Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer (ESPA)
Comprehensive Aquifer Management Plan

Advisory Committee

Meeting Notes

Date: Thursday, September 27th, 2007
Time: 9:00 am - 5:00 pm
Location: Rexburg Chamber of Commerce, Rexburg ID

MEETING AGENDA

1. Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review and Meeting Note Finalization
2. Presentation and Discussion: Report from Quantitative Goal Sub-Committee
3. Presentations and Discussion: Additional Surface Water Storage
4. Presentations and Discussion: High-Lift Exchange
5. Presentations and Discussion: Recharge and Water Quality
6. Public Comment

All presentations made during the meeting can be found on the project website: www.espaplan.idaho.gov

WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, AGENDA REVIEW & MEETING NOTE FINALIZATION

Jerry Rigby, Chairman of the Idaho Water Resource Board, opened the meeting and welcomed the Committee to Rexburg. He made brief remarks, expressing the view that the Legislature will want something more than a qualitative description of the Advisory Committee's progress during the 2008 session, to demonstrate progress. He also stressed the Board's hope that the Advisory Committee would be able to reach agreement on a majority of the substantive elements for the Comprehensive Aquifer Management Plan, as the Board does not want to be in the position of making those decisions. After Mr. Rigby's remarks, the group reviewed and approved notes from the August meeting, and all present made introductions.

REPORT FROM QUANTITATIVE GOAL SUB-COMMITTEE

Jonathan distributed a proposal put together by the Quantitative Goal Sub-Committee, and reviewed the basic contents with the group. The Sub-Committee recommends asking the Department to use existing spreadsheet tools to evaluate the potential impacts of the range of water budget changes suggested by the Strawman Proposal. This will be accomplished by analyzing an annual water budget change of 600,000 ac-ft and a water budget change of 900,000

ac-ft. For the purposes of analysis, these changes would be assumed to be spread equally over three areas: above Thousand Springs, within the A&B service area, and above American Falls. Jonathan reported that this proposed analysis was discussed with the Eastern Snake Hydrologic Modeling Committee on September 11th. The following notes record questions, answers, and discussion regarding the proposal of the subcommittee:

Comment: The 600-900 kaf range referenced by the Strawman presumed that many different measures would be combined to make that magnitude of a water budget change, including spring buydowns. It is important to remember that not all water budget changes will happen on the plains.

Comment: The Goal Sub-Committee did not discuss the tools needed to achieve the water budget change. We discussed, as a first step, trying to understand how that magnitude of a change would impact water flows. Since the Strawman numbers are well-known and much-discussed, it seemed like a good place to start.

Comment: The Goal Sub-Committee also drew a distinction between using Strawman numbers and validating or promoting the Strawman, which was designed as a litigation settlement and not as a long-term management plan. We felt it was appropriate to take the numbers from that effort and see what they would do for the aquifer. This is the step before figuring out what implementation strategies to use.

Comment: For many of us that have been involved in the Strawman process, if you use that name it has certain implications. Perhaps we should call it something else?

Q: From the text of this Sub-Committee proposal, it sounds like the Sub-Committee will determine the quantitative target? Is that true?
A: No, the Sub-Committee will only be looking at what process to recommend to the larger group, and the Advisory Committee will develop the quantitative target recommendation.

Comment: Looking at the impacts of a water budget change means starting with the effort or action, and moving to an outcome. I think eventually we want to determine what outcome is desirable, and figure out what actions will help achieve that outcome

Q: What will the output of the analysis be? Do we have the ability to understand how this will affect spring discharge as a quantity, or will it be just a percentage change?

