

Upper Grande Ronde River Watershed Partnership
Place-Based Integrated Water Resource Planning
Stakeholder Meeting No. 42

Meeting Minutes

October 6, 2021

5:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.

Conference Call

ATTENDANCE: Leonard Flint, Kim Ogren, Cheryl Murchison, Larry Larsen, Adrienne Averett, Joe Lemanski, Kathleen Cathey, Anton Chiono, Darrin Wallenta, Zamoria Remiza, Roxy Nayar, Jed Hassinger, Harmony Burreight, Brett Moore, Dana Kurtz, Donna Beverage.

Note: Comments from an unknown speaker are noted as “UKS”

I. WELCOME

a. Introductions

Donna opened the meeting and Dana reported attendance.

b. Meeting Guidelines

State your name when speaking, speak up, mute your microphone when not talking, and use chat function to share ideas/comments when others are speaking, respect other points of view.

c. Portland State review of PBP process – October 21 and November 1 (5-7pm)

Dana reminded the group about upcoming evaluation dates.

d. ODFW in-stream demand update

Dana reported that the in-stream demand work group met on September 8 with ODFW Hydrologist Spencer Sawaske. ODFW’s summary of the method to update in-stream demand: 1) To see use of ODFW instream flow targets in place of ISWR (we can provide a dataset of the most recent instream targets); 2) Improvement in accounting of instream demand for streams lacking ISWR/ODFW targets (we can help with target development here); and 3) A restructuring of instream demand accounting in some sub-watersheds from a mainstem-focused approach to a combined tributary and mainstem accounting approach (we can help with this as well).

Larry said he did not support this work because it sounded like it is not based on actual streams. Joe explained that the 2018 report did not cover the entire basin. This is an updated, broader approach looking at water, using several data sets across the basin and region to help the group prioritize projects and how actions can be implemented. If everything we know were based on hard data, we would be severely underestimating the water. We have to have models because we can’t have perfect data across the basin. Dana said it is newly collected data on in-stream demand, reconfiguring a calculation that was done. This will be like a placeholder until we can get study data. ODFW has said that Step 2 numbers would not change. Donna asked if water rights was being taken out of it. Adrienne said they would run traditional hydrology methods and apply principles to calculate ungaged tributaries. Jed said it sounds like a rework of the waters in the tributaries. Larry pointed out that the whole plan was built on rights and asked how they could be measured. Anton reminded the group that this was one of the data gaps we had and there were a lot of issues using water rights. This is not a perfect proxy for what is needed, but ODFW is trying to improve upon those. Harmony added that ODFW is trying to keep pace with changes in approaches, thinking, science, and policy. Water rights is one method to try to understand the need, but it does not capture all of the needs. Larry said that the group has already acknowledged that we don’t have the data, but this sounds like the numbers are going to be higher and that’s just not

Upper Grande Ronde River Watershed Partnership
Place-Based Integrated Water Resource Planning
Stakeholder Meeting No. 42

acceptable. He can see amendments to water rights. Donna said we need to stick to the real story based on water rights, that is our real time report, and it can be updated in a couple years. Dana noted that this would not change our numbers or the plan, it just affects action items. Anton added that the basin's planning document used some modeling, but we didn't have the ability to use this type of modeling at the time. Everyone needs to be comfortable with this, so it's important to attend the work group meetings. Larry said he would oppose adopting it. Joe explained that this is a tool to focus on some areas, but it is not an end all be all. Dana acknowledged that the message may be getting a little mixed, but we planned on updating this along with other demands. Adrienne wants the group to think of the data as a bridge to things like funding. The plan will need better data, especially ESA species, whether it is habitat, conservation, or municipal strategies.

