Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer (ESPA)
Comprehensive Aquifer Management Plan

Advisory Committee

Meeting Notes

Date: Tuesday, June 5, 2007
Time: 10:00 am - 5:00 pm
Location: College of Southern Idaho, Twin Falls

Attendees:

Advisory Committee Members

1. Alex LaBeau – Idaho Association of Commerce and Industry
2. Randy MacMillan – Clear Springs Foods
3. Dee Reynolds – Fall River Electric
4. Roger Buchanan – Domestic Well
5. Jeff Raybould – Fremont-Madison Irrigation District
6. George Katseanes – Blackfoot
7. Kim Goodman – Trout Unlimited
8. Craig Evans – Water District 120
9. Rich Rigby – Bureau of Reclamation
10. Dean Stevenson – Magic Valley Ground Water District (MVGWD)
11. Will Whelan – The Nature Conservancy
12. Lloyd Hicks – Burgess Canal Company
13. Jared Fuhriman – City of Idaho Falls
14. Rebecca Casper – Ball Ventures
15. Roger Chase – City of Pocatello
16. Roy Mink – IWRRI
17. Alison Beck-Hass – US Fish and Wildlife Service
18. Barry Burnell – Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
19. Don Parker – Water District 110
20. Scott Clawson – Water District 110
21. Vince Alberdi – Twin Falls Canal Co.
22. Lance Clow – City of Twin Falls
23. Stan Standal – Mixed Use
24. Dave Parrish – Idaho Fish and Game
25. Randy Bingham – Burley Irrigation
26. Steve Howser – Aberdeen Spring Field Canal
27. Linda Lemmon –Idaho Aquaculture Association
28. Bob Muffley – Middle Snake Regional Water Resource Commission
29. Steven Serr – Bonneville County
30. Hal Anderson – IDWR
31. Max Vaughn – Minidoka County Assessor

Other Attendees

32. Dell Raybould – State Representative
33. Norm Semanko – IWUA
34. Jonathan Parker – IWUA

Deleted: l

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

35. Adam Little – IWUA Intern
36. Matt Darington – IWUA Intern
37. Brian Patton – IDWR
38. Bryce Contor – IWWRI
39. Harriet Hensley – Attorney General's Office
40. Peter Anderson – Trout Unlimited

MEETING AGENDA

1. Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review and Meeting Note Finalization
2. Discussion: Review and Approve Operating Protocols
3. Presentation and Discussion: ESPA Water Budget (Bryce Contor IWWIRI)
4. Presentation and Discussion: Technical studies to support Committee review of management alternatives (Brian Patton IDWR)
5. Discussion: Review and Approve Work Plan
6. Discussion: Next Steps, Other Issues and Meeting Scheduling
7. Public Comment

WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS & AGENDA REVIEW

Diane Tate, CDR Associates, welcomed the Advisory Committee and facilitated introductions. Diane reviewed the agenda and the meeting notes from May 10, 2007. Diane asked the Committee whether the meeting notes were in a useful format and at an appropriate level of detail, mentioning that the notes attempted to capture only major discussion points. Committee members expressed comfort with the meeting notes and suggested no modifications to the format. Diane highlighted the Interest-Based problem solving section of the meeting notes and asked whether the summary provided was an accurate reflection of the Committee's needs and concerns. Committee members concurred with the content of the section and asked that the list of interests be updated as the process continues. Diane noted that the challenge of the Advisory Committee is to address the full range of interests outlined. A Committee member expressed his desire that the group move quickly to discussion of the substantive issues involved in ESPA management, and use time together effectively and meaningfully. The member also added that it was important to hear the perspectives of the state and federal agencies participating in the process.

OPERATING PROTOCOLS

Jonathan Bartsch, CDR Associates, facilitated the Operating Protocol discussion. The Committee reviewed, modified and ultimately approved the revised Operating Protocols. After extensive discussion the entire Advisory Committee, including alternates and agency participants, agreed to adhere to the discussion guidelines outlined in the Protocols. Jonathan noted that the Protocols are the first Advisory Committee agreement and will be used as a guide to future deliberations.

The Committee discussed numerous issues regarding the Operating Protocols including 1) the Committee's deliberation parameters and authority to propose legislative changes, and 2) whether and how the range of stakeholder interests will be addressed during the process. The Committee agreed that it will pursue changes in current state statute and/or laws if they are determined to be an impediment to effective water management, as long water rights are viewed as a property rights. Additionally, after significant discussion, the Committee recognized that its task is to address the range of water interests represented on the Committee. See attached June 5, 2007 Final Operating Protocols.