A: (Hal Anderson) The Sub-Committee recommendation is an assignment to IDWR's technical staff to take the numbers in the Strawman proposal and outline the impacts that might be expected from a water budget change. What increases in flows? What changes in groundwater levels? The management alternatives included in the Framework are the same ones identified in the Strawman proposal. In 2004, we developed spreadsheet tools that allow one to put different "stresses" on the aquifer and see the impact, based on responses in each cell as calculated by the model. We will come up with a combination of the alternatives for each of the three target geographic areas identified by the Sub-

Committee and run this through the spreadsheets, and generate graphs and tables that we can bring back to the Sub-Committee, modeling committee and Advisory Committee. All assumptions that are a part of the analysis will be documented for review.

Q: For each of the three geographical areas, you'll be able to come up with a group of actions that will result in a 200-300 kaf water budget change? We'll get the information on what those actions were? I don't want to let the tools limit what we might end up with. Response: What we use for this preliminary analysis won't limit our eventual decisions but will inform further discussion.

Q: Can one assume that by doubling the amount of water budget changes, you'll double the results? A: Not necessarily, and that's the value of analyzing both 600 kaf and 900 kaf water budget changes. Some things are linear, and some aren't.

Comment: Is the Sub-Committee assuming the model is accurate? We're making it a decision maker rather than a tool. I know that this Committee will make the decisions. This model is a tool, not the defining issue. We have to come up with a management tool that might offer some solutions rather than the model being the final say.

Comment: I'm concerned that the first product we get out of this model is not going to be what all of us expect. I think this is a necessary part of the painful process of getting to a recommendation. I don't have any expectations that the model is perfect, but don't know what else to use. This is not a final decision, but an interim step to gather information and improve our understanding.

Comment: The total annual ESPA water budget is around 12 million acre feet. 600 kaf is small, say about 5%. I don't think we can say this impact is definitely going to be measurable. I think the model isn't perfect but it is the best we have to analyze what may happen when you alter a small percentage of a big amount of water.

Comment: The 600-900 kaf range in the Strawman was based on what the people who developed it felt was reasonably achievable.

Comment: The Strawman proposal outlines what management actions make up those numbers, and they are based on certain assumptions in terms of curtailment, etc.

Comment: How can we interject potential impacts to fish wildlife or other biological communities? When will we have a chance to provide input to the underlying model runs?

Comment: I think we will address environmental issues later, and first need to look at actions and understand their potential impacts. What kind of output will we get from this analysis? How do we take any change shown by the analysis, relate it to the underlying trend in spring flows, and understand how the springs may perform in the future?

Comment: (Hal Anderson) The model at the base of this analysis is not a predictive model. Output will consist of a series of graphs and charts that say if we do the things we're assuming in each of these areas, what is going to be the change in reach gains in the river, and groundwater elevations? That will get at the question about impacts to wildlife. We won't get a number for a specific spring, but will get impacts to reach gains. Output will all be based on steady state. We'll be able to say this is what you'll get in the first five years, in ten years, etc.

Comment: There are people with valid water rights who expect answers from this Committee. This group was formed because we've got outstanding water calls and need to bring balance back to this system. As we do that, some of the other questions will be answered. It makes sense that if we increase return flows to river, the resulting situation will be better for fish and wildlife than current conditions. How are we going to deal with the primary problem of unsatisfied water rights?

Comment: We asked the Board at the outset of this process whether this is a settlement process, or a process to bring the aquifer back to balance. If it is just settlement, than some of us are extra thumbs. I think it's the latter – trying to bring this aquifer back into balance.

Comment: I want to make sure I understand the Sub-Committee role. If there are policy choices or assumptions to be made in the process of this analysis, the whole Committee needs to understand those. If the Sub-Committee alone is being asked to review and approve significant assumptions, I think that goes beyond our role. Perhaps a presentation could be made to the entire Committee?

Comment: (Hal Anderson) The Department will take an initial shot at assembling scenarios for the 600 kaf and 900 kaf water budget changes, and work with the Sub-Committee to find the best way of presenting that information and observations to the overall Committee. The Sub-Committee can help us make sure we've got the information everyone needs.

