

Policy Advisory Group Meeting 2
Integrated Water Resources Strategy
April 14, 2010 – Meeting Notes
Oregon Water Resources Department
Salem, Oregon

<u>Staff and Speakers</u>	<u>Members</u>	<u>Audience</u>
Phil Ward, Director, WRD	Tracy Liskey	Curtis Martin, OCA
Dick Pedersen, Director, DEQ	Mike Seppa	Patricia Farrell, City of Salem
Katy Coba, Director, ODA	Dennis Doherty	Kimberly Priestly, WaterWatch
Brenda Bateman, WRD	Richard Wells	Mark Landauer, SDAO
Christine Svetkovich, DEQ	Lorna Stickel	April Snell, OWRC
Bruce McIntosh, ODFW	Patrick Griffiths	Lori Warner-Dickason, DSL
Ray Jaindl, ODA	Janet Neuman	Sara Ryan, SOLV
Ken Stahr, WRD	Anita Winkler (alternate)	Tom Keller
Alyssa Mucken, WRD	Glenn Barrett	Karla Kay Edwards, Cascade Policy Institute
Jeffrey Pierceall, WRD	Teresa Huntsinger	Susie Dunham, OSU
Rick Kepler, ODFW	John DeVoe	Leslie Bach, TNC
Ryan Vanden Brink, WRD	Aaron Skirvin (alternate)	Jeff Stone, OAN
Jim Paul, ODF	David Pilz (alternate)	Daniel Eisenbeis, LOC
Ronan Igloria, HDR Eng.	Michael Campbell	Brett Brownscombe, The Freshwater Trust
Dwight French, WRD	Todd Heidgerken	Karen Homolac, OBDD
Doug Woodcock, WRD	Tod Heisler	Katie Fast, Farm Bureau
Barry Norris, WRD	Bill Gaffi	Rob Hallyburton, DLCD
Jonathan LaMarche, WRD	Peggy Lynch	Melissa Leoni, OWEB
Gene Foster, DEQ		Mary Meloy, WRC
Cynthia Solie, Facilitator		
Mike Carrier, Governor's Office		
Rep. Jefferson Smith		
Sen. Jackie Dingfelder		

Agenda Item I, Welcome and Agenda Review

Following introductions, the logistics, agenda, and objectives for the meeting were discussed. A request was made to discuss the budget situation for the Water Resources Department. David Pilz, from The Freshwater Trust, brought a letter from Joe Whitworth for distribution at the close of the meeting.

Agenda Item II, Review of January 19, 2010 Meeting Notes

Meeting notes were reviewed and approved.

Agenda Item III, Follow up from Previous Meeting

(a) Revised "Decision-Making Process and Meeting Protocols"

Members reviewed the revised text and discussed the majority versus consensus approach, including how final decisions will be made. If consensus is not made, meeting notes will be forwarded to Agency Directors for the final decision. The Project Team noted that the documentation and decision-making paragraphs are separate.

PAG members made the following suggestions:

- Record process and forward positions accordingly. Ensure documentation and transparency. Avoid majority vote to continue discussion under the assumption that we can reach consensus.
- Note member names, if dissenting. Previous PAG notes showed the Group's disinclination to publish dissenter names.
- Record full documentation of discussion, reflecting the full range of views.
- Include language about the Directors roles, decisions, and conversations.
- Send any revisions to the charter via email to the group.
- Provide a flow chart, step by step, to define the PAG role.
- Break up Section C – consensus versus documentation.

The Project Team will review the meeting protocols, based upon the above suggestions and will send modifications to PAG members electronically for comment and discussion at the following meeting.

(b) IWRs Revised Framework (including "Draft Policy Advisory Group Vision Statement")

During the January 2010 meeting, PAG members expressed interest in developing a vision beyond what the Water Resources Commission has developed for the Strategy. Instead of a "process" focused vision, PAG members wanted to create a vision of the physical resource itself. In response, Project Team members developed a new vision that focuses on the future of Oregon's water. PAG members were asked to comment on this vision.

"Everywhere in Oregon, we see healthy waters, able to support a healthy economy and healthy lifestyles."

*Healthy waters...*are abundant and clean. They include fully functioning aquifers, estuaries, wetlands, forests, flood plains, and river systems.

A Healthy economy... includes agricultural communities that produce food, fiber, and essential materials for the world's people, communities with healthy fish runs, and vibrant industries.