The following are questions and comments raised during the Operating Protocol discussion.

I. Advisory Committee Purpose

1) Beneficial Use, Water User's Needs and Addressing Committee Members Needs

A suggestion was made to change the purpose statement to include "beneficial uses of Idaho's water," so as to more explicitly include fish and wildlife and municipal interests. Some members commented that the proposed change did not make a substantive difference and asked for clarification regarding the term 'beneficial use'. Another member noted the purpose statement focuses only on consumptive use of water, and mentioned that the Committee should also consider natural resource issues. It was noted that the statement in the Protocols of "water user's needs" implies water rights.

Q: Is beneficial a loaded word? Is there a statutory definition? A: There is a list that is included in the spring flow statute, and includes aesthetics, fisheries, and wildlife. A list of places within state statues where further information about the concept of beneficial use can be found will be circulated to Committee members.

A member stated that the Committee should focus on efforts within existing state statutes, adding the opinion that the term 'manage' should not imply anything counter to state law. The Committee should base what it does on current state water law; if we want the legislature to change water law, that's a different story. The most important aspect is that the prior appropriation doctrine is adhered to as we deliberate, since this is a property right.

A different Committee member stated that in the legislation (SCR 136) and in the Framework document, it talks about satisfying existing beneficial uses; we need to make sure we're following what the legislature told us to do, and make sure we don't circumvent the prior

appropriation doctrine. We shouldn't take it upon ourselves to change those laws, we're focused on management.

Another Committee member noted that the existing law is part of what has gotten us into the current water situation. Those who put together the legislation advocated for an inclusive process that broadened the number of interest groups, and the member expressed the opinion that it would be a mistake to not ensure those interests are covered in our language.

It was also highlighted that the Committee is not in a position to change a law that defines a vested right. However, laws do a lot of other things – create a planning process, policy changes etc... It was suggested that existing laws be put into the context the Committee interests and considered through the process.

Other members expressed the view that Committee discussions should not be limited. They noted that right now the constitution and statute are what we've got to live with; some resolution might surface that suggests statutes be changed from where they are currently.

Jonathan noted that from the facilitator's view, the Committee needs to be consistent with existing laws, especially prior appropriation doctrine, but that there is room for legislative changes and modification if it can better meet water users needs.

A member noted that he had resisted the idea of wordsmithing the Protocols because he viewed their interests as captured elsewhere in the Protocols. It was noted that the Committee is in place due to a dispute among water users, and the core issue is how to resolve that dispute; however the solutions identified may be shaped to provide benefits to a range of other interests and may have impacts on those interests. The member expressed an interest in explicitly recognizing that the full range of water uses will be considered by the Committee.

Other Committee members highlighted that while the discussion of changing law may be premature, that the Committee should not limit its ability to make recommendations, including changes in the law if necessary. Some expressed the desire that the Committee remain open to looking at changes when we get to that stage, and if a need is identified. It was also clarified that the Committee will address water quality issues, not just issues of water quantity. Other members noted that the Committee has a significant challenge given how difficult it is to reach agreement on the Operating Protocols.

An additional proposal was made to separate the purpose statement from the introductory paragraph, and encourage the Committee to address the elements outlined in the Framework document. An alternate proposal was made and accepted by the Committee to change the language to "meet Idaho's water needs" was suggested as well as to clarify that we are discussing the ESPA (See Final Operating Protocols).

II – Comprehensive Aquifer Management Plan (CAMP)

Committee members discussed a proposal to add an additional objective to the Committee charge. It was noted that the goal and objectives had been approved and adopted by the Board

and as a result it should not change. Jonathan noted the Committee had expressed a commitment to address the range of water issues.

ESPA WATER BUDGET

Bryce Contor, Idaho Water Resources Research Institute, made a presentation to the Committee regarding the Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer Water Budget. The presentation provided an overview of a Water Budget (purpose, hydrology, process and divergent opinions), explained the relative magnitude of water budget components, discussed uncertainty, provided some descriptive detail (calculation methods, data sources) and solicited discussion. The goal of the presentation was to provide Committee members with a basic understanding of the importance of a Water Budget and highlight where the Committee could focus its efforts. Contor noted that management options closest to the river will have the largest immediate effect and that climate changes are a significant factor to consider in the management of the aquifer. While the presentation focused on the water budget, Committee members also asked questions about the ESPA groundwater model developed by IWRRI.