Comment: We need to use this analysis as a starting point, and not waste too much time. We need to look at solving the problem for the future, and fish and city issues will play a role. I say let's start with the Sub-Committee proposal and move on.

After discussion, the group agreed with proceeding with the Goal Sub-Committee recommendation. The Department, as quickly as possible, will run the spreadsheet tools and conduct the analysis. Assumptions and results will then be reviewed by the Sub-Committee and the overall Advisory Committee.

ADDITIONAL SURFACE WATER STORAGE: PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

Brian Patton, IDWR, gave a brief presentation on possible sites for additional surface water storage (see Power Point presentation on website). He highlighted two primary possibilities for

large scale storage: enlargement of Minidoka dam, and reconstruction of Teton dam. The following notes record discussion following Brian's presentation.

Comment: The cost estimates for rebuilding Teton dam seem low. Additionally, the negative perception of rebuilding would be a big issue. Engineers told us a lower structure, providing perhaps 100 kaf of storage, would be a safer and better facility; however the cost per acre-foot of storage goes up with a smaller dam versus a larger dam.

Q: How does the petition to list the Yellowstone Cutthroat Trout affect the feasibility of Teton dam? A: Don't know, but the Director (of IDWR) supports looking at this option.

Q: What would be the capacity for available water storage in 2006? Is this spring runoff?
A: 200 kaf of spring runoff; don't have the 2007 numbers.

Q: Do you have cost estimates for off-stream storage sites?
A: No, not at this point. They are generally of smaller capacity than on-stream sites.

Q: You mentioned 73 possible sites: why did the other 71 fall off the list?
A: Other sites have many more issues to overcome and address. New impoundments on rivers require decades to work through the environmental issues.

Q: A significant concern with raising Milner would be impacts to the wildlife refugee – right now, the shallow edges of the lake are good bird habitat.
A: Any proposed project would need a complete environmental assessment.

Q: Has the Bureau of Reclamation looked at potential impacts from raising Minidoka dam? How far into the process are plans to replace the dam at its existing height?
A: From the BOR perspective, we are too far down the road on plans to replace the structure to consider modifying the dam to make it taller. From the perspective of the irrigation districts that co-own the dam, it will cost money to delay construction, but it is better to stop now and consider raising the dam if someone has funding to do the study and participate in the construction. Construction is scheduled to begin in 2012, and it will cost a million dollars a year to postpone construction. The dam can only be raised a maximum 4 feet.

Q: Since Governor Otter supports developing increased capacity in existing reservoirs, are there any other candidate reservoirs?
A: Teton or Minidoka are the most probable.
Q: How do off-stream reservoirs work, and are they cheaper?
A: Off-stream reservoirs are dry most of the time and fill when water is diverted from the river directly to them. They are more expensive because they require a feeder system, which is sometimes pumped, and a discharge system, which is often gravity driven.

Q: Would Teton or extra storage in Minidoka fill every year?
A: Teton would have the last priority in the system for filling. Minidoka would fill most years.

Q: Is removing sediment in existing reservoirs a way to create more storage?
A: Flushing sediment creates problems for downstream water quality. Dredging is more expensive but may not create the same quality concerns.

Comment: We seem to be dismissing a lot of ideas because they take time. Our forefathers did not say "this will take X number of years to develop, so we can't do it" – if they had we would not have the facilities we do today. It seems almost cavalier to say that we cannot do this. Let's challenge ourselves to be a bit future minded and think about the next generations. We can view this as an investment in the future.

Q: What about flow augmentation below Swan Falls? Has that been investigated?
A: Yes – below Milner, may be able to have water for Treasure Valley and lessen impacts on the upper valley.

Rich Rigby, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, gave a second presentation (available online) on surface water storage. The following notes record discussion after Rich's presentation.

Q: If raising Minidoka could cause interstate flooding, does the $100 million cost estimate provide for mitigation of this impact? A: $100 million is a pre-appraisal cost estimate, and very rough.

