



**Final Meeting Summary For the Rathdrum Prairie
Comprehensive Aquifer Management Plan Advisory Committee
January 29, 2010**

Panhandle Health District, Hayden, ID

Participants

Advisory Committee:

Chris Beck
Todd Tondee
Jim Markley
Andy Dunau
Mike Neher
Ken Windram
Philip Cernera
Bruce Howard
Jon Mueller
Bruce Cyr
Allen Isaacson
Alan Miller
Kermit Kiebert

Kevin Lewis
Ron Wilson
Mike Galante

Public:

19 in attendance

IDWR/IWRB:

Helen Harrington
Bob Haynes
Bob Graham
Chuck Cuddy
Sandra Thiel

**Attending via phone
from Boise:**

Brian Patton
Neeley Miller

Facilitators:

Joe McMahon
Matt McKinney
Daisy Patterson

Overview of the CAMP Process

After a brief introduction by Chuck Cuddy and Bob Graham, members of the Idaho Water Resource Board, Helen Harrington of the Idaho Department of Water Resources discussed the purpose and goals of the CAMP. Information from her presentation can be found on the Rathdrum Prairie CAMP webpage on the IDWR website at:

http://www.idwr.idaho.gov/waterboard/WaterPlanning/CAMP/RP_CAMP/RathdrumCAMP.htm

Review of the Ground Rules

The participants then briefly reviewed the ground rules, making several refinements. A revised draft of the ground rules can be found at

http://www.idwr.idaho.gov/WaterBoard/WaterPlanning/CAMP/RP_CAMP/PDF/Ground_Rules.pdf

The participants discussed the role of alternates or designated observers for appointed Committee members. Although the participants did not formally agree on this provision, the emerging consensus seem to be:

1. Appointed Committee members identify their alternates to IDWR, the facilitation team, or both;
2. Designated alternates should attend CAMP meetings when possible to stay abreast of the content and logic of the dialogue;
3. Designated alternates should come well prepared to CAMP meetings when they are serving as an alternate for the appointed Committee member;
4. The designated alternate may offer to the Advisory Committee the views of the principal member on an issue regarding decision-making by the Committee

Note: The Advisory Committee did not reach a conclusion about whether an alternate should/could sit at the Advisory Committee table.

First Public Comment

Ara Andrea presented information on a new grant for \$300,000 awarded Washington Department of Natural Resources and Idaho Department of Lands for the Spokane Valley Rathdrum Prairie Aquifer Project. The project will provide educational sessions, demonstration sites, and financial assistance to promote forest-management activities that positively influence the quality of the water in the aquifer recharge areas.

Aquifer “101” Presentations

The participants spent most of the morning hearing scientific and technical presentation from:

- Bob Haynes and Guy Gregory on the USGS/WA/ID Hydrological Study
- Gary Stevens on Aquifer 101
- Dale Peck on Water Quality and Monitoring Programs

The powerpoint presentations are available at http://www.idwr.idaho.gov/WaterBoard/WaterPlanning/CAMP/RP_CAMP/LDP/presentations.htm

Working Groups

After lunch, the participants voluntarily broke into two working groups to begin addressing key issues for the CAMP. The two working groups were (1) Water Supply; and (2) the interaction of Surface-Ground, and of Water Quantity-Quality.

Report from the Working Group on the interaction of Surface-Ground, and of Water Quantity-Quality

The participants in this working group discussed a number of general issues, concluding that the issue of surface-ground and quantity-quality interaction is very, very complex. One discussion point that was not completed was: Are we trying to solve a real problem? How do we know a problem exists? Are we making assumptions about whether a given issue is a problem or if so, the nature of the problem?

Some of the conclusions of the discussion are:

- 1) The Advisory Committee needs to look beyond the aquifer and consider contribution zones.
- 2) Take steps necessary to avoid intrastate water conflicts.
- 3) Continue certain types of monitoring.
- 4) Move wells in losing reach to areas further away to reduce impact on river levels, and look at options for increasing Pend Oreille contributions.
- 5) Model future growth, climate change, etc. to see impacts on the aquifer and downstream river flows.

Facilitation Team recommendation: During the next meeting, this working group may want to limit its focus to one specific issue – such as aquifer protection – and then later back into the more complex and overarching issues of surface-ground and quantity-quality interactions.

Report from the Water Supply Working Group

The participants in this working group developed a preliminary framework to address this and other issues in the Camp.