*Healthy lifestyles...*depend on adequate and reliable water supplies for public health and safety, recreation, and sport.

PAG members provided the following comments on the draft PAG vision:

- There is no tie to instream values in the healthy waters, economy, or lifestyle phrases. Suggest changing "healthy lifestyles" to environment or ecosystem and specifically recognize both instream and out-of-stream needs.
- Prefer the term "sustain" over "support."
- "Healthy waters..." should include forest headwaters.
- "Healthy economy" is too narrow.
- "Healthy economy..." why provide for the world when we're having trouble providing for the region, state, or the nation? Suggest changing to region or nation; doesn't foreclose selling products elsewhere. Delete "for the worlds people."
 - Removing "for the world's people" doesn't narrowly restrict nor try to address the world's issues.
 - Don't restrict commerce or the ability to use water for products sold out of state. Continue to view Oregon as part of world economy and not as expendable.

- Use “fisheries” instead of “fish runs.”
- Add a statement about WRD’s ability to fulfill this vision and the ability to change and adapt the vision as needed in the future.
 - A visionary statement does not need to define WRD’s roles or duties going forward.
- “Lifestyles...” include something on urban communities.
- Natural systems are inherently variable. Vision should reflect a desire to create systems to weather these changes with minimal impact to the economy, our lifestyles, etc.
- Keep the vision simple. The steps to achieve the vision will be more detailed.

The Project Team agreed to revise the vision, sending the new version to PAG members via email for further discussion at the July 13 meeting.

One member suggested sending one or two PAG members to the Water Resources Commission meetings as a way to provide updates or comments. Members disagreed, since there is no chair or representative for the group. Instead, Director Ward reminded members that a Water Resources Commissioner would attend PAG meetings, serving as a liaison between the two groups.

Mike Carrier, Policy Advisor, stopped in to express the Governor’s support for the Integrated Water Resources Strategy.

Agenda Item IV, Developing the IWRS Research Agenda, A look at Data and Information Gaps
(a) Understanding Instream (Non-Consumptive) Needs – Presentation and Discussion

During this phase of the meeting, Members worked from a document prepared for the PAG meeting entitled “Developing the IWRS Research Agenda, A look at Data and Information Gaps.” Ronan Igloria, HDR Engineering, presented information on the instream study conducted under the 2008 Oregon Water Supply and Conservation Initiative. Dwight French, WRD Water Rights and Adjudication Division Administrator, presented information regarding interagency work on instream water rights. Bruce McIntosh, ODFW’s Fish Division Deputy Administrator, presented information on data needs for instream water flows.

Facilitator Cynthia Solie clarified the scope of the [Summary Recommendations](#) as priority needs for first five years of the strategy. The recommendations are not prioritized and serve as long-term management needs. Discussion regarding the resources and policy needs related to these recommendations will occur during subsequent meetings. If a PAG member has concerns with the stated recommendation, this meeting is an opportunity to seek clarification or comment.

Discussion regarding the Summary Recommendations: “Understanding Instream Needs”

For reference, see [Presentation Materials, Page 3](#)

Bullet 1: “Develop consistent methodology/data to define and quantify instream environmental needs (water quantity, water quality, channel morphology, substrate, and fish passage needs).”

Discussion:

- Need to call out the different types of methodologies rather than just using the term “consistent,” such as base flows, peak flows, and ecological flows and that each has its own methodology.
- Riparian should be included in this list.

- Clarify whether “consistent” refers to between locations or over time. Different methods are appropriate for different types of streams.
 - Project Team Response: consistent over time and not over regions, may be different in different ecosystems. We could use “robust, scientifically defensible...” instead.
- Suggest using “appropriate” methodologies to define instream needs.
- Expand fish passage to include habitat, spawning, and rearing.
- Should include collecting reliable data for comparison purposes.
- Say “define and quantify” consistent methodology.
- Does this group need to address all three types of flows (base, peak, and ecological)?
 - Project Team Response: PAG can decide how far into that discussion to go, although this may be more appropriate for a Technical Advisory Group.

Bullet 2: “Create guidance for prioritizing watersheds/basins for data collection and monitoring, given limited funding and staffing resources.”

Discussion:

- Keep in mind limited funding may be short term. PAG can set both short term (limited funding) and long term goals. Delete “limited funding and staffing resources.”
- This is very connected to the last two bullets, because they are connected to the “how” of data needs. Consider making recommendations in conjunction.
- Avoid using the volumetric approach when referencing instream values.