Q: Has BOR looked at recapturing aquifer storage? A: We've taken some preliminary looks, and there are probably some opportunities. One conceptual idea: everyone who takes water out of the aquifer pays a fee anyone who puts money into aquifer gets a check – incentive to put water in and disincentive to take it out.

Q: Are there opportunities to help water stay in the aquifer longer?
A: Recharging away from the river helps water stay in the aquifer, but it costs more.

Comment (public): Teton failed because the canyon walls are made of very permeable rock, and all of the openings were not sealed. How could this be prevented if the dam was rebuilt?

Comment: Other states have small, privately operated reservoirs which seem effective.
Q: How do we find out more about the Boise/Payette storage study?
A: BOR will send the facilitators a link to the appraisal report.

Q: If the red tape was eliminated, is raising Minidoka feasible?
A: It is technically feasible, but BOR thinks we are too far into the process to do it now. We have a dam that needs to be fixed. Earlier, we asked if the state was interested, and were told no. Then, we needed one million for the feasibility study, and a promise of 100 million for the construction.

Comment: It would be difficult to get Legislative approval for one million for the feasibility study, let alone $100 million in the future for construction.

Comment: If Minidoka is reconstructed to the current height, does it preclude enlarging the dam later? A: It makes it much more difficult.

Comment: Washington State has committed to new storage – how did they come together to make that happen?

HIGH-LIFT WATER: PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

Brian Patton, IDWR, gave a presentation on high-lift water (available online), specifically opportunities between Bliss and Marsing and how they might be integrated into an aquifer management plan. He also discussed the Bell Rapids purchase, where rights acquired by the State with money from BOR were used to fulfill obligations under the Nez Perce agreement for flow augmentation. The following notes record discussion following the presentation.

Q: What happened to the Bell Rapids land?
A: IWRB purchased the water rights, and the land remained with private owners. Some has been used for wind turbines (60 wind turbines permitted for that area) and some is a part of a dryland grazing operation.

Q: Where did the $24 million to purchase Bell Rapids come from?
A: The money was a combination of local, state and federal funds. The Legislature took money out of the liquor fund (taxes). Over the course of the 30 year lease agreement with the State, the Bureau will pay 21 million for the use of that water, which is where the majority of the money will come from.

Comment: The numbers work out to $437.50 an acre-foot; cheaper than storage.

Q: At the time of the Bell Rapids purchase, how many other proposals were made?
A: There were 110,000 acre-feet sitting in proposals that were not acted upon; if purchased for same price as Bell Rapids, this would be a total of $35 million dollars.
Q: What's the chance there are more than 110,000 acre feet available?
A: There is probably 300,000 ac-ft of high lift water being used in that reach. The total would be enough for a full exchange.

Q: How do you convert the amount of high-lift water purchased to the amount available for downstream flow augmentation? A: The estimates shown do not take power head into account – maintaining the reservoir at the level needed for power generation. In general, because the irrigation season doesn't match the salmon flow window; only 80% of a purchased high-lift right would be available for flow augmentation. This means that if we acquired 110,000 ac-ft, only 88,000 ac-ft would be made available for use on the Eastern Snake Plain.

Q: Could water be shaped through the reservoirs to match the augmentation season?

A: (Jim Tucker) Functionally it could be shaped, but shaping results in less power generation for us. We had an agreement that we would shape some of the Bureau water, and they would deliver energy back to us to compensate. In 2004 the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) terminated that shaping agreement. With this kind of exchange, the water would be flowing in kind of a base flow to the river. Augmentation has traditionally been a block of flow in July or August. We would have to shape it down at Brownlee during high flow, and then have to backflow. We lose head on our generation plants doing that – if we are shaping when we don't need that energy, then we lose generation capacity. We had compensation for that loss through the arrangement with BPA. We shaped their water, essentially releasing during a light load period, and they delivered energy back to us. (Jon Bowling) The end of June/first of July is the highest short-term demand period, but August has a higher total demand for energy than July because August is hotter. In a normal year, Idaho Power tries to keep Brownlee Reservoir as full as we can, as long as we can, to save that energy for the highest demand period. If we have to lose water early, we lose that capacity. In the earlier energy exchange agreement, we operated at a lower head during those high demand months, and got the extra power we needed from BPA.