The following points summarize discussion during and after the presentation. In these points, "modeling committee" refers to the Eastern Snake Hydrologic Modeling Committee, or ESHMC, a group of modelers working with IWRRI and the State on continuous model improvement.

Discussion points:

- Words like equilibrium, balance, health etc. have many different definitions, and these need to be discussed by the committee. One definition of "out of balance" is that the amount of water stored in the aquifer will go down. Also, committee members raised that equilibrium and status of appropriations are different concepts. The only way to use the model to determine whether current conditions are "in balance" is to run the scenario out many years and see if the values approach a steady state – these trend lines were discussed.
- Q: Is the change in storage within the aquifer something that is derived from other inputs in the model, or is it measured? A: There is a divergence of opinion within the modeling committee over how to deal with change in aquifer storage. Wells can be measured, but that only tells you part of the information. It is also important to understand the storage coefficient – the amount of water than can be stored in any one part of the aquifer. We found a period of 22 years where the water levels were the same at the beginning of the period and the end of the period. By using this as our time period for modeling, we avoid having change in aquifer storage as one of our variables.
- There is a divergence of opinion within the modeling committee as to whether underground flow from tributary basins should be considered as constant over time or variable.
- The model contains a complicated set of inputs and outputs, and is not linked to a surface water flow model.

- The modelers have used the water budget presented here to develop a "current practices" modeling scenario that examines what would happen to aquifer levels if current uses of water stay the same. Details can be found at the following FTP site: ftp://ftp.state.id.us/idwr/Outgoing
- Q: Can the model help you determine where spring flows might increase if groundwater pumping was limited? Yes, but not at the level of specific springs.
- After the groundwater model was developed, it was calibrated to see how closely the model results conformed to what actually happened during the 22 year calibration period, and adjustments were made. Some attempts have also been made at quantifying the level of uncertainty with the results.
- In an 11,000 square mile aquifer, it is difficult to solve all of the equations contained in the groundwater model, and the modeling committee is discussing methods to estimate what can't be solved.
- Hard data used to calculate the water budget included crop water use data, crop coverage data, diversion data, precipitation and other atmospheric data, and spring discharge data. Some data on return flows from irrigation canals were used.
- Q: What percentage of input to the aquifer comes from precipitation? A: The percentage is small, as most of the area overlying the aquifer receives an average of 10 to 12 inches of rainfall per year.
- Measurements of the depth of water in groundwater wells only capture the condition of the aquifer at one point in time. The model estimates transmissivity within the aquifer (the ability of water to move through the aquifer) to come up with a way to model aquifer flow.
- Q: Has the model been used to analyze what would happen if all groundwater pumping stopped? A: No, no one has authorized the modelers to conduct that experiment.
- Do we know exactly what the inputs and outputs are to the aquifer today? What about the total "deficit"? What is the difference between those?
- There are debates about whether we have seen all of the "lag effect" from past withdrawals from the aquifer. Lag effect refers to the fact that impacts from aquifer withdrawals far away from the river may not felt by springs at the river for a long period of years. The concept of equilibrium needs to consider the potential that all impacts from aquifer withdrawals may not have been realized at this point in time.
- Science can help answer questions, but can not make policy.
- How will the ESPA Management Plan deal with drought conditions, which impact available water?
- The potential for change in water use patterns, and in the regional climate, impact decisions made based on the water budget. One modeling scenario is based on assuming these things will not change – is this realistic?
- One way to think about the aquifer: it is a bank account into which deposits are made, and from which withdrawals are taken. Setting what level of water should remain in the account and what withdrawals are permissible is a policy decision.

TECHNICAL STUDIES TO SUPPORT COMMITTEE REVIEW OF MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES

Brian Patton, IDWR, made a presentation entitled "Adjusting Supply and Demand: Technical Analysis to Support the ESPA Management Plan." Brian briefly outlined the Technical Study Tasks at the May 10, 2007 Committee meeting which raised a number of follow-up questions from the Committee. Brian focused the presentation on means to increase water supply. The goal of the presentation was to outline the studies that are being conducted to assist in the Committee deliberations and to build understanding of Committee needs and concerns. The presentation is posted on the Committee website.