Bullet 3: “Develop a framework for collecting and maintaining “basic” data for priority watersheds/basins. Basic data include: streamflow, precipitation, water quality, and habitat parameters.”

Discussion:

- Add groundwater contribution to streamflow among the list of basic data.

Bullet 4: “Develop better data to define and quantify navigation, hydropower, and recreational needs.”

Discussion:

- Dislike “better.”
- Hydropower is not always non-consumptive, therefore, break it out.
- Better data is needed across the board, not just within navigation, hydropower, or recreational uses.

Bullet 5: “Develop better data to define and quantify impacts of run-off and removal-fill impacts.”

Discussion:

- Add groundwater use and water conservation.
- Enhance this bullet using bullets on page 10 of the meeting packet.
- Consolidate existing data, and where necessary and possible, identify additional data that will inform or help define instead of “develop better data.”

- Keep in mind run-off from agricultural use can be a quantity and quality benefit to the system (more return and organic material).
- No mention of wetlands – either here or elsewhere such as recharge of wet and dry meadows and impacts on streamflow. Need to better define the gaining reaches, losing reaches, recharge and the other dynamic pieces of the system.

Bullet 6: “Improve capacity to process data that is already available. For instance, develop basin yield estimates, building upon the “water availability basin” [WAB] methodology currently in use by OWRD.”

Barry Norris, Water Resources Department, defined “basin yield” for the PAG members and clarified how basin yield relates to instream needs.

Discussion:

- Concern that this is a policy decision that was dropped into the document.
- Annual hydrograph is about ecological flows. Data is relevant.
- Whether basin yield is relevant or not depends on the methodology used.

Bullet 7: “Create inter-agency (local, state, federal) agreements for leveraging resources, methods, and tools for data sharing.”

Discussion:

- Add tribal governments.

General Discussion – Understanding Instream Needs:

- No mention of invasive species. For example, high temperatures allow invasive species to outcompete native species.
- A lot of repetition of “data and methodology” throughout the document, consider consolidating.
- The primary concern of many groups is fish but these groups cannot come up with what is needed – we need a better understanding. Irrigators can quantify what is needed – find a way to bring fish needs to the table quantitatively. Find a way to turn a large amount of data into an expression of need.
- Any data management/acquisition plan should be designed to help us be predictive, given the hydrological and other changes that are before us. Knowing history will not be enough, we need to know history in a way that can model future conditions.
- Conduct a gap analysis to determine what regions benefit most from instream applications.
- Need data on which instream rights are being met and which are not.
- Need to be explicit on the need for measurement and metering. We only measure less than half of our water use. We need a better system of gages and measurement and staff to collect and incorporate data for decision making.
- In sections that discuss data needs and analysis, add a bullet on how information on instream needs will coordinate with out-of-stream needs and how this data connects to others – do not operate in silos.
- Some instream requirements are unrealistic and some will never be met under current allocation system.

- Determine how data will be compiled and actually used. Data is no good if it is not used. Consider budget constraints when doing so.

Agenda Item V, Roundtable Discussion with Oregon Legislators

Invited guests Senator Jackie Dingfelder (D-Portland) and Representative Jefferson Smith (D-Portland) joined PAG members during lunch and offered some insight and guidance on the development of the strategy.

Key points made by Senator Jackie Dingfelder:

- My vision includes integrated participation of agencies and parties. This group must establish a vision, need, and priorities according to resources. Develop aspiring goals for later tasks – may need to take an incremental approach.
- Must deal with basins individually, while supporting the state-wide strategy and resources.
- Need more ideas for recovery goals of species, associated uses, and water resources.
- Need innovative ideas on funding and pooling resources. Create partnerships with federal agencies, federal delegations, nonprofits, regional districts, and local governments.

Key points made by Representative Jefferson Smith:

- Increase the state’s commitment to finding and paying for win-win-win water projects. Find these projects and elevate them with the public and politicians. Embrace innovation.
- Tackle the hard problems for real change that will benefit all. Find the hard thing and do that.
- Maximize the benefit to Oregonians that don’t have a lobbyist. People, fish, etc. all need water. Advocate for all Oregonians.
- Tell the legislators what needs to be done. Build consensus and work toward an iterative process.