Step # 1 -- Start with four goals of CAMP as articulated by the IWRB

1. Provide reliable sources of water, projecting 50 years into the future
2. Avoid conflict related to conjunctive management of surface and groundwater
3. Prioritize future state investments in water
4. Bridge the gaps between future water needs and supply

Step # 2 -- Articulate specific goals for each issue, and explain how each specific goal relates to the overall goals of the CAMP as articulated by the IWRB

In this case, the preliminary list of goals for Water Supply include the following ... not in any order of priority:

1. Maintain a sustainable aquifer (including the lake and river)
 - a. Relates to CAMP goals 1-4
 - b. Avoid mining the aquifer or prevent mining of the aquifer
 - c. A related goal is to protect existing water rights
2. Allow reasonable growth
 - a. Relates to CAMP goal 1
 - b. Balance this with goal 1 above
 - c. Explore the idea of creating a buffer between mining and periodic shortfalls

3. Maintain streamflows in the Spokane River
 - a. Relates to CAMP goals 1, 2, and 4
 - b. A critical component of this goal is to clarify what role Idaho and/or other forces (e.g., geological) plays in influencing this
4. Better understand the relationship between the aquifer and stream/river system
 - a. Relates to CAMP goals 1 and 2
 - b. Build on existing knowledge
 - c. Its critical to do this to meet the other goals articulated here
5. Foster greater public awareness and understanding (of this whole set of issues and potential solutions)
 - a. Relates to CAMP goal 1
6. Better link land and water decision-making systems (i.e., water purveyors, regulators, and land developers)
 - a. Relates to CAMP goals 3 and 4

Step # 3 --Review and refine goal statements – this where the working group will pick-up at the next meeting.

Step # 4 -- Put options/action items under appropriate goals (and generate additional options as appropriate).

Step # 5 -- Characterize each option/action item as research, policy, governance, and so on.

Step # 6 -- Evaluate options/action items based on criteria generated at meeting.

Criteria to Evaluate Options/Action Items

After short presentations by each working group, along with preliminary discussion, the participants identified the following criteria to evaluate options/action items. There was not a complete discussion of this topic – therefore this list preliminary and builds upon comments made in Advisory Committee meeting #1:

1. Does the proposed action advance the four CAMP goals?
2. Will the proposed action have a measureable impact?
3. Is the proposed action legal (currently or within reasonable changes of law)?
4. Is the proposed action technically feasible?
5. Is the proposed action socially acceptable?
6. Is the proposed action financially feasible?

What do we need to know and how do we learn it?

The Committee identified several questions that they would like answered in real-time discussions with those individuals that are familiar with the data in the USGS Hydrological Study and other members of the ad hoc resource network.

There were several questions addressed directly to the Future Demand Study:

- Will the study include consumptive use as part of the discussion of surface-ground interaction?
- What explains how more effluent without aquifer mining equals water loss in river?
- What kinds of consumptive use affect the river flow? Where?
- Will the classes of withdrawal be defined?
- Identify the difference between what is being pumped and what is being consumed.
- How much of the mining of the river is contributed by Idaho and how much by Washington?
 - Spokane County study may answer this
- Will the Future Demand numbers be able to fit with the USGS Hydrological model?
- Is supply steady or volatile for the next 50 years?
- What's the difference in reuse instead of directly depositing in river?
- How does upstream augmentation translate to downstream benefits?

Public Comment

Members of the audience had two chances to provide input and advice throughout the meeting – once in the morning and once in the afternoon. While nobody commented in the afternoon, two people shared information with the Committee.

- Shane O'Shea, Idaho Department of Lands, distributed a handbook on forestry practices for the Advisory Committee members.

Next Steps

The participants discussed the schedule of meetings for the next four months, and agreed to the following dates:

March 5, 2010

April 16, 2010

May 7, 2010

June 4, 2010

During the March meeting, the participants agreed to start the meeting with no more than two hours of dialogue between Committee members and a panel of scientific and technical resources people. To prepare for this dialogue, the Committee asked the facilitation team to circulate the list of questions raised during this meeting to the Committee members – soliciting additional questions. The final list of questions will be shared with members of the panel in advance of the March meeting so they can prepare appropriately.

Although the Committee seemed to be leaning against any more formal presentations per se, the facilitation team recommends that we kick-start the panel discussion with a very short (20 minute) presentation by Christian Petrich, who is conducting the future demand

study. After this opening presentation, the Committee will engage in a question and answer dialogue with the resource panel for not more than two hours.

After the panel dialogue, the Committee seemed amenable to breaking into two or three working groups to continue addressing selected issues for the CAMP. At this point, the facilitation team recommends using the format developed by the Working Group on Water Supply. The facilitation team further recommends that two working groups should be created for the day – water supply and aquifer protection (keeping in mind that this is a Comprehensive Aquifer Management Plan). These working groups will work from roughly 10:30 to 2:30, and members of the ad hoc resource network will be available to answer questions throughout the day.

On the advice of the IDWR and the facilitation team, the participants seemed to agree to use the community room at the Public Library in Coeur d'Alene as a standard meeting place – assuming it is available. Kootenai County and Idaho Department of Lands may have other options for future meetings.