II. STEP 5 PLAN REVISIONS

a. Comment line-by-line discussion

- 1. Added statement to reflect that the Plan is linked to Statewide Integrated Water Resources Strategy & policies.**
- 2. Added statement listing the five separate steps of the planning process.**
- 3. Added statement detailing exact number of MOU signatories.**
- 4. Added statement reiterating that our plan is in accordance with OWR planning guidelines.**
- 5. Added summary detailing balanced representation of participants and their participation in groups.**
- 6. Added statement with hyperlinks detailing the planning process.**
- 7. Added statement from the Step 2 reports about why ecological needs/ESA species are important.**
Larry would like to see references to step reports, not additional explanations, so that this does not become too long. Dana noted that a lot of the agency review comments acknowledge that things were done but not reflected in this report and this did make it 25 pages longer. We need to strike balance between additional information and the length of the summary. Harmony agreed that it is striking a balance of high-level key takeaways from the step reports and making sure they have a home in the final plan. It could be summarized at a very high level and then point towards the step reports for details. Dana said the group would look for ways to condense the language once there is a general consensus without removing things that people want included.
- 8. Added statement to describe how we established the eight sub-watersheds.**
- 9. Removed statement (current in-stream demand was) "likely underestimated" and added: "and do not account for the full range of ecological flows ..." This clarifies that there are higher channel flows in the winter.**

Larry questioned how they would know in-stream demand was underestimated; that may be their opinion, but they can't prove it. They should not allow a statement to categorically say that the numbers we came up with is either an overestimation or an underestimation. Adrienne noted that when they receive in-stream water rights applications from ODFW, they reduce the amount allocated to the in-stream water right to 50% exceedance. Often times ODFW will ask for more water than they actually

Upper Grande Ronde River Watershed Partnership
Place-Based Integrated Water Resource Planning
Stakeholder Meeting No. 42

receive through certificated in-stream right. Based on currents and basin investigations, water rights are at the very low end of what the demand is as represented in those reports.

Dana's understanding was that the review agencies did not understand how long we had spent coming up with this phrasing of 'likely underestimated.' This was a very big negotiating point for getting the step 5 report proofed. Dana recalled that Annette from ODFW mentioned they would be okay with leaving 'likely' in the statement if we made changes in other places. Dana asked Joe if, based on the other changes, he would be okay with leaving 'likely' in this statement. Joe said that mathematically and biologically, they are of the understanding that it is an underestimate simply because biological targets are different from in-stream water rights targets. When applied for from an ODFW perspective, despite the biological target, those in-stream water rights where fish and wildlife protection are reduced down to the median flow at that particular time of the year. There are also several sub-basins within the Grande Ronde basin that are not characterized as a water availability basin, and, there are some areas that don't have these water availability estimates. It is an estimate and anything is possible; his understanding is that the in-stream demands are underestimated simply because there are several aspects unaccounted for through the estimation process.

Anton said that in-stream water rights don't cover every stream in the basin so we know that we have underestimated it because we based the methodology on incomplete coverage. We were tasked to make this plan with the data we had available and we did the best job we could but it was incomplete data and this is recognizing that's the case. Larry said that it is phrased in a way that means that it is absolutely underestimated and we don't know that, and that's why 'likely' was put in there. Anton wondered if we could use something that speaks directly to the problem that the methodology we used is incomplete. Donna suggested saying, 'in-stream demands will be updated as more data...' Larry agreed something along those lines would be ok, but his main point is that we don't need to have an absolute statement because he doesn't think you can absolutely say these are underestimated, even if there are streams where it would be true.

Dana said that a lot of our language in this report includes words like caveat, likely, approximately, anticipating and other words commonly used when you're trying to take the best information you have and say something about it; that's why we landed on 'likely' in this part. Joe suggested saying something that would account for both ends of the spectrum like, 'current understanding of in-stream demands is uncertain.' Larry thought that would be better than saying it is underestimated. Dana asked if it could be said as, 'current understanding of in-stream demand is uncertain. In-stream demands are likely underestimated.' Joe reiterated that with the methodology used, there are portions of the basin that are unaccounted for and it is by mathematical logic that it is underestimated. Dana said we accounted for each part of the basin by using proxies. It's not accurate to say that we didn't calculate it based on the four points of each sub-watershed. We did not do it based on tributaries. We assumed that that one core point would also be used to calculate our quantity.