Agenda Item VI, A Look at Data and Information Gaps, continued

(b) Understanding Out-of-Stream Needs – Presentation and Discussion

Ronan Igloria, HDR Engineering, presented information on the consumptive study conducted under the 2008 Oregon Water Supply and Conservation Initiative (OWSCI). Director Ward mentioned that OWSCI was the first step in the statewide water resources strategy and serves as a good launching pad for continued work.

General Discussion – following Ronan’s Presentation:

- Land-use is driving water change in the Deschutes area. Other parts of the state will be dramatically different – underscores watershed by watershed approach.
- There were no off-the-shelf standards with OWSCI (first of its kind) or in relation to scenario projections. Must establish standards or scenarios going forward.
- Not all cities or agricultural practices are the same. There is a wide range of efficiency and use. Junior users tend to be more efficient than senior users; therefore, junior users have set the efficiency standards.
- Refine OWSCI. Demand may be what is “wanted,” but not what is “needed” to accomplish a goal. Do we consider the product goal and then figure how much water is actually needed across scenarios?
 - Municipalities must demonstrate need before they can use water, it is just not granted to municipalities.

- Good demand forecasting is financially, technically, and temporally intensive. It is hard for jurisdictions and even the state to do this.
- Simply citing lack of data is no good – find solution within parameters.
- Use data to figure out future outcomes and reactions needed.
- Agriculture is good about knowing needs and planning for it.
- The Deschutes area is trying to manage every drop and as a result, it has more information than other areas. Still, we don't have all of the data needed.
- Perception can deceive, as can data. Coast gets massive rain but many cities still have deficits in the summer months.

Member Comments on the Oregon Economic Business Development one-pager:

- Very concerned that this is such a thin document; water is a draw to businesses - urban and rural. Need to have information relevant to all.
- Data collection should consider where jobs will be and what water those jobs will use. Business and water will affect the future of Oregon.
- Economic development will help price or value water in Oregon. There is an economic development strategy. We should learn about that strategy and figure out where water fits in.

Discussion regarding the Summary Recommendations: “Understanding Out-of-Stream Needs”

For Reference, see [Presentation Materials, Page 11](#)

Bullet 1: “Develop better standards/guidance for water use data collection and reporting.”

Discussion:

- Beyond standards and guidance, make sure there are other requirements to ensure collection and reporting happens.
- Some entities have a legal requirement to report use currently. What is not reported now?
 - Response: domestic wells, for example. Reporting requirements and standards may be something that PAG wants to address.
- We cannot lose the long term record relative to the existing gaging system. Once those programs go down, you will lose long term records.
- Why do standards for reporters need to be better?
 - Good standards do exist, however, we may need to increase those segments required to report.
- Data collection is not the issue - there are tools to get the information. Need to be careful on collecting data just to get the data. Get the bigger picture – if we are tracking diversions, then track return flows as well. Address what is meant by “better.”
- Need to measure all use for proper management of the resource. Measurement is different from reporting. However, simply measuring is the first step – measure all water use and streamflows to prepare the strategy. A measurement and reporting plan lays out all gaps.
- Need a connection between statewide activities and local decisions or actions, which will help form standards and goals moving forward. Statewide focus is overwhelming and information will not be useful unless it is at watershed level.
- Metering at the front and tail end is very costly, so why not report the amount that is allowed? What good is requiring metering, measuring and reporting if the state cannot keep the data staff person?

Bullet 2: “Utilize and enhance the OWSCI Demand Forecasting Tool for policy discussions and regional-level planning; prioritize data needs and put in place the funding and capacity to regularly update the state-wide demand forecast.”

Discussion:

- Disagreement among some PAG members as to whether OWSCI is the right tool.

Bullet 3: “Conduct statewide coordinated economic studies for: (i) land use-water use; and (ii) infrastructure replacement and renewal (“capital conservation”).”

- Disagreement with the term “economic” – it is more than that.
- Data is only useful if it is local.
- Economics should be incorporated somehow. Maybe look at two issues: land use and water use locally and also infrastructure replacement and renewal.
- Create an inventory of regional planning studies or efforts throughout the state.
- Pick an altitude and stick with it, whether it’s at the watershed level or state level.

Bullet 4: “Consider the ties among water planning, land-use planning, and economic development. Where will Oregon grow? What industries will it recruit? How will private and public investments emerge, in relation to community land-use programs and economic development incentives? How will water quantity, quality, and ecosystem issues shape development and vice versa?”

