July 30th Meeting Summary For the Treasure Valley Comprehensive Aquifer Management Plan Advisory Committee

On July 30, 2010, the Treasure Valley CAMP Advisory Committee met at Meridian City Hall. The objectives of this meeting were to

1. Review results from the Future Demand Study and determine how the Committee would like to proceed with the data presented. *Due to delays with data collection, the final results from the study are expected prior to the September meeting.*
2. Learn more about down river obligations, conjunctive administration and how both are relevant to the CAMP process.
3. Review work on reliable water supply options and discuss online survey results.
4. Identify conflicts likely to occur in the Treasure Valley in the next 50 years and develop potential options to address those conflicts.
5. Review and discuss issues relating to water supply and management.

List of Participants

Brent Adamson
Doug Amick
Jamie Anderson
Rex Barrie
Gayle Batt
Barry Burnell
Russ Dane
Paul Deveau
Dave Dixon
Gary Duspiva
Mike Echieta
Allen Funkhouser
Michael Fuss
Stephen Goodson
Matt Howard
Chris Jones
Greg Nelson
Brian Patton
Kathy Peter
Clinton Pline
John Prigge
Scott Rhead
Jayson Ronk
Bob Schmillen
Jeff Scott
Lon Stewart
Warren Stewart
John Thornton
Rick Ward
Paul Woods
Janice Yerton

Welcome, Introductions, and Review of Agenda

The Facilitation Team, the Advisory Committee and the public observers all introduced themselves. Daisy Patterson reviewed the meeting goals and agenda for the day. Daisy explained that the facilitation team leader, Joe McMahon, has had health issues and is expected to return in September.

Daisy explained that prior to this meeting, she and Neeley Miller contacted most of the Advisory Committee to gather comments and suggestions regarding the CAMP process. Common feedback from Committee members included a desire to limit public comment to

the public comment periods designated on the agenda, which was a rule set during the formation of the ground rules by the Advisory Committee. The facilitation team encouraged members of the public to take notes during the day to capture their comments and share those comments during the public comment period.

Future Demand Study

Due to delays in transfers of data from local source to the Future Demand Team, the results from the Future Demand Study will not be available until prior to the September meeting. Elias Tijerina, supervising engineer at WRIME, Inc. presented the foundation for the WRIME's analysis of future water demand over the next 50 years. Elias explained what data is necessary for the analysis, and he identified what data is still needed from local sources. For more details on the Future Demand Study presentation, please see the Documents page in the Treasure Valley CAMP section of the IDWR website.

Downriver Obligations

Brian Patton, Planning Bureau Chief, IDWR, presented information on downriver obligations. While there is no interstate compact that obligates Idaho to provide water to Oregon or Washington, there are two downstream obligations that must be met: minimum flow at Weiser gauge on the Snake River and flow augmentation for aquatic species.

Brian pointed out that a considerable amount of flow could be removed for additional use above the Weiser before impacting the minimum streamflow at the Weiser Gage. Another option within the current obligations is to move the Boise River component of flow augmentation out of the basin in order to make this storage available for future needs in the basin. For more information about each of these obligations, please see the Documents page in the Treasure Valley CAMP section of the IDWR website.

Conjunctive Administration

Garrick Baxter, Office of the Attorney General, and David Tuthill, former Director, IDWR, delivered presentations regarding Conjunctive Administration. Garrick Baxter provided background information on the following concepts:

- Prior appropriations doctrine
- How water rights are established
- How water is allocated during shortages
- Purpose of the adjudication process
- General description of conjunctive administration

David Tuthill described the differences between the current administration of water and conjunctive administration, potential impacts of conjunctive administration, and new advances in technology that will assist the inevitable transition from current to conjunctive administration.

For more information about both of these presentations, please see the Documents page in the Treasure Valley CAMP section of the IDWR website.

Public Comments on the Lower Boise River Feasibility Study

Many Advisory Committee members attended the US Army Corps of Engineers' public meetings on the Lower Boise River Feasibility Study (LBRFS). The LBRFS explored various options for above ground storage of water, with the USACE goal of mitigating flood hazards. This study is relevant to the CAMP in that these storage mechanisms may be considered as potential options for meeting future demand. The Advisory Committee members that attended these public meetings relayed several key points that came up during the public discussion:

- The concept of a large-scale flood is difficult for many members of the public to understand. More education on this matter is needed for all.
- Some public expressed strong concern regarding the potential to submerge land for water storage and the decision to use tax dollars for storage that benefits specific areas. Many of these concerns are related to the question of who will benefit from this solution. Upstream entities are concerned about the cost and lack of potential benefits. They may be advocates for non-structural solutions and increased efficiencies.
- There are questions about the appropriateness of using reservoirs as a solution versus other options like buying out homes in the hazard are a. Some of these questions also include the amount of time it will take to implement these solutions. (Questions like: "Will I live to see changes?")