Dana asked if we could say, 'current in-stream use is calculated using only water rights. Current understanding of in-stream demand is uncertain.' Adrienne said that that edit loses the original intent of the statement and suggested to leave 'likely.' The agencies can probably live with 'likely.' The way they take information from ODFW in the water rights process and the fact that there aren't in-stream rights everywhere, it is an underestimate but this is probably not worth the amount of time to negotiate. We can make a case for keeping that word in if some of those other statements are also included around ecological flow. Dana asked if she wanted to remove 'the current understanding demand is uncertain.' Adrienne said she could go either way on that one.

Upper Grande Ronde River Watershed Partnership
Place-Based Integrated Water Resource Planning
Stakeholder Meeting No. 42

Anton said this is a great example of how much the planning group put into the verbiage of this document over a long 42 meetings. To an outsider some of this may look trivial. We've had all these conversations before and the wording has been very carefully chosen. Dana explained that we tried to make required and suggested changes, but if there is a suggested change that we have concerns about, it can be taken out. She said she tried to show that the plan is inclusive and considering some of the advice. Some good information has been added from that advice. This word has been talked about many times.

Larry couldn't recall any meeting where ecological flow was discussed and it has not shown up in this executive summary. Dana said it was familiar to her; she thinks it came up in a Step 3 report, then taken out when Larry brought up concerns. We didn't include that word because it wasn't well defined. Larry said if you start using buzzwords, people have their minds made up about things before they should. He does not personally know what ecological means or how you would calculate it. He questions why that word would come up in in the final report when it hasn't shown up in the other ones. Dana thought that it means the channel forming flows, the high winter flows, and the seasonal varying flows. All of those that fish need on a normal day but are important for the system to flush out all the sediment or rehydrate the floodplain. Larry said if that's what it means, then you can simply say full range of flows across the seasons, it doesn't have to say ecological. He has a problem with something that could cause us grief down the road.

Dana asked if the agencies would be okay with 'the full range of flows across the seasons.' Harmony thought that would make sense. Kim reminded the group of the intended message from the agencies in its highlighted required changes. They tried to provide some suggestive language, but they are open to using different language when the concept or issue is addressed. It is more important that the concept be presented. If in talking about ecological flows was an issue in past discussions, and you have a different way of characterizing it that means the same thing, then that works. Anton believes the group did that. Leonard pointed out that the language and explanation needs to be understandable. Donna suggested removing 'ecological' and condensing to just 'flows.' Anton asked what was said before because we have had this exact conversation and these need to be terms we are familiar with. Dana said she would note the question and see what was said in Step 3. Donna asked if anyone objected to removing 'ecological' and putting in 'range of seasons.' Anton said yes, because he would like to see what we did before. UKS said to keep the language as is if it was already discussed in previous steps.

10. Edited statement to reflect agency's suggested addition to summary of climate change: "associated with increasing temperatures."

11. Added statement: future in-stream demand "is likely to increase."

12. Edited statement to add: "with other uses of water."

13. Edited statement to add: "Based on analysis in Step 3..." and "...likely connected."

14. Added statement for clarification: "protecting in-stream needs for fish and wildlife."

15. Edited statement about scenic waterway flows downstream to include: "hydraulically connected groundwater during several months of the year unless mitigation is provided."

Upper Grande Ronde River Watershed Partnership
Place-Based Integrated Water Resource Planning
Stakeholder Meeting No. 42

16. Recommended change to emphasize that we may want to look into a basin-wide program that does not currently exist to facilitate mitigation. Notes added as a tracking table.

