APPENDIX 2

Written Comments

All Roundtable participants were encouraged provide written comments if they did not feel comfortable with offering verbal comment. The following comments are retyped from the index cards. The comments were grouped by theme where possible.

The two comments under the heading 'General Comments' were received via email after the Central Oregon/Bend Roundtable.

Roundtable Comments

Issues – Initial voting (Qwizdom) questions were too vague especially the question about highest priorities – considering how these questions may be used – define ecological?

Issue - Question (Qwizdom) about highest priority can be misleading

Energy – Water Nexus

Issue- "Watergy" – the energy needed to manage water resources. (In CA, this is 19% of all their energy used) How do we balance the "need" for hydroelectric power and ecosystem services?
Result- A balance in watergy.

Water Quantity and Water Measurement

Issue – Need to monitor/meter agriculture withdrawals of water.
Outcome – More data available to assist with water resource decisions/management of groundwater resources.

Issue – Projected impact of climate change on snowpack and precipitation patterns
Outcome – Secure, reliable water sources – above and below ground

Issue – Lack of water withdrawal monitoring and enforcement.
Solution – Increased funding for monitoring and enforcement of withdrawals.

Infrastructure

Issue – Regional water systems. We know important issues are where we collect water, when we collect water, and how we collect water.
Outcome – This lends itself to appropriately designed regional water systems. We need to encourage them. What does that look like? Increased resources to encourage including grants, better enabling legislature, model examples, legal aid, facilitations

Please add drinking water infrastructure to funding for aging infrastructure. Sewer already addressed.

Challenge – In stream reservoirs
Outcome – Out of stream / off channel storage – reservoirs

Issue – Conflicting uses of stored water
Solution – Develop a collaborative water allocation plan

Issue - Difficulty for rural/small water/wastewater systems to upgrade/improve infrastructure to increase efficiency effectiveness of collection and distribution systems.
Solution - Provide access to additional funding to repair/replace/expand small/rural system infrastructure.

Problem - *Drinking* quality water in toilets and on lawns.
Outcome - Less strained drinking water systems.

Groundwater

Problem - Exempt Wells
Outcome - Sustainable groundwater use and maintenance of groundwater dependent surface flows.

Issue – Groundwater dependent ecosystems.
Solution – Identify and delineate groundwater dependent ecosystems and provide for environmental water allocations.

Issue – Better protection of groundwater sources in rural areas
Outcome – Better water quality, less reliance on septic systems in rural/suburban areas

Issue – Quantity and quality of subsurface water
Outcome – We know how much we have and how much we use

Water Quality

Issue – Hierarchy of water quality requirements for designated uses
Outcome - Water reuse/develop and implement integrated water resource management program

Issue - Unknown chemicals being introduced into our water
Outcome – Green chemistry and product controls

We need to better integrate the Clean Water Act and Safe Drinking Water Act since water that is safe for human consumption may not be acceptable for surface water discharge into streams with salmonids (i.e., temperature) yet wastewater treatment plants have little control over these discharges.

Issue – Impact of stormwater and non-point source pollution from urban and rural landscapes.
Outcome – Integrated techniques and plan to reduce pollution, sediment etc. which reduces water quality.

Threat – Hanford Nuclear Reservation has leaking containers of radioactive material. Oregon has had minimal involvement.
Outcome – Oregon steps up to the plate with Washington to hold the US DOE to its agreement to clean up the reservation and therefore protect the Columbia River.

Issue – Release of toxics to state waters
Outcome – Cleaner water, cleaner fish

Challenge – Urban storm water and non-point source runoff
Outcome – Improved water quality and hydrologic function (keep water in place)

Problem – Increased use, improper disposal, and inadequate treatment of pharmaceutical and other chemicals that contribute to the increasing incidence of people suffering from "multi-chemical sensitivity" (allergic response, ill health, etc.)
Outcome – If problems are addressed, fewer people will suffer ill health and probably the sustainability of native plants, fish and wildlife would be aided.

Issue – Increasing threat of urban stormwater runoff
Outcome – Change public perception of stormwater from a "liability" to a valuable resource by encouraging the integration of it into the landscape.

Environment/Conservation/In stream Flows

Concerned that current efforts in water conservation and water measurement aren't productive. They will make no more water. We should be speaking time and dollars on water that will make additional water, i.e. storage and ground water development.

