



**Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer (ESPA)
Comprehensive Aquifer Management Plan
Implementation Committee**

**Draft Meeting Summary
Tuesday, April 6th, 2010
City of Chubbuck Council Chambers**

AGENDA

Tuesday, April 6th: 10:00am-5:00pm

1. Introductions, March 5, 2010 Meeting Note Finalization and Agenda Review

2. Update and Discussion: Updates Since March 5th Implementation Committee Meeting

Goal: Candid discussion on the Implementation Committee process and Working Group deliberations, the short-term accounting legislation, the long-term funding legislation process and other items/updates

3. Presentation and Discussion: Recharge Project Submissions

Goal: Review and evaluate the recharge projects submitted to the Implementation Committee for evaluation in 2010

4. Presentation and Discussion: Conversions and Demand Reduction Project Submissions

Goal: Review and evaluate the conversions and demand reduction projects submitted to the Implementation Committee for evaluation in 2010

5. Discussion: Other Projects

Goal: Discuss any other potential projects that should be considered by the Working Groups and Implementation Committee

6. Discussion: Next Steps

Goal: Determine what actions need to occur prior to the April 29th Implementation Committee meeting so that recommendations regarding 2010 projects can be made to the Governor's Office and the IWRB.

7. Public Comment

1. Introductions, March 5, 2010 Meeting Note Finalization and Agenda Review

Joan Sabott, CDR Associates, welcomed the group and facilitated introductions. The meeting summary from the March 5th, 2010 Implementation Committee meeting was finalized. Implementation Committee members were reminded to review all meeting summaries upon their distribution. Not only is reviewing Implementation Committee documentation included in the Operating Protocols that were agreed to in June 2009, but their review and any subsequent edits promotes a process in which all members are aware of agreements, questions that need to be considered and any next steps. Finally, Joan reviewed the agenda and no additional items were introduced for discussion.

2. Update and Discussion: Updates Since March 5th Implementation Committee Meeting

The Implementation Committee discussed the recent, ongoing and upcoming activities of the Committee regarding Plan discussion and implementation. Activities include:

- Numerous efforts to address incidental recharge and will continue to pursue an approach that is acceptable to the water user community
- Evaluated, prioritized and reviewed project activities as outlined in the ESPA Plan
- Sub-committees were formed to address elements of the Plan: 1) Education and 2) Environmental
- At the request of Governor Otter, initiated a project proposal process for 2010. Received 4 project proposals, in addition to projects that were under review by the Implementation Committee
- Short-term account legislation was passed in March 2010 in order to provide a mechanism for collecting cost-sharing funds **As a follow-up, Mike Webster from Governor Otter's office indicated that the Governor would be signing the Aquifer Planning and Management Fund sub-account legislation on April 12th, 2010.*
- Ongoing and concerted effort to develop long-term funding mechanism for ESPA Plan – continue to address issues. **Clive Strong reminded the Implementation Committee received Version 2.0 of the long-term funding legislation in March and indicated that there are still legal issues to address. The parameters, given some of the legal issues, may have to be discussed and agreed upon again. His suggestion is to reengage the Funding Working Group to continue the discussions regarding the long-term funding mechanism, and to involve the appropriate legal representatives in some capacity.*
- Projects that are to be considered by the Implementation Committee for 2010 are strongly encouraged by the IWRB to present a final proposal that includes a 60% cost-share (40% to be covered by the State). This is in an effort to award and implement projects in 2010 that are consistent with the ESPA Plan and the associated funding structure of a 60%/40% cost-share.