Discussion:

- Don’t tie water rights to land use planning. Maintain the Prior Appropriation doctrine, as charged in the authorizing legislation.

Bullet 5: “Watershed-level identification of mitigation opportunities.”

Discussion:

- Mitigation opportunities for what? Need clarification.
 - See write up from ODOT for clarification.

General Discussion – Out-of-Stream Needs:

- Add last two bullets from the Instream Needs Summary Recommendations.
- Add DHS- Drinking Water to the list of one-pagers provided for the meeting.
- What are the conservation opportunities?
- What are the re-use opportunities?
 - Re-use and conservation is cheaper, more effective than new projects. Maybe a list of viable conservation/re-use projects for watersheds and prioritize. May open up new funding sources.
- Look out for unintended consequences.
- Consider and protect water rights.
- Follow the water; make sure conserved water goes where you think it will.

- Did not take into account trends or changes in agriculture or crops. Where's an agriculture one-pager?
- Source of most city water is in forests.

(c) Understanding Surface Water, Groundwater, and the Hydrological Connection – Presentation and Discussion

Jonathan LaMarche, WRD Hydrologist, presented information on the Department's Stream Gaging Network. Doug Woodcock, WRD Groundwater Section Manager, presented information on the Department's groundwater work. Gene Foster, DEQ's Watershed Management Section Manager, discussed the various types of data that DEQ uses for water quality management.

Discussion regarding the Summary Recommendations: "Understanding Oregon's Water Resources"

For reference, see [Presentation Materials, Page 15](#)

Bullet 1: "Maintain existing and install additional flow monitoring at prioritized stream reaches."

Discussion:

- Need to include groundwater/well monitoring.

Bullet 2: "Leverage data/sample collection between agencies. A Statewide Monitoring Council would be needed to ensure data quality needs are met."

Discussion:

- Change "council" to "team." Council implies another governmental entity.
- Add "and among other partners," to ensure entities like watershed councils are included.

Bullet 3: "Conduct effectiveness monitoring of treatment techniques to point future projects to those areas with the greatest potential to improve water quality."

Member Comment:

- Look at both water quality and water quantity.

Bullet 4: "Define a structure (perhaps through the Integrated Water Resources Strategy) that lists assumptions so all agencies are using the same assumptions in planning/decision-making and can use adaptive management."

Discussion:

- Duplicate of some others already discussed; consolidate with others.
- Rather than a lack of "structure," it's a lack of will, perhaps. Get agencies to communicate on this topic.

Bullet 5: "Monitor and assess pollutants for which we have no comprehensive data, but which the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has flagged for future work."

Member Comment:

- Include toxics in this list, which is a state priority, not U.S. EPA.

Bullet 6: “Resources to conduct (and cost-share) basin-wide studies.”

Discussion:

- Look at all of the alternatives for each basin, current and needed data, and alternative action plans.
- Promote or encourage pilot projects where there is scaled-down climate data.
- State can leverage federal (BOR) money to conduct these basin studies.
- More specifically define what is meant by “basin-wide studies.”

General Discussion – Understanding Oregon’s Water Resources:

- More information on subsurface geologic formations is necessary – maybe add a one-pager from DOGAMI and information on areas WRD wants to measure.
- Combine data collection so that all parties that track information can get data without duplicating efforts, allowing them to plug into each agency’s database to monitor.
- Don’t forget that temperature change means different populations of humans, animals, etc. and we will need different amounts of water in different places, because of population change and economic adaptation (crop changes, extended growing season, etc).
- Assess the effectiveness of the TMDLs that are currently in place. The TMDL’s are the centerpiece approach to water quality; therefore, we must assess their effectiveness every few years as well as additional information needed.
- Find out where the potential opportunities are to re-use wastewater, stormwater, and rainwater at places and times when it is needed. View as a resource and not as a waste.
- This is opportunity to correct information gaps in a cost-effective way – look outside of scope and outside data sources to figure out what kind of network we need, and how to plug in with others, if at all.
- Need to do a better job of using what we have – employ flexible and adaptive strategies.
- Work to ensure federal data gathering efforts and planning programs meet state needs and priorities. We are partially successful with data, but not planning – it can cost more to follow federal protocols or pay for them than just doing it yourself.
- Fund the Water Use reporting program. Enforce reporting and analyze information. We cannot recreate the data. The actual water use does not always match water right amount limits. People will only report their right, even if they use more. Municipal reporting is a bit better, but again this is why reporting is necessary.