Larry requested better clarification of what we are trying to mitigate; he suggested a statement about how they wanted mitigation programs that do not currently exist to facilitate conflict. Dana thought mitigation would be for new water rights if you wanted to develop a new well. UKS added that it could be ground water permits; you can still do exact flows. Dana noted that this is very detailed for the executive summary, and it might be important to have here since it isn't written elsewhere. UKS said this was a suggested change, but it could be removed and considered in the future. If it is something that wasn't talked about a lot then it may not be a good fit for the executive summary. Dana said there is a section about allocation in the Step 3 report; we were more focused on understanding actual supply.

17. Added statement in response to question about lower vulnerabilities in municipal systems: "based on the water use reporting data showing needs are met and relatively small demands."

18. Deleted statement: "water needs for self-supplied domestic users and livestock uses, self-supplied industrial uses" because those were included in the municipal demand section.

19. Added statement: "Natural hazards like flooding, fire, and drought impact the UGRRW frequently..." because they are hazards we experience, but were not quantitative assessed.

20. Added statement to graph: "Area water quality concerns include temperature, bacteria, sedimentation, dissolved oxygen and pH. Temperature impairments are the most widespread." This was a required change from DEQ to clarify how we talked about TMDLs.

21. Edited statement to reflect that surface water quality falls below statewide regulatory standards throughout different times of the year.

22. Edited statement to reflect TMDLs have been established for temperature and bacteria. This is to add information to supplement our step 2 report.

23. Added references to map (Section 4.0).

24. Added 'management' to statement: "all are needed to inform strategic groundwater resource planning and management."

25. Suggestion was to retitle this summary for more clarity and to reorder sub-watersheds. No changes were made because the order was voted on and no strong reason was apparent to change it.

26. Added "for instream and out-of-stream uses" to title: "Issue/Goal 1 – Eliminate surface water deficit for instream and out-of-stream uses."

27. Suggested title change to: "Reduce groundwater declines and reduce supply uncertainty." It may not be the best way to say it but it explains the two questions we are trying to answer. If it's declining, we want to manage that and figure out our supply. No change made today; separate meeting to be held to draft language.

Larry suggested 'understand groundwater cycles and reduce supply uncertainty.' Otherwise, the way it reads is that we have declining groundwater and we don't necessarily know if it is declining or not. We're

Upper Grande Ronde River Watershed Partnership
Place-Based Integrated Water Resource Planning
Stakeholder Meeting No. 42

not going to reduce it, we want to understand groundwater fluctuation and reduce supply uncertainty. Dana recalled that OWRD has stated, and wants it stated, that based on all the information they have, groundwater is declining. Other places in the text she tried to explain where there is uncertainty and for all these reasons that we understood before. Larry said he would seriously disagree with the agency's position; they may have stated it and believe it, but you can't make that conclusion from all the data they have shown us and we have looked at. It doesn't decline in all areas so you can't say it is a decline in the entire watershed. That's a false statement and we shouldn't be encouraged to put out false information. We should be saying that we want to understand groundwater fluctuations. They do not know if it's declining and they shouldn't even be telling us that they do because they haven't got the data.

Dana suggested 'understand groundwater level conditions and fluctuations.'

Larry said groundwater goes up and down every year. You can say trends, but it does not mean that it is declining. UKS agreed, they don't know what it is across the basin. They have to base the analysis on the data they have, which show declines in both the alluvial and volcanic, but it is not uniform across the basin and there is a significant amount of uncertainty. Larry said it is not a true statement to say that there is a general groundwater decline. UKS agreed and added that this is about what the known data says and the remaining uncertainties. Larry said that the data we do have says that we need to study it more. We know that it is not categorically declining, that is an absolute fact. We don't want to add a statement that projects that we have a declining groundwater when we don't know. We should say that we want to understand groundwater fluctuations or trends. It is not a decline and we are not going to try to reduce it because we don't know that we have a decline.