While the Implementation Committee is making decisions during this stop-gap year, the group discussed the importance of communicating with other stakeholders, elected officials and other

citizens of the ESPA-region about the projects/activities that have already been implemented as a result of the ESPA Plan: Projects and activities include:

- Managed recharge in 2009 (early and late season) and 2010 (early season)
- AWEF contract award from NRCS
- AWEF project awards in 2009 (in various stages - design to implementation) to ESPA property owners
- Weather modification efforts in the Upper Snake, led by IPC
- The opportunity to award and implement projects in 2010 without a long-term funding source in place

Additionally, the Implementation Committee discussed upcoming transitions regarding this implementation phase of the ESPA Plan. Jonathan Bartsch indicated that the Implementation Committee process is one that, in upcoming months, will transition from a higher level of facilitation effort to one that requires more technical expertise and leadership. While the Implementation Committee agreed that more technical leadership will be necessary moving forward, several members indicated that the role of facilitation in the proceedings is still an important role in making recommendations to the IWRB.

Several Implementation Committee members commented on the need to clarify further the information needed to make decisions and the metrics that will feed into the decision-making process as the group moves forward. This is a discussion that needs to occur after the 2010 projects are recommended, so that the group is making informed decisions as we transition back to the long-term decision-making that will occur after the 2010 recommendations are made to the IWRB and the Governor.

3. Presentation and Discussion: Recharge Project Submissions

Jonathan Bartsch introduced the four project proposals that are being considered in 2010: Egin Lakes, Mile Post 31, Idaho Irrigation District and Managed Recharge 2011. The Recharge Working Group had the following recommendations regarding these four projects:

- Measuring and monitoring necessary for all recharge projects, hydrologic and biological; gain more data
- Phase 2 of the Egin Lakes proposal for development, monitoring and measurement of the site
- Idaho Irrigation District project proposal to gather data and evaluate recharge sites (60% cost-share identified in proposal)
- Mile Post 31 pilot test in 2010 (est. \$3,000)
- Reserve funds for managed recharge 2011 (additional discussion is needed on amount to reserve and whether cost-share funding is required)

Bill Quinn presented the modeling for the Egin Lakes and Mile Post 31 projects. Given the results, the Implementation Committee indicated support for the direction provided by the Working Group. Several Implementation Committee members stated their support for developing a system for recharge that provides information on what works, how to measure it and how to improve it. These principles then should be applied in all ESPA recharge projects in order to provide a level of assurance that projects are being implemented in the most effective

locations and that distributed funds are spent in a way that provides the most benefit to the aquifer.

4. Presentation and Discussion: Conversions and Demand Reduction Project Submissions

Joan Sabott introduced the four project proposals that are being considered in 2010: the Big Wood project, AWEP 2009 and AWEP 2010 and the Pumpback at the Thousand Springs.

Highlights from the Working Group discussions include:

- AWEP 2009 and 2010 prompt two major questions: do AWEP funds, if a project is recommended, count towards the 60% cost-share for the project sponsors? and for 2010 AWEP project awards, does the Implementation Committee want to focus on one large-scale project (Pumpback, Big Wood, etc) or allow for multiple projects throughout the ESPA? These two questions will need to be addressed by or on April 29th in order to make recommendations regarding 2010 projects.
- In order to understand the Big Wood proposal for the gravity pressurized pipeline system and the injection wells, the Working Group and Implementation Committee would like to see more information. One particular area of information relates to the estimated net water budget change to determine if there is a positive change to the aquifer caused by the project implementation.
- Phase One of the Thousand Springs Pumpback proposal is a comprehensive one that fits well within the demand reduction and conversions activities outlined in the ESPA Plan and appears to provide good “bang for the buck”. Implementation Committee members identified several areas in which they would like additional information for the April 29th meeting including: energy costs, administrative actions that might be necessary because of project implementation, further breakdown of Phase I as a standalone project, nutrient management issues, the net water budget change, monitoring and long-term O&M costs.

5. Discussion: Other Projects

No additional projects were introduced to the Implementation Committee for consideration.

6. Discussion: Next Steps

In order to finalize recommendations on April 29th, a number of questions to consider were raised at the meeting. Implementation Committee members are encouraged to discuss these items provide input regarding them to the IWRB Staff and Jonathan and Joan. Questions include:

- Do project sponsors need to identify the funds to meet a cost-share requirement of 60%?
- Managed recharge 2011 – 60% cost-share?
- For this year, do we want to focus on one large-scale project or on multiple projects?
- Should we consider the AWEP funds as a portion of the 60% cost-share of the project sponsor?
- With AWEP funds, should we focus on one large-scale project or on multiple projects throughout the ESPA?
- Will cost-sharing contributions in 2010 by water users be recognized in the contributions made when long-term funding is secured? If so, how?

