Kyle, Cheryl, and Dave. The following members said they could vote yes: Anton, Donna, Jed, Jesse, Jim, Matt, Curt, and Kyle. Adrienne, Bill, and Gretchen said they would abstain.

Larry stated that he did not oppose it, but would like more time to read it. He was concerned with table 2-3 and the irrigation period including November. This was changed to "late summer early fall." Rodger stated that he had not thoroughly read the report and didn't feel he was knowledgeable enough to cast a vote. He said it

Upper Grande Ronde River Watershed Partnership
Place-Based Integrated Water Resource Planning
Stakeholder Meeting No. 34

sounded like it could be supported with some of the language cleaned up as suggested. Cheryl and Dave agreed that they could support it and vote yes if the language was cleaned up. Tim stated that, considering the concerns raised at the meeting, it was too early to take a vote and the document was not ready. Larry, Rodger and Tim will send their suggested changes to Dana prior to the next meeting.

Steve stated that the group had worked well together and he appreciated efforts revising language to reflect the group's ideas. He applauded Dana's great work in managing and writing the document.

IV. Step 5 Action Plans (45 minutes)

a. Begin review of action plans – content and framework

Dana reviewed the strategy summaries and sub-groups. Sub-groups will focus on the top five priorities to reduce content into bite size pieces and populate some of the Step 5 sections. Feedback indicated that the organization and structure was widely supported, easy to read, and nicely presented. The subtasks and defined timeline was appreciated.

Steve stated that it's important for the group to take on what it can realistically tackle at one time, then build momentum with its success. Tim agreed the group should narrow the focus to immediate tasks it could complete.

Dana suggested that the next meeting could include some time for sub-groups to work through tasks and then report findings at the end. Donna agreed and added that there could be space in separate meeting rooms on county campus for that to happen. Adrienne suggested considering the use of breakout functions within virtual meeting platforms. Dana will send lists of sub-groups to everyone and let everyone decide if they can meet before the next meeting.

V. Conclusion (5 minutes)

a. Next meeting is December 9, 2020 (5-7pm)

Meeting format will be determined when it gets closer, and may include an in-person option, or via conference only.

b. Other Comments

Steve stated that the Water Resources Commission would meet November 19 at 11:15 a.m. to make funding decisions for applications that were submitted last spring. It can be viewed on YouTube and is helpful in seeing how they consider applications and make those decisions.

Donna adjourned the meeting at 6:35 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Cinda Johnston
Union County Planning Department Specialist