The following are comments and questions raised during the discussion.

Flow Augmentation and High Lift Projects

Q: Can someone define flow augmentation? A: The Bureau of Reclamation has consulted with NOAA fisheries on the impacts of Bureau operations on salmon and steelhead – specifically how the amount of water released at various times of the year impacts reproduction of key fish species. We've committed to provide 200,000 acre-feet from the upper valley to meet that agreement. Flow augmentation helps salmon migrate to the ocean. Q: What is the role of IDP in flow augmentation? A: As far as the state is concerned, they have no role, BOR might feel differently.

There would need to be some shaping, managing the timing of the water release**,** to make using water obtained by purchasing high lift water rights work for flow augmentation projects. Since the high lift water rights are further down the river than the current sources of flow augmentation water, there would be a need to hold this water and release it so that it looks the same to the fish as the water coming from the upper valley reservoirs. Participants also noted that exchanging upper basin water for lower basin water for purposes of flow augmentation might mean getting less credit against the total flow augmentation requirement for the same amount of water. It is not just the amount of water, but timing that is critical to flow augmentation. Additionally, new information suggests fall Chinook are migrating out of the river sooner. What used to occur in July or August, is now happening by mid July.

Q: Is the full diversion counted as flow augmentation if we buy high lift? How does BOR do this accounting? A: **It was suggested that information on flow augmentation be put together and distributed to Committee members.**

It was noted that the high-lift water purchased from Bell Rapids is being used to satisfy the Nez Perce tribal agreement, and was a special arrangement. It was also noted that the Bureau of Reclamation, the State and the cities of Idaho paid for this acquisition. A groundwater representative noted that his district got involved in the Bell Rapids acquisition, and that one of the problems was the 20% loss of water. Q: Is there a way to smooth that out? A: The way to do this is to plan for it in the long-term since in a year to year, one can't fix problems early enough.

There is a period where no exchange water is required, and one can be stuck with water with no where to go. Also, sometimes there is not 20 kaf coming out of the upper snake to exchange it for. These kinks need to be worked out. A member requested a presentation on the 'kinks' of the system, to see what the Committee could do about them.

Q: How much high lift water is out there? Is there any? A: Brian noted that when the Board solicited proposals that resulted in Bell Rapids purchase, it also got other proposals. The Department is going through those previous proposals to see how much might be available and whether they are still interested in selling.

Additional Storage and Rental Pool

Q: How much water are we talking about in the Payette rental pool? Q: Are we using present storage to full capacity? A: Yes, we're using storage to the full capacity.

It was noted that the Payette pushed back against the idea of doing anything for the ESPA. The Payette wants to keep Cascade reservoir full year round, they don't want us to release any until August 30. We'd like to have it out by July 15, but we have a really hard time getting the water out by then.

It was discussed that through the Boise system an attempt to reserve water for growth of those municipalities was being made. Participants asked about the possibility of doing something similar in the ESPA.

Q: The Payette rental pool is shown as an option, and with some sort of exchange are there similar options in the Boise system? A: No, this has not been considered given the increasing demands in the Treasure Valley area. Q: Would you consider additional storage in the Boise system? A: Other parties are currently considering that and it could provide more options for shaping water. New storage sites in Boise would store quite a bit more water than what is available in the Boise rental pool.

Q: How does a rental pool work? A: A rental pool is a system where the Bureau has developed contracts with water users to hold water, and when those users don't use all that storage, they can lease that storage to other users on a year to year basis. It was noted that storage owners, not the state, paid for the storage. Storage contracts relate to the percentage of dam construction costs paid by users. Storage owners voluntarily provide water to the rental pool. The state authorizes this process and the price is set by the Committee of Nine. The intent was to keep people irrigating. Renting water for agricultural purposes above Milner is the cheapest water to rent. For example, the Committee of Nine sets tiered pricing arrangements, an outlines the consequences of renting water. The bigger the risk you take with your water, the more money you get for it in the rental pool.

Deleted: it is not supposed to be market or dollar based

Recharge

It was mentioned that the expected maximum benefit of recharge efforts, using the Board's water rights and existing canal systems, is 40,000 Acre-Feet annually. Q: What about injection directly into the aquifer? A: If we want to build constructed recharge facilities on the Eastern Snake Plain, they will involve injection wells. The IWRB is currently studying the use of injection wells for the purposes of recharge. This is the conclusion that we've come to in the W Canal project.