Issue – Lack of appreciation of beavers in creating and enhancing well functioning wetlands
Outcome – Change trapping laws and stop treating beavers as "lowly" rodent

Issue – Plant trees

Issue – Return to natural condition systems ditched for agriculture, aesthetics, convenience
Outcome – Costs money, but is better for everything and everyone

Issue – Funding of conservation effort.
Outcome – Priority water projects are funded and implemented.

Threat - Need a better understanding of the cost for conservation projects.
Outcome- Public support for increased rates to support conservation projects.

Issue – To eliminate the back log of in stream water rights applications requested by ODFW which WRD has not resolved and issued.
Result – Sets minimum flows for fish and recreation on important OR streams and rivers

Issue – Subsidized water consumption.
Outcome – Price signals that encourage conservation.

Threats – Putting recreation in the back seat and then getting constant citizen complaint
Solutions – People (voters) will be more likely to support water conservation because they (as recreationists) will have a vested interest.

Issue – Need for restoration plans and flow targets. Assessments needed
Outcome – Prioritize flow and impact to where it's needed

Issue – In stream water rights
Outcome – Enough water is in the stream to protect/enhance all life

Issue - Water loss from canal seepage
Payoff – Conservation of water

Issue – Almost all water flow in streams and rivers in Southern Oregon is over allocated. So the more recent in stream rights are never achieved
Outcome – Provide some in stream water right on all streams in state

Issue – Returning streams to more natural form and function
Outcomes – Less flooding, downcutting, better shade, etc.

Problem – Reduce water waste at homes for <u>every</u> family
Outcomes – Reducing the amount of water used at each home. Reuse of greywater and recharge of ground water.

Issues – Ecologically appropriate peakflows, floodplain/stream connectivity, and stream system simplification
Solutions – Determine appropriate peakflows, connectivity, and restored complexity

Issue – Stream flow protection
Outcome – Get in stream water rights in place where they don't exist and process applications that are not complete

Issue – Protect winter/peak flows to maintain channel maintenance and ecological flows
Outcome – Get protection in place and recognize need to protect peak flows in future allocation

Issue – Standards for data collection on water needs and demands
Outcome – Better water planning

Land Use and Water

Issue - Lack of good science/models that represent the true complexity of the interaction of water and land. (Specifically, I've been trying to find good models to compare pre- and post-developed evaporation water balance.)
Result - Post-developed condition of land development "looks" to the watershed, no different that the pre-developed state.

Issue – Disconnect between water planning and land use planning
Outcome – Water incorporated into "The Big Look"

Issue – Small acreage landowners+
Outcome – Education and same guidelines as agriculture

Issue – Protecting the urban/rural interface
Outcome – Need this protection to keep natural filter areas in place/wetlands/estuaries/ and vegetated need to filter and store water

Issue – Watershed runoff from removal of cover policies. These increase water temperature and silt
Outcome – Policies that address water systems such as runoff in development and logging. Every drainage needs cover for shade and silt capture.

Problem - Preserve wetlands and streams with buffers.
Outcome - *Improved* natural resilience to storm events, improved habitats, less impermeable surface.

Protection of small streams from development that put them at risk (for example, Marion County's groundwater ordinance aims at protecting wells, but provides no protection for streams that affect property values and wildlife and that are related to groundwater). Many decision makers (commissioners) do not recognize the relationship of surface water and groundwater.

Issue/Opportunity - Establish flow duration based standards for evaluation urban development proposal.
Outcome - More efficient mitigation that can address healthy streams issues.

Water Exportation

Issue – Oregon's water is a target for others to purchase. The concern is that it will go to the highest bidder.
Outcome – Comprehensive plan with underlying premise that water is a right, not a commodity.

Interstate/Federal Issue - Are there examples of out of state parties with deep pockets who can purchase water rights and ship that water out of state? Be sure we educate our federal representatives that this example is real and could result in a lost of water in Oregon.

Threat - Large, private, out-of-state corporations can use threats and lies to push their own money-making agendas and ruin our environment in the process (i.e., Riverbend Landfill in Yamhill Co.)
Outcome - Seek the truth. Obey environmental and natural laws. Don't allow private industry to rule the environment.