Dana recalled that we have had these conversations before and she didn't know if this is a change in OWRD's position or a more firm position than in our previous reports. Previous reports talk about uncertainty and likely declining. 'Likely declining' makes sense because most of them, or not a ton of them, are going up. That's what we said in our other reports. She recalled that Larry made the point to get the groundwater memo provided by OWRD; it is not definitive, it is likely that it is declining. It didn't seem to fit in but it was cited in the agency review that it needs to be definitive that it is declining. Larry said his position is that they can go pound sand because that is a false statement; they know it and they should do a better job. UKS said she would characterize the agency's statements a little bit differently. In the volcanics, every observation they have shows that there is very little recharge to that system and so essentially, when tapped into that system, they are drawing down storage that existed in those volcanics. She agreed with Larry that it might be variable across the basin. The alluvials data points that they do have show a modest decline over time. She has heard that locally people have observed in some places it's coming up or fluctuating year to year, so there is greater uncertainty there. How do they capture what they do know, data they do have and what it says, as well as the local knowledge of what is observed on the ground and the remaining uncertainties? The agency comments are just about how to accurately represent what the agency is observing based on the data they do have because the agency feels they have a responsibility to accurately convey what they are seeing with the data. Larry said the obvious conclusion here is that the agencies made a decision before they should have. UKS said that no decision has been made.

Leonard said his understanding of the term groundwater is 12 feet above because it is considered surface water, and anything deeper than that is classified as something else. He asked for more clarification. Harmony said her understanding is that groundwater is the water between soil and rocks under our feet and the threshold line between surface water and groundwater. The really deep groundwater is

Upper Grande Ronde River Watershed Partnership
Place-Based Integrated Water Resource Planning
Stakeholder Meeting No. 42

considered groundwater as much as the saturated zone. It is where it's all wet under our feet and where the space between the soil and the rocks are full of water. Dana asked if that was the difference between alluvial and groundwater that touches surface water and goes back and forth. She said that there's deep groundwater under the basalt. Harmony said there are five data points in alluvial and then more data points in the other units. All of these are going down and are more mixed, very seasonally, and when there's runoff, it recharges. There are these different units, the shallower system and the deeper system and they behave differently. They get recharged when it rains, and for those really deep systems, it takes a really long time for water to work its way down that deep. Whereas the shallow system is more likely to be recharged after a big rain.

Harmony said that for a better understanding of groundwater it would be worth sitting down with Phil, their hydrogeologist, and picking his brain to learn what he knows and then also share what you know with him. The agency is very interested to know if their data is different from what you all see out there; that is really important to note. They also have a responsibility to explain what they are seeing with the data. Larry said that they have so few data points that they don't know what they have. Until we have more data points, we don't have any business making those kinds of confirmations. He said that's where the agency has gone totally wrong; they don't have the data to prove what they're trying to sell and he is not accepting that.

Harmony asked Larry if it would not be an observable trend when his well was declining. Larry said it depends on the time of year because there is an annual recharge. He has two wells that are in alluvial and every spring they recharge, come up way high, and then he declines them over the season because other people are draining the water, too. There's still sufficient recharge to bring it right back up to the same general level it was before. He said they don't have enough data to make statements based on a decline of half a foot or so. The best thing we could do is to study it. That's what we said we were going to do and the agency wishes to show that they know all of this, but they don't. If you don't have the data, you don't have the data. Harmony said this is just saying that of the data we have, this is what it is showing but to the extent that it agrees or disagrees with what you all observe locally. Larry said that when they say reduce ground water decline, they are not having any flexibility in it, and they don't even know it's declining.

Donna asked for the original language that the group voted on.

Dana reported the original language: "reduce groundwater declines and supply uncertainties." She said the language is a real sticking point because it has been changed throughout this document. She said that in the past she added, "OWRD has stated groundwater is declining," but that statement has been changed. A lot of our other reports said we only have six wells and, "there is uncertainty and groundwater is likely declining." There are words around declining, but it's not as certain as these new changes would make it. The language we had for the goal was "reduce groundwater declines and supply uncertainties." Originally, it was, "reduce... well water uncertainty," then people wanted to specify getting at the two things where we want to figure out what our supply is.