Comment: (Rich Ribgy) 2004 was the year of the Enron debacle, and prices kept going higher throughout the summer. The agreement was expensive for Bonneville, so they decided not to renew. Ironically, they would have made money on the agreement in the years that followed.

Q: Do you have flow in August to maximize your generation capacity at Brownlee?
A: No. In reality, we import 20-40 percent on any given day to meet our energy demand, from other sources – we buy it on the market.

Comment: Because of the Nez Perce agreement, we are limited to 60,000 ac-ft of natural flow that can be rented to the Bureau in any year. That's a limitation, unless we can change it to allow that water to be used.

Comment: Reclamation likes to rent that water because it firms up the water we need to meet our commitments, and we would like to rent it in any year it is available. This could be allowed with a change in state law.

Q: Did Idaho Power help purchase Bell Rapids? A: No.

Q: The Endangered Species Act (ESA) directed the augmentation, so why would Idaho Power have any influence on the effectiveness of a new volume of water?
A: To make the flow augmentation agreement work, we need Idaho Power to help shape the water so we can consider all of it as augmentation and not take a 20% loss. If you were okay with taking the 20% loss, Idaho Power could have no role.

Q: Are there downstream users interested in acquiring high-lift water?
A: United Water in Boise has acquired high-lift water that they exchange, and it gives them some flexibility. The nuclear plant in Bruno will need to buy water from

somewhere. Other states are also interested in acquiring high lift water, as are land developers near Boise

Q: Given the fact that you don't always have the augmentation volume to deliver, how often would the exchange agreement work in terms of being able to deliver water for other uses?
A: (Brian Patton) There are 8 years between 1982 and 2006 that there would have been no rental pool water coming out of the Upper Snake.
A: (Rich Rigby) Reclamation would use water acquired every year. We could convey to the state whatever rights we had in the Upper Snake in exchange for the high-lift water.

Q: With that same funding, could you buy out marginal groundwater land?
Comment: Doesn't provide any direct benefit to the river, like the exchange does, but flow improvement would be seen over time.

Q: If the Bell Rapids full diversion right was 100,000 and the Federal government was willing to put in money because of flow augmentation benefits, would the agencies find it rational to do a one time contribution toward another exchange?
A: (Rich Rigby) Bell Rapids was a part of the Nez Perce agreement, and we signed an agreement with the State stating what we'd be willing to pay each year for 30 years. We would probably pay that for this water too. In the Bell Rapids agreement, we put in a stipulation that we could pay the total amount down at any time. Right now we're putting 500,000 into the agreement because it is the end of the fiscal year and we have the resources. We could set up that kind of situation again, where we could use surplus money.

Comment: (Roger Chase) I don't think the cities would be opposed to paying for some of this if a portion was reserved for future growth.

Comment: (Rich Rigby) The basic concept of a potential long term agreement is pretty straightforward. We would want to focus attention on the timing issue, talk to NOAA fisheries and make sure we could get a full credit for the full season, and discuss whether Idaho Power should participate.
Comment: (Hal Anderson) Discussing what it would take for Idaho Power to participate is an important part.

Comment: If a senior is paid not to divert, technically that water is available for the next junior user. We have been able to get buy with saying it's not the case with rental pool water, but this issue may need to be addressed.

