1. Introductions, Opening Remarks, Agenda Review (9:00 a.m. to 9:10 a.m.)

   See sign-up sheet attached for attendees.

2. Technical Working Group Updates (Work Product, Schedule, Contractor Work Product), (9:10 a.m. to 10:45 a.m.)

   **Key Action Items:** Has each TWG identified all projects to consider? Have data gaps been identified that would prevent any project summaries from being completed? Has Screening Criteria Been Developed/Documented? What Project Summaries Are Done?

   Each TWG presented the status of their efforts. Completed project summaries are on the website. Steering Committee members should review the content of those summaries, and if they have questions or suggestions, provide comment directly to the TWG Chair. The goal is to get all (or as many) of the project summaries in good shape before the project pairing exercise.

   a. Planning Advisory Technical Work Group (Chris Marks, CTUIR)

      GANTT chart with additional tasks is being developed/managed and will be posted online by October 21st. A flowchart version on decision making will also be used in the Flow Study to help communicate process steps.

      Proposals for unallocated funds totaling about $21K will be compiled by the Facilitator and distributed to the Steering Committee by October 21st for voting by October 31st. Proponents should send a 1 paragraph summary and cost estimate to Dan before October 21st. This will ensure sufficient time to modify the Ecology grant and get work accomplished.

      Planning TWG continues to discuss moving towards a more formal governance document. Greater engagement on this issue is expected now that the Reclamation grant has been approved. Goal is to have Steering Committee review draft work product in January.

   b. Water Conservation and Infrastructure-OR (Brian Wolcott, WWBWC)

      8 summaries are posted; 1 summary remains to be drafted. Most summaries reflect opportunities effectuated since 2002, so they will add to the baseline and reduce the gap to the flow study objectives. Limited new opportunities for conservation in Oregon exist based on infrastructure already completed.
The Flow Study needs to clearly explain the effects of conserving water that create greater need for aquifer recharge.

Visual ways of showing flow effects, longevity, and need in the Flow Study would be helpful. For example, we should create a map showing the 6 stream reaches, the low flow and average flow conditions in each reach, and the deficit relative to the Flow Study objectives. Each stream reach could have a simple bar chart color coded to various objectives, such as the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flow Achievement Remaining for Long-Term Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flow Benefit for Other Uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flows Achievement remaining for Short-Term Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow Benefit from Completed Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flows &lt; 2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A discussion ensued regarding accounting for historic conservation benefits relative to bypass flows by Oregon irrigators. Greater clarity is needed on this issue to ensure we’re telling the correct story in the Flow Study.

A discussion ensued regarding benefits of this effort that are likely needed to convince a broader coalition of local interests to support the effort. While the short-term objective for flow recovery is front-and-center, other benefits to irrigators and municipalities should also be considered. The Facilitator proposed addressing this issue through the “project pairing” exercise coming up in December.

c. Water Conservation and Infrastructure-WA (Renee Hadley, WWCCD)

Approximately 7 have been completed and 2 new are being developed, which will also be posted for review. Like Oregon Conservation, completed projects will be claimed as part of the Flow Benefit we have already achieved through collaboration, which will help show progress towards the final goals.

A discussion ensued about how to tell the habitat benefit side of the flow benefit equation. Mark Wachtel will help coordinate available habitat-flow information. Brian Wolcott will help summarize other habitat related work (e.g. levee setbacks), which may be helpful to describe in the Flow Study as well.
d. Managed Aquifer Recharge (MAR) and Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR) Technical Work Group (Steve Patten, WWBWC)

Project summaries have been completed. Key questions the Steering Committee had in trying to understand how to evaluate the project summaries are:

i. Help summarize the situations that led to the license not being fully utilized? (Steve summarized some of these orally).
ii. What’s being done to overcome these issues in the future?
iii. How much more water is needed to meet augmentation goals?
iv. What is the retiming signature of the facilities (to assist in the project pairing spreadsheet)?

e. Surface Water Storage (Brian Wolcott, WWBWC)

Brian described the process to narrow sites from 42, to 21, to 7, to 4 Pine Creek sites remaining. Brian is coordinating a scope of work to feed some of the data gaps that will help refine the project summaries. The scope is expected to be let by the end of the month, and the goal is to have the desk-top exercises be done before the end of the year.

f. Columbia River Pump Exchange (Brian Wolcott, WWBWC)

Projects Summaries have been prepared and a summary table of pros and cons was developed and shown by Brian. Gary developed a separate table that added some additional elements. Both will be combined and posted for review with the project summaries.

g. Water Right Management and Transactions Technical Work Group (Anton Chiono, WWRID)

Anton described some of the challenges in fitting this TWG effort into the project summary work product. We discussed completing project summaries for relevant transactions since 2001 to mirror some of the conservation approaches. Then, we discussed potential scaling some of the past expenditures for future efforts. However, implementation would be necessarily opportunistic.

h. Legal Technical Work Group (Chris Marks, CTUIR)

The TWG is diagnosing how the existing legal memo can be improved. Options could include an augmented scope of work to Cascadia, or perhaps an Oregon legal perspective on the issue. They will make a recommendation by email to the Steering Committee for approval.

The Steering Committee recommended a Washington AG to Oregon AG meeting be convened to discuss options, what is supportable under existing laws, and what
could be improved, based in part on the existing legal memo. Guy Gregory and Mike Ladd will coordinate.

3. Project Pairing Decision-Making Process for January Meeting (10:45 a.m. to 11:15 a.m.)

   a. Summary of Options and Examples of Other Efforts (Dan Haller, Facilitator)

   **Key Action Item: What format for project pairing work best for the group?**

   Facilitator shared examples of other efforts, and summarized a proposed methodology which was agreed to by the Steering Committee. It will include the following:

   a. TWG completes all project summaries.
   b. TWG estimates flow benefit by reach for each project summary by end of November, using a spreadsheet template that will be circulated by the end of October.
   c. The Steering Committee will vote by email on a list of criteria for project pairing by November 15th.
   d. The Planning TWG Plus TWG Chairs will meet in December to begin a project pairing exercise, using Steering Committee criteria. A minimum of 2 alternatives should be developed that aggregate projects that will meet the Flow objectives and other criteria set by the Flow Committee.
   e. The Steering Committee will meet in January and March to work to select a preferred alternative. A flow chart from the white board summarizing this is shown below.
4. Goals and Schedule for Remainder of Fiscal Year (11:15 a.m. to 11:45 a.m.)
   a. Review GANTT Chart Schedule and Upcoming Decision-making Timeline

      Chris H. summarized this, and will coordinate with Chris M. and Brian to post a new version on the website by October 21st.

   b. Funding Updates (OCR, Reclamation, others)

      Status of OCR funding ($500K budget ask) and Reclamation funding ($50K/year for 2 years awarded was reviewed.

   c. Flow Study Outline Development Process

      10% outline circulated to Planning TWG for review and posted online. Next step is 50% draft with content generated significantly from TWG work product.

   d. Communication Plan and Outreach Strategy

      Dan shared example outreach materials and summary of how a communication plan reaches different local, state, and federal audiences. Chris H. will lead this effort to develop a draft, and Mark Wachtel will assist.

   e. Roundtable

5. Agenda Development for January Steering Committee, Closing Remarks (11:45 a.m. to Noon).