Water Policy

Competitive demands for water, when represented by singular focus advocacy groups in segregated workshop discussions will never be met to the satisfaction of any of the groups. In a time and place like Eastern Oregon in which there is not enough water for farmers, fish or municipalities, it is imperative that these uses are represented by those who prefer consensus to competition. Oregon has lacked leadership in creating supplemental collaborative decision making if all the needs of any one group are net while that others are left feeling deprived, a solution has not been reached.

Issue – Surface water over appropriation: need to address today's needs rather than maintaining 100-year old laws
Solutions – Better use of limited surface water supplies

Issue – No money next session
Answer – Prioritize the limited funds that affect the most people

Issue – Funding is low compared to problems
Outcome – Increased funding – we slap band-aids that does not address long-term problems; need projects funded longer to complete

Opportunities - Counties are in the best position to convene and coordinate what are the most conflictive issues of surface water/groundwater planning for all uses and users.
Outcome - This requires at least 2-5 years and would be a stakeholder association of cities, counties, state/Feds that work towards a collective technical, political, and social water demands. This requires little funding e.g., Benton County Water Project during the 2008 OWSCI. The State moves faster than a collaborative process – aligning the tow is required or we will all lose out in future planning.

Solution for Water Quantity - Increased funding for planning and construction for water storage from the State of Oregon

The problem - The right of a person to sell a right thus negatively impacting the community.
The solution - Don't know.

Issue – Opposing agencies. Example – ODEQ encourages constructed wetlands to treat stormwater. DSL and Corps (of Engineers) says wetland that treats water cannot count as wetland credit. WRD says if the new wetland recharges – it violates our injection program
Outcome – Agencies reach consensus

Watershed Councils

Opportunities – Watershed councils are established/prove organizations for working on water quality, water availability, and working with multiple stakeholders
Outcome – Watershed councils will be a good resource/tool for future water issues

Economics

Issue – Balancing economics/jobs with ecosystems
Looks like – Economically vibrant communities, ecologically vibrant ecosystems

Issue – Funding for professional bookkeepers to manage grant and stipend funding that is entrusted to groups for water quality and agriculture projects

Issue – Lack of market-based incentives for landowners to adopt conservation (soil and water) practices
Outcome – Beyond regulatory, incentives are available to landowners to adopt soil and water conservation measures and protects public interest.

Education

Issue – Education
Outcome – Too many to list: weeds, sediments, capture storage, safe release of water. Needs more funding

The need for the public to know and realize that the agricultural community has mechanism to help produces employ Best Management Practices (BMPs) to avoid detrimental impact to water quality. These "1010" plans are by watershed and have on-going review of how plans are being implemented and how to improve. Recognize that State and Local communities need to preserve that ability to manage/control the Watershed in which they reside. I am referring to the recently introduced Federal "Clean Water Restoration Act" that would severely take control away from localities in water management. Sadly, our Governor Kulongoski sent a letter in support of this misguided legislation.

The problem - Fear of losing a water right results in use of more water that is necessary and a refusal to change for fear of losing the right.
The solution - Better education.

Education through grade schools – many do not have any idea where the water comes from, how to conserve it and not pollute – dangers from knowing areas that are polluted.

Preserve water rights. The temperature from my spring is 65 degrees. People educated in subject they claim jurisdiction over in that area location.

Problem - Public perception of water abundance.
Outcome - Lowered water demand leads to more water for everyone.

If we do our job well and water quality and quantity drastically improve, water will become extremely attractive to metro areas. What prevents City of Portland filing on excess water stored in reservoirs upstream? Then it becomes water right for populace. What prevents water grab like California? Its politics. Education of public is essential.

Water Reuse

What is the ratio of drinking water consumption to manufacturing use?
What happens to manufacturing effluent? Can it be reclaimed?
What do arid countries do to preserve water? Are there Middle Eastern or European models?