(d) Coming Pressures – Presentation and Discussion

Barry Norris, WRD State Water Resources Engineer, presented information on climate change and the Department’s related work.

Discussion regarding the Summary Recommendations: “Understanding Coming Pressures”

For reference, see [Presentation Materials, Page 21](#)

Bullet 1: “More robust climate data to account for regional variability and climate change conditions in demand models, including downscaling of global and regional scale models.”

Member Comment:

- Add hydrologic in addition to demand models.

Bullet 2: “Better information on groundwater supply to help land-use planners assess carrying capacity.”

Discussion:

- Use “sustainability” instead of carrying capacity. Note that the land-use community has defined and does use the term “carrying capacity.”
- The constituents within the League of Women Voters feel strongly about this.
- Would like to see “capacity” include surface water effects.
- Need to clarify this – is it surface water, too?

Bullet 3: “Better information on the cumulative impacts of groundwater use on drinking water supplies and instream flows.”

Discussion:

- Include exempt uses of groundwater.
- Include impacts on surface water and rights.
- “Drinking” unnecessary.
- Use is interrelated for surface water and groundwater.
- Don’t disregard the impacts of climate change.

Bullet 4: “Quantify the impacts from development, so that information related to affects on water supply and quality can be integrated into individual land-use decisions.”

Discussion:

- What impacts? What about an infrastructure plan? Include reference to Goal 14 and clarify requirements to plan and address water availability and impact issues in development of land and infrastructure.
 - Local governments are not required to demonstrate adequate water supply to accommodate long-term growth; only required to have a plan to accommodate infrastructure needs. State law is very permissive for rural development; less so for urban development.
- Land use/water use is a big issue in Deschutes and Clackamas.

Bullet 5: “Develop better information on the cumulative impacts of septic systems on groundwater quality, including consequences for community and individual wells.”

No comments made.

Bullet 6: “Assess source areas for drinking water systems, including the location of land uses that generate contaminants.”

Discussion:

- There is already source water information.
- Needs updating and analysis?
- Agreement among PAG members that as stated does not capture needs.

General Discussion:

- Incorporate or reference Goals 5 and 6 for land use.
- Pressures include species needs, storage (underground-aquifer or above), pollution, and population growth.
- Add aquifer storage needs.
- Identify what adaptation strategies could look like to address potential climate change impacts.

Agenda Item VIII, Public Comment

Ray Jaindl, Oregon Department of Agriculture, commented on the importance of evaluating the hydrologic connection between groundwater use and summer flows and evaluating the impact of irrigation management on water quality and water quantity.

Karla Kay Edwards, Cascade Policy Institute, commented on the need for overarching criteria on modeling and monitoring that includes setting scheduled deadlines to truth test models. Do not continue to use these models if proved inaccurate, and provide guidelines to re-evaluate assumptions and to adjust models as new data arises. Ms. Edwards stated the importance of getting local, on-the-ground help to determine monitoring and gaging sites. Local water experts can help provide richer data.

Curtis Martin, Oregon Cattlemen’s Association, commented on how water is critically different in terms of values and priorities to different regions of the state and the open houses have been a good venue to identify these differences. He encouraged the strategy efforts to continue focusing on water basin planning and management and to continue supporting local efforts. The natural resource community is tapped out of money, just as agencies are. Mr. Martin shared his opposition to water resource taxes or fees because of the detrimental effects they would have on the economy. We must keep in mind that not all needs will be met.

Agenda Item IX, Other Business

A letter from Joe Whitworth was distributed among PAG members. The next meeting is set for Tuesday, July 13 at the Water Resources Department with a focus on planning efforts around the state. The Project Team will send out a list of state-wide plans and strategies in advance of the meeting and asked PAG members to email the names of any plans left off the list. A request was made to audio record the July 13 meeting for those members not able to attend.

The Water Resources Department will be submitting plans for a 25% budget reduction in preparation for the next biennium. The Department will request continued support from the Governor on the strategy efforts.

Agenda Item X, Recap and Feedback

The Project Team will review the suggested changes for both the vision statement and meeting protocols. Any revisions will be brought back to the Policy Advisory Group meeting for discussion at the following meeting.