Q: Are sinkholes, for recharge, an option? A: No, if the state is going to be involved in recharge, it has to protect public health and public safety. One lesson learned from other states involved in recharge operations is that they are lawsuit magnets. It was noted that addressing issues of water quality may involve a rudimentary sand/gravel filter prior to injection.

Q: Is an injection site is different than a recharge site? A: The soils – clay – make recharge options such as in settling basins impractical in the ESPA.

Q: Using the existing canal systems how much recharge can be accomplished, and during what time of the year? A: Maximum recharge of 40 kaf with the Board's existing water rights can occur during the shoulders of the irrigation season (before irrigation begins and shortly afterward). We need to look at using excess natural flow on the shoulders to recharge as well. One question is whether using storage water for recharge makes sense from a cost/benefit perspective. For example does it make sense to buy water from the rental pool and put it in another storage system? It may make sense if the water will be 'spilled' for flood control purposes anyway.

From 1996 to 2000 recharge has been done on the 'shoulders' of the irrigation system. There has been an average of 150,000 acre-feet recharged for those six consecutive years. It was noted that one of the things not considered during those seasons was the Milner hydropower operations issue. The Northside canal system is great for recharge, but during irrigation season there is no capacity.

The Committee needs to understand the Palisades agreement, and Idaho power situation on recharge.

Conversions (hard and soft)

Q: Soft conversion and hard conversion – what are those? A? Soft conversions are an idea that includes canal systems that have a large number of supplemental wells. The opportunity is to deliver more water down those canal systems to replace well water; in order to make this happen it would need new surface water supplies. The conversion would be supplying surface water when available and when the canals have capacity, and using groundwater at other times. A hard conversion is permanent replacement of groundwater with surface water as an irrigation water source.

Weather Modifications

Q: Is cloud seeding like stealing the water from the next guy? Should we be making a claim on Oregon, since they are doing cloud seeding? A: Some experts say you're not actually stealing water from you neighbor but enhancing the water supply. That is one question we've identified and want to explore in the weather modification study – would there be downstream effects?

It was noted that all data on downwind effects have shown a positive impact. The amount of precipitation that comes out of a cloud during a weather event is small, about 10% of the water that is in that system. Cloud seeding changes the amount of rainfall by some percent, which is a

small percentage, but can create a fair amount of water on the ground. Not all of the seeds have the effect in the area you're aiming for, some are downstream.

We depend on the Wyoming watershed a great deal and they are doing quite a bit of cloud seeding. It was noted that Wyoming is spending over $8 million on various weather modification studies - there is real interest in this approach. In the past they examined tributaries to the Salt and Snake rivers as areas for Wyoming to conduct weather modification, however from Wyoming's analysis all the benefits would accrue to Idaho, so Wyoming was not interested in pursuing. These are areas for Idaho to investigate.

A summary of data on weather modification was requested. Q: How do you know it wouldn't have snowed that much if you hadn't done anything – what is the control scenario? How do you determine you've had a positive effect? A: The most difficult part is quantifying what the effects are going to be and determining what you use for control. **The studies from Wyoming will be distributed to the entire Committee.** Weather modification is a big issue for some western states as it may be their only opportunity to increase available water supplies. We didn't do it this winter, perhaps that's our control scenario.

Bingham County tried cloud seeding for a few years and stopped because it was no longer believed it was helping in our area. Our efforts may have helped in other areas, but weren't cost effective for us. It was also noted that Idaho Power has been conducting weather modification studies that can be learned from. In other parts of Idaho, cloud seeding has been conducted for quite a few years – it is difficult but we have seen positive results. The fact is that where you had the seeding machines, you have substantially more precipitation than where you didn't have the machines.

Q: How do we address the potential disconnect between the technical analysis and the deliberations of the Committtee? We need to be deliberate about not pushing decisions until the 11th hour, but need to have this information before we can make decisions. A: We are trying to move these studies along, but IDWR doesn't receive the money for RFPs until July 1, 2007. We hope we can get information in a timely manner to support the Committee deliberations.

As a response, it was suggested that the CAMP could make recommendations and say – "pending ongoing studies, tweak it here and there." We cannot wait for all of the information to be provided and need to make recommendations to the Board. It was suggested that the Committee could also request to the Board that this analysis is done more quickly.