Reliable Future Water Supply

The IWRB created four goals to guide the statewide CAMP program. The first goal is to provide reliable sources of water, projecting 50 years into the future. The Advisory Committee discussed, organized, and refined their prior list of options to provide reliable sources of water. This list is a comprehensive list of options discussed at the meeting, but this list does not represent any recommendations or agreement among the Committee. This list will continue to be fleshed out and refined at future meetings.

1. **Integrated land use and water planning**
    - Reduce future demand per household through land use planning/efficiency of use
    - Manage growth through land use planning
    - Direct development to appropriate locations through land use to ensure recharge/other benefits
    - Floodplain/flood control management through land use planning
    - Integrate land use planning with water planning/management (storage, distribution, recharge, etc.)
2. **Development of Decision-making Tools and Data you Need**

- Improve or continue to study future demands
- Improve groundwater and surface water (and interaction) modeling
- Improve cooperative measurement and management (consistent data-collection) to increase efficiencies
- Continue to study and monitor/testing surface water and groundwater system (shallow and deep) to increase knowledge and adjust actions as needed

3. **Utilize cloud seeding (NEED PRESENTATION TO UNDERSTAND BETTER) (The storage is temporary via snowpack only – has to be tied to long-term storage)**
4. **Conservation (how do we get the most value of the water we have right now)**
   - Reuse of wastewater treatment plant
   - Explore the cost to meter non-agricultural, non-metered uses of water
   - Education
   - Low flow toilets/faucets
   - Improve efficiency of water delivery system
5. **Distribution**
   - Capture water at the end of the basin through pumpback
   - Explore feasibility of interbasin transfers/exchanges
   - Consider new distribution systems (pumps and pipes) to move water where needed
   - Local storage and delivery systems
   - Review existing delivery systems from current storage units
6. **Explore strategies for storage that utilize surface and ground opportunities**
   - Increase/manage surface water storage
     a. New facilities (consider location of storage, distribution, and need)
        i. Upstream
        ii. Downstream
     b. Increase capacity of existing reservoirs via raising dam height
     c. Optimize reservoir operations through increased/improved modeling/data/sensing/forecasting for more accurate releases– *perhaps technical optimization*
     d. Buy water rights for reservoir water and use differently from ag to municipal
     e. Recognize and adhere to contractual obligations of storage
   - Utilize underground storage
     f. Recharge
        i. Recharge somehow of excess that now goes past Weiser Gauge
     g. ASR
7. **Protect and maintain (or improve) existing irrigated agriculture infrastructure**
   - Use and improve existing irrigation delivery system for recharge

- Flood control (?) on into the future (like canals into storage/recharge areas if flood)

8. **Flood Control (related to a number of topics above so cross cutting interest/topic)**
9. **Administrative and Legal**
   - Focus on conjunctive management
   - Protect against claims from entities outside Idaho
10. **Encourage effective use of geothermal resources as technologies evolve, including reinjection**
11. **Utilize and improve the market system**
    - Lessons from other states/what's been done/what's worked and not
    - Investigate other Idaho rental pools (multiple year leases) (talk about current rental pool/bank system)
    - Market mechanisms across a variety of means
    - Review legal impediments to more efficient water use
    - Reallocate storage and release times (through new contractual arrangements) – *perhaps contractual optimization*

Likely Future Water Conflicts

The second CAMP goal is to develop strategies to avoid future conflict over water resources. The Advisory Committee brainstormed various issues they consider related to the goal of avoiding future conflict. The list created by the Advisory Committee is included here, and the Advisory Committee will refine this list in future meetings.