Issue – Domestic water reuse systems
Outcome – More efficient homes

Issue – Rainwater collection
Outcome – Greywater use, reuse

Regional Issues

Issue – Umatilla Basin
Critical GW Areas, Diminishing GW, Nitrate Issues
Concern – Developing ASR projects for storage and recovery that will (1) address critical groundwater problems; (2) assure healthy watershed; (3) protect baseflow in Umatilla River
Outcome – Use Columbia River water and existing (80% infrastructure for off-stream aquifer storage). Set up water banking for future water withdrawals and uses
Needs – funding – infrastructure completion – set up water bank
Infrastructure investment for water storage (new, old) and conservation (upgrading existing and funding new technologies)

Umatilla Basin West Extension Irrigation District
Protect senior surface water rights from other uses.
Needs – collaborative efforts to recognize all interests, creative solutions, and parties interest in common good (Ag – Fish – Urban)

General Comments

I was in attendance at the **Roundtable** in Central Oregon on the 25th of September, and thought the meeting was well organized and had many of the "right" people in attendance, with an opportunity for initial input. Dr. Campana's presentation may seem like a "worst case scenario", but his apprehension is well founded and timely.

Being in the business of agriculture, and owing water rights issued in the 1800's, it does not seem correct to state that Oregon is one of two states without a water supply plan, or policy. This statement would lead one to believe we had no basis for our water code and had no water law in Oregon. Maybe it would be enlightening to explain what a Long-term Water Supply Plan or Policy would contain. There does not seem to be a format, and the imagination is unlimited.

Our immediate family has been in Agriculture in Oregon for nearly 50 years, and our ancestors ran cattle in Oregon prior to statehood. Protection of water has always been a priority. We have drilled many wells, built upstream storage, installed many miles of pipeline for water projects, raised crops and livestock, lived, and recreated in Oregon's water.

I have been to many water meetings over the years; have been a member of and active in the local Watershed Council since its inception; and, participated in statewide water policymaking. The **Roundtable** was like the beginning of many, showing promise for future water management. However, unless we go back and talk about the foundation that exists, the very structure that has served the state well and fed its economy and people for over 100 years, the **Roundtable** effort will fail.

Apprehension exists in regard to early agricultural water rights, permits, and legally "exempt" water uses, including domestic and livestock watering. Many, but not all of these historical uses are claimed by some of these same agricultural producers, whose ancestors founded Oregon. Oregon did not record these early uses, and still today allows for exempt livestock watering and domestic well drilling. If one of the purposes of the **Roundtable** is to have integration of the processes involving water issues in Oregon; then, it seems we must have an accurate inventory of the historical and existing uses of the water in Oregon; otherwise, we will have an incorrect outcome that will be riddled with legislative conflict and years of legal activity, thereby having wasted everyone's time and revenues.

Oregon does not have an abundance of funding for water issues; and, over the years has not prioritized water issues. There is agreement that water issues need to be managed and protected; but, having attended the **Roundtable** in Bend, it was a great disappointment that the Water Rights breakout did not come back with a report to the group. This is not surprising as water rights are very complex; but this should have been a focus of leadership prior to this Roundtable.

Water Resources Department should have estimates for existing water rights, permits and applications. There are unresolved adjudication proceedings, unadjudicated waters, and backlogs of applications, including groundwater study applications, that should be prioritized

and protected, prior to focusing on new uses and allowing for unrestricted population growth projections. These problems are years of buildup, and our planning process needs to get beyond the "study". There are many up-stream storage sites identified and/ or could be identified; but, if the application process is not streamlined and made more time-sensitive and user-friendly, the studies will be obsolete prior to any "new water" being created. Each time we throw new $$ at Water Resources Dept., it seems the focus is on the backlogs; and, then the job is perceived to be completed.

I commend Chair Dingfelder's committee prioritization of problematic water issues. Let's make a conscious effort to include all of Oregon and all of its citizens in the Solutions.

Thank you for your consideration, and feel free to ask questions.

Wasco County Soil & Water Conservation District
2325 River Road. Suite 3
The Dalles, OR 97058-3551
Tel: (541) 296-6178 ext. 3, Fax: (541) 296-7868, E-mail: wasco.swcd@oacd.org

2325 River Road. Suite 3
The Dalles, OR 97058-3551
Tel: (541) 296-6178 ext. 3, Fax: (541) 296-7868, E-mail: wasco.swcd@oacd.org

Michael Campana
Institute for Water and Watersheds
210 Strand Agriculture Hall
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR 97331-2208

10/1/08

Dear Mr. Campana,

The Wasco County Watershed Councils would like to share our comments with the Statewide Water Roundtables, which unfortunately we will not be able to attend due to the meeting locations. The Watershed Councils serve as an important forum in Wasco County for the discussion of water issues. We currently have four active Watershed Councils, and while the focus of each is unique, some common threads are shared by all. These commonalities are what we would like to share with the Water Roundtables.