Donna suggested changing the statement to 'reduce groundwater supply uncertainties.' When we say we want to reduce uncertainty, we are saying that we need more data and we want to find out.

UKS said it sounds like the group had already agreed on the groundwater declines but state agencies did not propose that language. There might be a disconnect in understanding what OWRD specifically wants included in the plan, which is that is that they have observed the declines in both the volcanics and alluvial

Upper Grande Ronde River Watershed Partnership
Place-Based Integrated Water Resource Planning
Stakeholder Meeting No. 42

system. They can acknowledge the uncertainty in areas where there is a rate of decline and where there is recharge. They do have data in a number of wells that indicates that there are some declines in the basin. This is including that piece and also that there are other places where groundwater levels are increasing, stabilized, fluctuate year to year, or we just don't know. To not include and acknowledge those data points is a problem because they have observed some declines.

Larry asked how many wells are declining. UKS said she didn't know the number off the top of her head but could follow up after talking OWR Hydrogeologist Phil Marcy. Dana reported that the valley has 13 wells in the alluvial and 7 wells in the basalt. Larry said that them saying everything is declining based on six wells is bull. UKS clarified that she was not saying that everything is declining, but that they have observed some declines. Larry said that is not what the document is saying, it says 'reduce groundwater declines.' That means that we are accepting that it is in decline and you don't have enough data to know that.

Donna suggested this discussion might be better suited in another section of the executive summary and noted that this statement was just added: "OWRD has noted there are observed level declines in both the alluvial groundwater system and the volcanic groundwater system." Larry said that using the word 'observed' implies that we have seen quite a few and we haven't. There may be, but we haven't seen them because we don't have the data to tell us that.

Adrienne made a request to pause and review the ground rules everyone agreed upon and adopted in the governance agreement. In the past, there were ground rules about questioning a thought without attacking speakers. We have a lot of hard work ahead of us and it would be really helpful to facilitate fruitful discussions, moving forward to get this plan to the finish line.

Dana posted the ground rules in the meeting screenshare and read aloud: "Recognize the legitimacy of the interest and opinions of others; Come to meetings prepared with comments; Only one person speaks at a time; Make an effort to offer potential solutions if a challenge or problem is brought forward; Make commitments only if it is believed they can be fulfilled; Respect the facilitator agenda and any issues put aside for later; Meeting minutes with task lists will be prepared after every meeting; and personal attacks and unprofessional behavior will not be tolerated."

Dana acknowledged that this was a good pause. The group is doing a pretty good job getting through this. Some topics will need to be tabled for later, like the need to involve more folks with the in-stream demand revisions. The document's statements about groundwater are different in a lot of places now that it has been revised a lot. It is in more detail; it says that groundwater is generally declining in the alluvial and aquifer systems, but it also says there's a lot of uncertainty and we need to come up with more data points in our evaluations.

Leonard asked if Union's wells were included in the data; Dana said she was pretty sure they were and would check on it.

It was agreed to schedule a separate work group meeting to come up with an overall message on groundwater that is expanded throughout the document.

28. Retitled: "Prepare for natural hazards/climate change."

Upper Grande Ronde River Watershed Partnership
Place-Based Integrated Water Resource Planning
Stakeholder Meeting No. 42

29. Statement added to explain that our partnership will mostly focus on the top five strategies and will support individual groups working on other strategies as much as we can.

30. In response to a comment about strategies not balanced towards all user groups, a statement was added indicating which user groups were the primary beneficiaries of the strategies.

Donna said that the municipal users are not the only beneficiaries of infrastructure. Dana said her assumption was that all of the strategies would benefit everyone, but the agency's concern was that the document does not show individual groups that would benefit the most. Municipal was listed because a lot of the work is around flooding and disaster relief; cities are primarily involved in that, but more users can be listed. Donna said that infrastructure to reduce frequency and severity of damage due to flooding helps all three groups: in-stream, agriculture, and municipal.

