North Ada County Technical Working Group Agenda

Thursday, January 31, 2008
1:00 – 4:00 pm

IDWR CONFERENCE ROOM 602A and 602B

Items

1) **Introductions**

Attendance:
Ed Squires (Hydrologic, Inc.)
Mark Utting (Hydrologic, Inc.)
David Head (NACFA)
Jim Taylor (BOR)
Jennifer Johnson (BOR)
Kevin Boggs (Independent)
Angie Grimm (IDWR – Western Office)
Sean Vincent (IDWR)
Christian Petrich (SPF)
John Thornton (NACFA)
Allan Wylie (IDWR)
Jim Bartolino (USGS)
Dennis Owsley (IDWR)
Roger Dittus (United Water)
Shelley Keen (IDWR)
Chris Duncan (Holladay Eng.)

2) **Opening Remarks (D. Owsley)**
Announcement that the updated "Distributed Parameter Water Budget Data Base for the Lower Boise Valley" produced by the Bureau of Reclamation has been released. Several copies distributed at the meeting by Jennifer. An electronic version will be posted on the North Ada County website next week.

a) status of project funding (S. Vincent)
Administrator Hal Anderson updated Sean Vincent with respect to the proposed funding for this project. The legislature has reviewed the request and Hal has had discussion with the legislature regarding the amounts. It appears optimistic that

approximately $20 million will be allocated for statewide ground water investigations. North Ada County will be on the top of the list for the money. Approximately 2 million is currently proposed for this project. We should have a final answer by April. If approved, the money will be available in July 2008.

3) **Update of M3 Aquifer Test (E. Squires)**
   a) **Comments through IDWR**
   b) **Timing/progress**

   Ed Squires updated the group on the status of the proposed aquifer test for the M3 development. Ed mentioned that he was waiting on approval from DEQ before continuing with additional proposals. He mentioned he still felt optimistic that the test will occur this winter, but that timeline is quickly closing. IDWR promised him comments on his proposal sometime next week. In summary, Ed proposed that they are targeting a test of a minimum of 1,000 gpm for a minimum of 5 days. A longer duration test at the maximum allowable pumping rate is the current proposal. Issues of discharge capabilities, monitoring of irrigation wells and domestic wells, public announcement of the test, and potential results expected from the test were discussed.

   John Thornton asked if any analysis of water chemistry in the Payette.

4) **SPF project summary/update (C. Petrich)**
   a) **Presentation of current work and findings**
   b) **Treasure Valley**
   c) **Eagle Aquifer Test**

   Christian presented a comprehensive overview of the Treasure Valley Hydrogeology in general. A review of the TVHP and the results of that project was presented, a summary of the work that has been completed near the Avimor project was presented, and general water usage and future growth within the Treasure Valley was discussed. His presentation opened the floor for detailed discussions on his work for the TVHP as well as the Avimor project. Discussions related to the Willow Creek aquifer, Spring Valley aquifer, and the Sandy Hill aquifer occurred. Christian also presented water levels for the Eagle area, showing the stable

water levels in the area, indicating water is available for appropriation.

Additional discussions ensued regarding the importance of good, long-term monitoring wells. It is currently viewed that the monitoring network currently is not appropriate for making sound scientific decisions. Multi-level monitoring wells were discussed regarding the validity of the data and the cost saving associated with such wells. Maintain access to wells is critical to maintain long-term monitoring. From a modeling point of view, it was expressed that the water level monitoring is one of the most important pieces of information that is incorporated into calibrating a model.

Chris Duncan presented his views on municipal water rights and the actual volumes used versus the numbers presented in the water rights. He feels the actual volumes diverted are significantly less than the volumes calculable based on the diversion rate and period of use as appropriated on a water right. He also discussed how large municipal wells are phased in and that monitoring should be emplaced to determine the appropriate amounts to allocate in a water right.

5) **Review of Current SOW (D. Owsley)**
   a) **Discuss Phase I items**
   b) **Discussion of Phase II**

   A variety of discussions related to the overall scope and objectives of this project occurred. Currently, it appears the objectives for this project have not yet been defined, and need to be established before moving forward. A proposed study area that incorporated the watersheds for the Dry Creek and Willow Creek drainages was presented as starting place. Generally speaking two suggestions were proposed with regard to the scope and study area of the project. One suggestion was to expand upon the initially proposed are to include areas near Caldwell, Kuna and Emmett without emphasis on studying the smaller ground water flow systems, such as the Sandy Hill, Spring Valley and Willow Creek aquifers already identified in the area. This would be done to focus more on the larger aquifer system that potentially connects the Payette Valley to the Boise Valley.

The other suggestion was to focus the study more on the localized area aquifers (Sandy Hill, Spring Valley, Willow Creek, etc.) within northern Ada county specific to the areas currently being developed.

Ideas were generated as to how to approach developing objectives for this project. Sean suggested we should be talking about what aquifer systems are we interested in characterizing, not just thinking about a geographic area.

Dennis provided his thoughts that all of the aquifer systems in the area should be incorporated, as they are all areas of potential development. Some of the smaller areas have already been shown to have limited ground water resources available. The Dry Creek water right application is currently being contested by the local neighborhood association.

John emphasized his thoughts on developing the goals for the project. He recommended that we start at a large, regional scale and work down to a more detailed area such as the north Ada area outlined in the map. He feels we will have more success by breaking the project into phases, starting with the largest and working down in scale.

No consensus was reached on the objectives or study area boundaries. However, the group agreed that we must determine what questions we desire the study to answer before objectives and other project aspects can be decided upon.

It was concluded that we have email discussions prior to the next meeting to help define/refine the objectives of this project.