Water quantity and quality are both concerns in Wasco County. Our Watershed Councils work to address these concerns to protect healthy communities, economies, and ecosystems.

In the view of our Watershed Councils, water issues are much more complex than the evident concerns that can be measured at any one moment in any given stream. One creek in Wasco County may be suffering from low flow, high temperature, and pesticide inputs. This could pose a threat to fish habitat on one hand and economic viability of agriculture on the other. However, we will not effectively address these stream impairments without addressing the overall health of the stream's watershed. Therefore, the first strategy suggestion we would like to share with the Roundtables is an insistence on addressing water issues by focusing on holistic watershed function.

The functionality of a watershed depends on its uplands as well as its streams and riparian areas. We suggest that sustainable management of our uplands is crucial to sustaining healthy and abundant water resources. For example, our Watershed Councils have helped convert the majority of Wasco County's acres of dryland wheat to no-till farming, which has significantly benefited in-stream water quality by reducing runoff and erosion. The Councils have also served as a forum for discussing new orchard pest management techniques that have reduced chemical use and drift, resulting in healthier streams. Council efforts to bring about widespread irrigation efficiency upgrades have helped protect in-stream flow. These are just a few examples of the types of upland

management strategies that the Wasco County Watershed Councils suggests as partial solutions to some of our water quality concerns in an agricultural setting.

Wasco County Watershed Councils pursue riparian and in-stream projects to complement upland efforts. Our objectives are to protect these habitats for fish and wildlife and to create resilient ecosystems that will be better able to respond to unpredictable influences such as the effects of climate change. Riparian revegetation projects not only shade streams to keep water cool enough for native fish while providing cover for wildlife, they also influence how water moves through the watershed. Healthy floodplains and riparian areas better absorb runoff and buffer the effects of major storm events. Again, we emphasize the importance of working toward overall watershed function in order to address our major water concerns of water quantity and quality.

The Wasco County Watershed Councils would also like to suggest to the Roundtable that the most effective way to work toward holistic watershed health is to involve as many watershed stakeholders as possible in coming up with solutions. These Water Roundtables provide one opportunity for stakeholder participation, and Watershed Councils provide another, long-term opportunity. The Councils in particular are able to reflect the communities in which they work, and create opportunities to address water concerns in ways that are uniquely adapted to local needs. Because they are based on cooperation and a mutual interest in effective water management, Watershed Councils can serve as a resource for difficult water conversations, both present and future.

As one example of a current water concern and Watershed Council response, I would like to highlight the recent work of the Mosier Watershed Council, one of the four councils in Wasco County. Declining aquifers are a major concern in Mosier, where both domestic and agricultural users depend on groundwater. To address this concern, the Mosier Watershed Council has taken steps to improve water use efficiency, particularly by assisting orchards with the conversion to more efficient irrigation systems. Perhaps more importantly, the Council initiated a full-fledged geological study of its groundwater system in cooperation with the US Geological Survey. This will allow the Council to hold informed discussions on potential long-term water supply solutions such as artificial recharge or aquifer storage and recovery. A thorough understanding of both above and below-ground water interactions, combined with a local forum for education and discussion among stakeholders, will give Mosier the best possible chance to achieve its water needs.

In conclusion, the Wasco County Watershed Councils wish to share our water concerns and strategies with the Statewide Water Roundtables. Our concerns include water quantity and quality for healthy communities, economies, and ecosystems. Our strategies include focusing on holistic watershed health, and working through cooperative stakeholder groups to achieve appropriate local solutions.

Thank you for your efforts in organizing the Statewide Watershed Roundtable series, and for your consideration of our comments.

Sincerely,

Kate Merrick
Watershed Council Coordinator
Wasco County Watershed Councils:

Bakeoven Watershed Council
Fifteenmile Watershed Council
The Dalles Area Watershed Council
Mosier Watershed Council

Baker County Water – and Agriculture

Agriculture is the engine that drives the Baker County economy. Without a healthy agricultural base, Baker County as we know it, would essentially cease to exist.