31. Suggestion to rename Infrastructure to "flood reduction group" considered but not accepted.

Dana said that although it's not really stated in this quick summary, there are a lot of different things going on in this group. The BOR study and the sedimentation study is about a lot more than flooding. Both of those would be leading to habitat-like projects. There might be agricultural applications, too. She suggested no name change, but said it can be changed if someone sees value in making the title more flooding based. Jed would like to leave it as is.

32. Suggested update to in-stream demand. No change made today; separate meeting to be held to draft language.

33. Added statement to reiterate how and why the plan would be updated.

Donna suggested adding 'every five years, or as needed.'

III. CONCLUSION

- a. Next regular meeting is Wednesday November 3 (5-7pm) Conference Call
- b. PBP evaluation meetings are October 21 and November 1 (5-7pm) Conference Call
- c. Other comments

Donna asked for feedback about more frequent meetings to get through the process faster and be on track to present at the March OWR Commission meeting. Dana noted that there would be two small work group meetings and two evaluation meetings before the next regular meeting. Meeting frequency will be reassessed at the next regular meeting.

UKS suggested that another way to get through this a little quicker would be to focus on the required changes and topics that the state agencies had deep concerns about, and how the plan did or did not follow the planning guidelines. She said she appreciated the group including a number of the suggested changes and noted that the state agencies understood the suggestions likely would not, or might not, be incorporated. They are fine with that. Dana said that was a good point and they could definitely focus on required changes only. A lot of the suggested edits are related to the same points of the required edits, so it could reflect negatively on the group if they're not all addressed. Going line by line is not ideal, but it helps with discussion and for those who have not read the document before the meeting. It will go faster now because everything flows from the executive summary.

Upper Grande Ronde River Watershed Partnership
Place-Based Integrated Water Resource Planning
Stakeholder Meeting No. 42

Roxy suggested offering a nonverbal option for people to participate in a different way allowing them to comment on topics that generate a lot of debate and discussion in case they are not comfortable speaking in the moment. Dana said she understood what Roxy was saying and added that everyone is invited to provide comments before the meeting and asked if she meant emailing to object in the moment. Roxy said she meant just another way to let people know they can weigh in if they don't want to do it during the meeting. Dana said that it is hard when they are trying to make decisions. They want to avoid everyone commenting after the meeting to make new changes. Dana invited everyone in support of the nonverbal opportunity to email feedback to her after the meeting.

Dana reminded the group that the document does not have to be updated in the way that ODFW has recommended. ODFW developed a methodology and understand that process; if we like it, we can use it. There is opportunity for feedback and input. We are close to finishing the groundwater statement; we just need to come up with a unified message. It could be deciding if we definitively say 'groundwater decline' or 'likely' with caveats, or make it more specific with the number of wells that were observed, declining, and going up seasonally.

Donna would like everyone to be aware of their opportunity to attend the separate work group meetings. Dana noted that those meetings would be opportunities for comments on these topics. A summary will be provided at the November meeting and then the group will continue working through the rest of the document. Dana will send meeting details to everyone via email.

Donna thanked everyone for taking the time to join the meeting. She appreciates the cooperation from both sides. Those that have been at the table since the very beginning are able to share that we have had a lot of these conversations. We don't want to rehash too much, but at the same time, we want to make sure the group and the state are happy with this plan.

Action items:

1. In-stream demand work group will meet before November 3.
2. Groundwater work group will meet before November 3.

Oct. 6	Draft Step 5 Plan for discussion
Oct – Nov	Small work groups meet to work on disagreements, TBA
Oct. 21	PSU evaluation meeting (virtual) – 5-7pm
Nov. 1	PSU evaluation meeting (Virtual) – 5-7pm
Nov.	Step 5 Plan finalization
Dec.	Step 5 Plan vote for approval
Mar.	Step 5 Plan presentation to Water Resources Commission

The meeting was adjourned.