RECHARGE AND WATER QUALITY: PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

Barry Burnell, DEQ, gave a short presentation on water quality considerations applicable to recharge programs. He stated that managed recharge programs may not need a permit from DEQ, but may instead need DEQ review on the monitoring program. If recharge is accomplished through an injection well, a permit from IDWR may be required. No monitoring

plans are required for incidental recharge, or shoulder season recharge in existing canals. The following notes record discussion after the presentation:

Q: You've shown water quality test values for the mid-Snake; what about the Upper Snake?
A: Mid-Snake values were collected because of TMDL (total maximum daily load) work, and it is safe to say they are relatively the same in the Upper Snake.

Q: Would off-stream storage require water quality monitoring?
A: If the concept is to put the stored water back into the river, and recharge of groundwater, that would affect monitoring requirements. Would have to approach on a case-by-case basis.

Q: It is clear why bacterial contamination is a focus, but why are no other pollutants measured? Metals, etc.?
A: I chose to focus on contaminants that are exceeding limits, such as bacteria. Not many surface water sources exceed metals levels for drinking water.

Q: We've had concerns about whether passive recharge is affecting water quality in springs and therefore in the river.
A: Where water transitions from surface water to groundwater and back again – those are the locations that you have contaminated groundwater that has the potential to move toward surface water. The greatest concerns are inorganic contaminants, VOCs and bacteria.

Comment: Let's come back sometime to the discussion of the potential to create new concerns for surface water habitat if we don't think through the issues associated with water quality.

Q: Does DEQ have experience with a managed recharge site that provides examples of the effectiveness of the State approach?
A: We began trials this summer at the X1 site, but it is premature to put in monitoring wells until we determine whether that site is good for infiltration.

Q: A lot of the contamination seems naturally occurring – what about intentional contamination? Will we start having to monitor because of those concerns?
A: With Homeland Security funds, we're looking at safety of public drinking water systems statewide. We can't spend those funds looking at managed recharge programs. Is it possible for something to happen at a managed recharge site? Yes.

Q: What about injection wells?
A: IDWR permits injection wells, and DEQ acts in an advisory capacity. A current project is planning to use injection wells adjacent to wells that serve public water supplies. Our concern is that those drinking water wells would then be subject to surface waters, and we have rules that govern groundwater under the influence of surface water. It is preferable to install treatment before injection, but DEQ's role is only advisory.

Q: What are the steps for getting approval for a managed recharge program?
A: The document I showed has two appendices which are taken and modified for each project. They ask for a site characterization, groundwater direction, flow amount, evaluation of downgradient users, proposal for where to install a monitoring well, and set up a monitoring plan to collect samples. We've provided some funding to IDWR to help offset monitoring costs.

Q: With the injection well program, is there monitoring of those wells and the surrounding groundwater to see if there's been violation of state groundwater standards?
A: (Brian Patton) The Department would issue a permit, which would usually require monitoring.

Q: Is there evidence that injection wells have caused a violation of water standards?
A: Lots of wells were put in place prior to those rules, and there is localized evidence of violations. I don't know the answer now that the rules are in place. Injection wells have a whole series of requirements within IDWR, and it might help to go through these and discuss state history with injection wells.

Comment: (Rich Rigby) When we built the A&B project, we injected the return water, and then quit because we saw risks in the future and it was easy to figure out something else to do with the excess water.
Comment: (Dan Schaeffer) All but five or six of the injection wells on the A&B system have been closed (used to be 150-200). The whole system changed because we are operating it to not have runoff from the canals.
Comment: (Dean Stevenson) I live on the A&B project, with five wells within a mile of my home. My water has been monitored and never showed contamination.

Q: If someone wants to develop small acre parcels out of a big block of land, each homeowner has to drill a well and put in a septic tank. The developer can't drill one well and put in purification for the whole deal. Does that cause heartburn for DEQ? In the long run, it creates quality problems.
A: (Barry Burnell) The Agency would support development of a public water system under that scenario. The law allows a developer to do what you described, but they have the choice of putting in a public water system.
Comment: It is so much cheaper for the developer to have each homeowner create their own well and septic system that often there isn't another economical option.