- Is the matrix sufficient for Implementation Committee decision-making? Is additional information needed? Is more detail needed to the existing elements in the table?

The procedural next steps include:

- Working Group meetings to share new information about and further discuss and evaluate the project submissions
- Funding Committee begin work with attorneys
- Project sponsors continue to identify additional cost-sharing sources and coordinate with others to gather additional information about the projects
- Identify questions for project sponsors that will help to facilitate a more informed decision making process by the end of April
- Implementation Committee meeting on April 29th in Chubbuck to prioritize and evaluate the projects and finalize recommendations for Governor Otter and the IWRB. At this meeting, the Board staff will provide information about the water rights process in order to better understand some of the administrative elements of the Pumpback proposal.
- Provide monitoring and oversight during project implementation. Who is responsible?
- Address the issues regarding managed and incidental recharge
- Continue prioritizing and evaluating projects as part of long-term ESPA Plan implementation

7. Public Comment

No public comment.

MEETING ATTENDEES

Implementation Committee Members

1.	Hal	Anderson	IDWR
2.	Peter	Anderson	Environmental and Conservation
3.	Randy	Bingham	Surface Water Users
4.	Barry	Burnell	IDEQ
5.	Rebecca	Casper	Land Developers
6.	Scott	Clawson	Groundwater Users (via telephone)
7.	Steve	England	Municipalities/Counties
8.	Craig	Evans	Groundwater Users
9.	Jared	Fuhriman	Municipalities/Counties
10.	Steve	Howser	Surface Water Users
11.	Linda	Lemmon	Spring Water Users
12.	Albert	Lockwood	Surface Water Users
13.	Randy	MacMillan	Spring Water Users
14.	Brian	Olmstead	Surface Water Users
15.	Walt	Poole	Idaho F&G
16.	Jeff	Raybould	Surface Water Users
17.	Rich	Rigby	BOR
18.	Steven	Serr	Counties

- | | | | |
|-----|------|-----------|--------------------------------|
| 19. | Dean | Stevenson | Groundwater Users |
| 20. | Jim | Tucker | Hydropower |
| 21. | Will | Whelan | Environmental and Conservation |

Other Attendees

- | | | | |
|-----|----------|--------------|---------------------------------------|
| 22. | Jonathan | Bartsch | CDR Associates |
| 23. | Dave | Blew | Idaho Power |
| 24. | Jon | Bowling | Idaho Power |
| 25. | Cynthia | Bridge Clark | IDWR |
| 26. | Randy | Budge | Idaho Groundwater Appropriators |
| 27. | Stan | Clark | Eastern Idaho Water Rights Coalition |
| 28. | Don | Dixon | U.S. Senator Mike Crapo's Office |
| 29. | Terry | Edwards | USDA |
| 30. | Stan | Hawkins | Great Feeder |
| 31. | Matt | Howard | BOR |
| 32. | Alan | Kelsch | Idaho Irrigation District |
| 33. | Daryl | Kerr | Great Feeder |
| 34. | Neeley | Miller | IDWR |
| 35. | Brian | Patton | IDWR |
| 36. | Chuck | Pentzer | City of Jerome |
| 37. | Bill | Quinn | IDWR |
| 38. | Joan | Sabott | CDR Associates |
| 39. | John | Simpson | Barker, Rosholt & Simpson |
| 40. | Bert | Stevenson | Idaho State Representative |
| 41. | Clive | Strong | Attorney General's Office |
| 42. | Lyle | Swank | Water District 01 |
| 43. | Dale | Swensen | Fremont-Madison Irrigation District |
| 44. | Lynn | Tominaga | Idaho Ground Water Appropriators, Inc |
| 45. | Mike | Webster | Governor's Office |