See attached PowerPoint Presentation.

ESPA Work Plan

The ESPA Work Plan was reviewed and approved by the Advisory Committee. See attached Final ESPA Work Plan.

The following are questions and discussion notes from the Work Plan agenda item, presented as they were raised by particpants.

Q: Why are we setting interim targets? . A: Any target is moveable as it evaluated and changed and that adaptive management is necessary. It was noted that by setting 5 – 10 year targets, actions can be evaluated on the basis of whether they achieved the desired effect over the time period.

The Committee should have a discussion about how best to get to the quantification of qualitative goals. In order to make progress we need more details to make real recommendations, we need more numbers such as the cost of injection wells. The details will help to quantify target – cost per acre foot in an injection well – is this worth our time?

Need details for increasing supply or decreasing demand – need to know the cost and what can be accomplished. In order for the Committee to make progress we need to evaluate the real costs and get a handle on how much money and how much water is needed, obviously there is not an unlimited amount of water. We have to get a handle on the magnitude of the problem, the resources needed.

The interim targets and management alternatives need to interact with one another to: 1) develop an array of ways to set targets, bracket the range of interests and alternatives and 2) then square these options with the range of costs and policy implications. A matrix around this topic would be helpful.

When picking the targets we need to carefully consider the cost and benefits and determine how much water there is and who is using this water. The committee should determine how many acre-feet of water are we talking about by finding an agreeable source of this data.

The Strawman Proposal of 2004 was discussed and characterized. One option is to start with the Strawman Proposal, which examined adjusting supply and demand as a way to balance the aquifer water budget. The Strawman may be a place for the Committee to start considering the interim targets. There are preliminary cost estimates developed with specifics regarding the mortar and concrete to implement conversion projects. One of the tough issues with the Strawman was how difficult it was to 'sell' this idea to our constituents (groundwater users). One option is to lay out the various positions of the parties and have a presentation and discussion about them. Additionally it would useful to have a presentation on the Strawman Proposal from Clive Strong (Attorney General's Office).

One approach, advocated by the surface water coalition, is to look at a 20 year timeframe between 1980 and 2000, and use the average _____ as a target goal. This is one way of knowing where we are going as we develop a management plan. We need to determine what kind of water budget change is possible and what can be achieved from each of the management alternatives. We need to know what the target water balance is and then we can tell where we need to go. A problem is that, especially with the technical presentations, many of us don't know the questions to ask to get us there.

One approach is for cities to buy water now based on future needs and lease it to the state to address current issues. Some cities cannot use water that is below Milner Dam, which is a constraint.

The question is what is it going to take to stabilize the aquifer? How much more water is it going to take meet the target? We need to pick aquifer water levels during some past year as the target. In order for this to be accomplished we need more specific information versus a lot of general information. The challenge is that many of the group do not have a complete foundation in terms of knowing what the main issues are from the perspective of each water use; groundwater, surface water, fish propagation, etc. The group wants to have an understanding of positions, including what the impacts of any proposed solutions might be. We need to understand the issues and solutions – so we have a solid foundation. There has not been a forum for dealing with this in the past. Determining what the appropriate level of the aquifer is depends on your perspective; we should look at what is 'doable' and avoid setting a hard target.

It is important to at least start with some numbers that represent the status quo that we can agree upon, including the difference between water allocation and water delivery. We don't have a good sense of where we need to get.

Two Committee issues were outlined including that we don't have the 'facts' and that we have a coding or translation problem with the terminology. For example the terms 'equilibrium' or 'balance' do not have a shared definition. We need to get past our 'coding' problems. One way to increase understanding is the basic 'Water 101' DVD that was put together by the Middle Snake Commission. It was suggested that this DVD be distributed to the Committee.

It was requested that all documents referenced during this discussion be posted on the Board's ESPA website.

NEXT STEPS AND MEETING PLANNING

Diane and Jonathan proposed that input received on how to determine the quantitative target be considered and that an approach be proposed by CDR for Committee review.

The Committee will meet on the fourth Thursday of each month and that the locations will be rotated across the ESPA. Meetings will be held between 10 am and 5 pm. The 4th Thursday in November is Thanksgiving Day, so an alternate date will be proposed. The proposed dates and locations include:

- July 26, 2007 – Idaho Falls
- August 23, 2007 – TBD
- September 27, 2007 – TBD
- October 25, 2007 – TBD