



February 3rd and 4th Meeting Summary For the Treasure Valley Comprehensive Aquifer Management Plan Advisory Committee (Meeting #10)

Meeting goals

1. Review the decisions made at the January 7 meeting.
2. Finish discussion converting Options to Recommendations – Goal 1 Water Supply.
3. Hear presentation: Reasonably Anticipated Future Needs.
4. Assess the results of the Goal 2 matrix – conflict prevention.
5. Begin moving tentative decisions to a more final “recommendation” format.
6. Consider whether/how the Committee can assess specific action plans or identify targets with which to measure recommendations (for example, “achieve [recommended action] by a date.”)

List of Advisory Committee participants

Ron Abramovich	Paul Deveau	Kathy Peter
Brent Adamson	Dave Dixon	Clinton Pline
Doug Amick	Gary Duspiva	Scott Rhead
Jamie Anderson	Mike Echieta	Jayson Ronk
Michelle Atkinson	Allen Funkhouser	Gary Shoemaker
Rex Barrie	Michael Fuss	Lon Stewart
Ellen Berggren	Matt Howard	Warren Stewart
Jon Bowling	Chris Jones	John Thornton
Vern Case (for Gayle Batt)	Bill Larson	Rick Ward
Russ Dane	Meg Leatherman	Paul Woods
Kevin Decker	Brian Patton	Mark Zirschky

Attendance constitutes approximately 83% of the Advisory Committee.

Facilitators: Joseph McMahon, Daisy Patterson

IDWR: Helen Harrington and Neeley Miller

Welcome, Introductions, and Review of Agenda

The Facilitation Team, the Advisory Committee and the public observers all introduced themselves. Joe McMahon explained that the agenda for day two would be determined at the end of day one.

Reasonably Anticipated Future Needs Water Rights

Interim Director Gary Spackman, Idaho Department of Water Resources, delivered a brief explanation of Reasonably Anticipated Future Needs (“RAFN”) water rights,



and suggestions for how the Committee might consider RAFN water rights through CAMP.

A RAFN water right allows an applicant to secure a water right without having to demonstrate the need for that right in the 5-year period normally required for water rights. This RAFN right helps municipal providers by providing a much longer planning horizon to help them strategize their investments and plan for growth. The RAFN planning horizon is established by the provider seeking the RAFN water right. Predictions must be reasonable and agreed upon by the Department. The longer the horizon, the less certainty can be attributed to the predictions.

The term “municipal provider” refers to three distinct entities:

1. A municipality;
2. An entity that has a franchise with a public utilities commission; and
3. An entity that has a service area (and is regulated by DEQ).

In urbanizing areas, there are opportunities for a work group like the CAMP Advisory Committee to offer the surrounding communities a template for how to go forward securing RAFN water rights. Municipal providers are often competing to expand service areas and promote water. An alternative to competition would be a coordinated RAFN effort to establish a common planning horizon, a common vision of how the area will grow, and then address the acquisition of water rights.

One Committee member asked if, given that 50 years, at least in terms of storage structures, would an application of a 100-year planning horizon be laughed at? Gary Spackman described a tension surrounding appropriating water for that long. Each application needs to employ background numbers that support the selected planning horizon.

Question raised: How do RAFN water rights align with surface and groundwater priorities? Gary: RAFN doesn't trump “first in line, first in right.”

Question: Is there water available RAFN? The adjudication showed that there will be some extra water available for appropriation in some locations. Even if that is the case, one Committee member asked if additional diversions have negative impact on existing water rights.

Question: Would the creation of a groundwater management area help answer some of these questions related to RAFN applications and provide a forum for RAFN discussion? Gary said he was reluctant to suggest a government structure or designation. He said that this Advisory Committee could suggest a template for how those questions are answered or how a forum could be created.

Gary pointed out that the water right doesn't expire at the end of the planning horizon. The horizon in a RAFN provides a longer time to develop the right, or to demonstrate the use of that right.



Potential for Managed Recharge in the Treasure Valley

Bryce Contor, Idaho Department of Water Resources, provided a presentation on the Potential for Managed Recharge Study (“Recharge Study”).

The Recharge Study suggests that there is 200,000 to 400,000 ccf of potential storage for managed recharge. Managed recharge can be accomplished through two approaches: (1) transfer of water with canals to specific sites, and (2) use of canals as recharge mechanisms.

The two issues of (a) the effect of storage on water rights and (b) what water can be stored are applicable to both surface storage projects and managed recharge.

Bryce stated that managed recharge is generally appropriate for most locations where the water table is more than 50 ft below the ground surface. Managed recharge is possible in areas with a high water table – but only if you overdraft and back fill. During a drought, there are areas where the system could be strategically overdrafted with the intent of managing recharge in that area later.

The Recharge Study is complete to the extent of its intended use and will be available through the IDWR website.

If managed recharge is to be pursued in the Treasure Valley, the next steps include:

- (a) work with canal organizations to firm up estimates of capacity and willingness to participate; and,
- (b) answering questions regarding the legal and physical supply of water for recharge.

The site owners also need to be asked what they would need in order to convey the extra acre feet to the recharge site.

The Recharge Study was an initial inquiry into this topic. As such, the Recharge Study did not include conversations to owners of gravel pits whose sites are included in the report. The Recharge Study does not suggest a willingness on the part of the landowner to use those sites – that remains to be assessed and discussed. Further, the Recharge Study did not look at flood control as a potential source for recharge water.

For more information, contact Bryce Contor: bcontor.uidaho@gmail.com.

CAMP Draft Development

The Advisory Committee continued to discuss and shape the ideas that should be included in the recommended plan that the Committee transfers to the Board.

The Committee requested that a drafting subgroup be created to further refine the draft language and provide a draft prioritization of recommendations for Advisory



Committee review. The drafting subgroup was created and consists of Rex Barrie, Russ Dane, Matt Howard, Chris Jones, Kathy Peter, Rick Ward, Paul Woods (“Drafting Group”).

The Advisory Committee also requested that another subgroup take on the development of ideas on Reasonably Anticipated Future Needs water rights to be included in the next draft of CAMP. The RAFN working group consists of Michael Fuss, Scott Rhead, Mike Eicheta, Jayson Ronk, Warren Stewart Doug Amick, Gary Shoemaker, Bill Larson, Russ Dane, and John Thornton (“RAFN Group”).

The Drafting Group and RAFN Group will meet prior to the March meeting and provide new information for the Committee to review at the March meeting.

Public Comment

Liz Paul, Idaho Rivers United, suggested that the CAMP recommend that the Board resume and complete the Comprehensive Basin Plan for the Boise River. Smaller plans exist for various parts of the Boise River area, and Liz suggests that the Board should take them all, fill gaps, and develop a basin-wide plan.

Next Meeting

The next Treasure Valley CAMP meeting will be March 15-16.

The Committee is providing input on potential dates for an April meeting. The Committee will decide in March whether they would like to meet in April.