1. Endangered Species Act
2. DCMI taking over the world
3. Conjunctive management and a call that requires the Department to Act (only something to lose for GW users) – what number do we need to factor in for this (there are impacts as of today to senior surface rights – material injury today?)
4. Growth versus economics – Valley can grow too big and destroy ag economics
5. Goal is to avoid conflict through demand reductions and new supplies
6. Put in system to make more open, friendly, cooperative system that delivers to needs/uses
7. Current water right holders have bought and paid for those rights
8. Invasive species (already issue with Zebra mussels and others)
9. Las Vegas principle should be avoided– taking all rights from non-municipal users
10. If so much water flows beyond our political boundaries, could become to be seen as a downstream right/expectation that creates future conflict with us here
11. Out of basin entity trying to get hands on our water
12. Deteriorating conveyance systems and possible failures and conflicts that would arise (aging infrastructure)
13. Water quality, regulation in the future, treatment in ppb, ability to use and for what – future conflicts then may arise

14. State and local governments ideally spreading costs fairly – more and more conflict if less and less money
15. Water markets that are inefficient or go against community needs/values
16. Municipal versus agricultural
17. Changes in the water law as water uses change
18. Inability to meet public's expectations or changing expectations for recreation, ecology, agriculture (moving target over time)
19. Jurisdictional cooperation or lack thereof – creating haves and have nots
20. Conjunctive administration
21. River water quality standards and how that impacts current users
22. Increased mining requests upstream and impacts on water quality both surface and ground (and conflicts with down stream users)
23. Diminishment of local food supply leading to conflict
24. Don't sell off current investments/wealth at expense of future well being
25. Don't grow more than we can collect, ensure adequate water supply and recharge in this high desert climate
26. Loss of current culture and agricultural way of life
27. QUESTION: How far were Arrow Rock and Anderson Ranch looking ahead when planned/built?
28. Easements/access to canals in face of growth
29. Landscaping of future residences and what people are willing to do/or not
30. Increased urbanization and increased irrigation efficiency practices, then less recharge
31. Increased storage means increased conflict with the rest of the country – hate dams
32. Security both in terms of infrastructure (terror attack on dam) and on quality (contaminating water supply)
33. Cost conflicts (who pays and how much)

Process Issues

The Advisory Committee created a list of ground rules to guide how the Advisory Committee functions during the CAMP process (That list can be found on the IDWR website). Several issues have come up since those ground rules were created, and the Advisory Committee discussed how they would like to resolve those issues about meeting locations, information distribution, and attendance.

The Advisory Committee decided that Meridian City Hall and the Idaho Association of Realtors conference room are acceptable locations for future meetings. If neither location is available, staff will reserve a space suitable for this group.

The facilitation team will distribute meeting documents, but anyone wishing to share information with the Advisory Committee may do so by providing an electronic copy of the information to either the facilitation team or IDWR staff. The electronic document will be posted on the IDWR server, and a link will be placed in an appropriate space in the Treasure Valley CAMP section of the IDWR website.

Many Advisory Committee members have expressed frustration at the inconsistent attendance of some Advisory Committee members. The Committee was reluctant to create a strict attendance policy. Daisy asked the Advisory Committee members inform either the facilitation team or IDWR staff if they will not make future meetings to help with logistics of meeting setup and catering. The Committee members agreed that members who miss meetings are obliged to stay apprised of what happens at the meeting.

Public Comment

Liz Paul, Idaho Rivers United, requested distribution of Jeff Fereday's *Rural Water Use in Urbanizing Areas* to the Advisory Committee. She also offered information on tools from the Alliance for Water Efficiency on calculating conservation data in urban areas. Many new appliances come equipped with water saving features that require no action or changed behavior by consumers. Liz pointed out that this water savings data should be considered in the Future Demand Study.

Workplan and Next meetings

The Advisory Committee brainstormed topics for future meetings. The facilitation team and IDWR will develop the agenda for the next meeting based available speakers for topics and the new work plan.

1. Cloud seeding
2. Market systems/approaches
3. What happens in other states or areas of Idaho regarding market approaches
4. Potential artificial recharge, storage and recovery through flood flows/peak flows
5. How a new storage facility works (how to fill it, get it up and running, and how would be utilized given subordinate to existing facilities)
6. Various groups doing forecasting in land use planning– who are players/who is predicting what
7. Efficiency and water conservation measures – what others are doing?

The facilitation team will create a new workplan based on this list of agenda topics and other discussions during Advisory Committee meetings. This workplan will be distributed prior to the next meeting.

Currently scheduled meetings are:

- September 29, Meridian City Hall, Meridian
- October 20, Idaho Association of Realtors
- November 10, location to be determined

COLLABORATIVE PROCESSES®