One could say that agriculture is a "value-added" product of water – irrigation water that is so essential to the production of crops, and to the agricultural base. There are two primary sources of irrigation water in the county:

#1 – the storage waters of Phillips Reservoir, Wolf Creek and Pilcher Creek Reservoirs, and to a lesser degree, Thief Valley Reservoir. There are five high lakes in the Elkhorns which also store and provide irrigation water to those lake-water owners.

#2 – the free-flowing water that comes from the snow pack, and snow melt, in the Wallowa and Elkhorn Mountains of Baker County. This water generally runs out, except for the most senior users, by early July.

There are a small number of irrigation wells in the county, which are primarily used for supplemental irrigation for late season water when the mountain flows have diminished below adequate flows for irrigation.

In 2007, Baker County agriculture contributed $67,148,000 to the local and state economy. (Source: Oregon Agricultural Information Network). The leading crops were:

- Cattle -- $47,500,000
- Potatoes -- $8,714,000
- Alfalfa and other hay -- $3,270,000
- Grains -- $2,508,000

Without irrigation water, there would be no significant livestock industry in Baker County as at least 50% of all the 124,000 head of cattle in the county depend upon irrigated agricultural lands one-half of the year – i.e. the spring/summer/fall months while grazing on irrigated pastures. The other 50% are cattle that are on rangelands during the spring/summer grazing period.

100% of the cattle depend on irrigated agricultural lands 50% of the time – for aftermath grazing when brought off the rangelands, and for the winter feed which is grown on irrigated cropland. There are roughly 46,500 head of mother cows in Baker County that depend on high quality winter feed to produce a live and healthy calf in the spring.

In Baker County there are:

- 33,000 acres of irrigated alfalfa land
- 41,000 acres of other irrigated hay and pasture lands
- 3,000 acres of irrigated potatoes grown for Simplot and Ore-Ida
- 500 acres of irrigated peppermint
- 400 acres of irrigated corn for silage for livestock feed
- 200 acres of irrigated grass seed.

100% of these crops are dependent upon on a reliable source of irrigation water.

A multiplier of at least 1.5 should be used on the $67 million of farm gate sales of raw agricultural product from Baker County. Agriculture supports the parts stores, machinery and equipment dealers, crop protection and fertilizer businesses, veterinarians, local car dealerships, Main Street stores and professional offices, grocery stores, fuel distributorships, the electric cooperative, and numerous community and 4-H endeavors.

Agriculture is one of, if not the largest, employer in Baker County – creating both full time and seasonal jobs. Because agriculture is a highly specialized and technical business, the base wages are higher than in many other job opportunities. In fact, many full-time employees are in the top 1/3 of the pay scale in Baker County. We have too much invested in land, equipment, crops and livestock to want anything but the best and sharpest employees. We need employees who have very specialized skills.

Agriculture in Oregon, and in Baker County in particular, is highly invested in active and on-going water quality/water conservation projects. The Powder River water-quality pipeline project provided off-stream watering to nearly 8000 head of cattle – removing them from drinking in the river. It provides them with clean, reliable and steady sources of drinking water, while improving the riparian area and the water quality of the Powder River as it flows the length of the Baker Valley. Investment in this cost-share project was around $3 million dollars. A few examples of other private investment and cost-share projects that have gone in the last 5 years include:

- Conversion to high pressure/gravity flow delivery to replace electrical pumps;
- Drop structures to eliminate ditch erosion and water sedimentation;
- Conversion from flood irrigation to sprinkler application.

Farmers and ranchers are stewards of the land – and the water. This is part of the concept of Sustainable Agriculture. Our livelihoods depend upon taking good care of the resources – the land and the water. We have to live with our mistakes.

Water rights are appurtenant to the land – they are part of the deed when we buy the land. Anything which would alter this historic water law principal in Oregon would destroy the engine that drives the Baker County economy, and the base economy of Oregon – 21st century production agriculture.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jan Kerns
Baker County diversified agriculture farmer/rancher
Member – Oregon State Board of Agriculture

45917 Quail Road, Haines, OR 97833
541-856-3449 jkerns@bmi.net