Q: What is the difference between an injection well and a sinkhole?
A: Naturally occurring vs. constructed; an injection well is defined in the state rules by a ratio of depth to width.

Other Issues and Topics for Future Meetings

Climate change and the relationship to developing a management plan was discussed.

Comment: The Committee needs objective, unbiased presenters to present a scientific perspective on the boundaries of potential impacts. A number of Idaho scientists are working on climate change as part of the Western Governor's Association and Mayor's are very interested in this issue.

Comment: Any presentation needs to address reliability – how do we plan for reliability in the CAMP? How do we adjust if there is more variability in the system?

Comment one idea is to have a report back from attendees of the climate change workshop in October. The attendees could present a synopsis and handouts of the conference.

It was decided that a briefing from the Climate Change Workshop will be presented at the next Committee meeting.

Comment: We need to use the Committee time wisely in order to make a preliminary recommendation to the legislature in next 3 months. We need to decide whether we are providing concrete recommendations or a general direction. If the weather pattern does not change, there will be a lot of pressure for a concrete plan.

The Committee discussed the goals, products, timeline, and funding for this legislative session (early 2008).

Comment: We need to begin putting together the rudimentary outlines of the plan, summarize what has been learned, and start to address issues (range of benefit, impacts, costs). This can be done in an alternative matrix. Next we need to develop proposals to improve alternatives.

Comment: We need to establish a placeholder in Governor Otter's budget for CAMP. There are two types of funding, continuing money or one-time or surplus $. If the Committee is requesting money for projects we need to get the backing of the Governor.

Comment: Funding is available for on-going Committee activities; however there may be an immediate need for funding of short-term issues, for example if the Minidoka enlargement issues taken on. One idea is to invite the Co-chairs of the Interim Committee to a Committee briefing.

Comment: We need to determine what the Committee strategy is with the legislature during this next session, report or a proposal? Do we report what have we covered, where are we going, or something more?

Clarification: The initial Committee product/recommendations will be to the Board not the legislature. The Board in a public meeting will need to make decisions. It needs to be clear that the Committee's purpose is to develop long-term plans.

Comment: I signed on to this as a eighteen month task not nine. I suggest that we outline what we are considering x, y, z, the anticipated costs and put the issues on the radar screen of the legislature. It would be a report with consideration of what is being narrowed down noting that the deliberations are continuing.

Comment: At some point need to solve problems and do some serious work to establish and develop a plan and really negotiate. How and when does this come together? We need to start putting proposals on the table and get to a different place. In general serious negotiations need to be done in relative quiet and we need to get started on that.

Comment: During the legislative session my recommendation is not to have many ESPA meeting in Boise. This will result in premature reports and incorrect judgments about the deliberations of the Committee. Another comment noted that the legislature is very busy during session and recommended that we the Committee not have meeting in Boise during this time.

Comment: If a plan is developed in a 'half-assed' way and presented to Legislature the Committee's credibility will be destroyed. My advice is not to bring to the legislature until it is well-thought.

Comment: This is a consensus process I would be cautious to rush into a report and funding request before we have an ability to consult with constituents. Need to be thoughtful and deliberative about the process.

Comment: There are three water calls the Director is examining, with potential warning letters of curtailment and different dates suggested. There are many looking to the CAMP for guidance and believe that we need to need to address issues in a shorter timeframe. Maybe we can develop the plan in 12 months not 18 months.

Comment: This is a long-term issue; once a plan is developed a Committee will be needed to work through implementation.

The Committee decided to address this issue at the October meeting and further discuss Committee outcomes and legislative reporting mechanisms. Additionally, Committee members were encouraged to develop one-line statements for discussion regarding short-term proposals for 2008. High-lift exchanges and additional money for Minidoka enlargement analysis were used as examples of short-term proposals.

Comment: It would be useful to learn what other states with similar situations have done with conjunctive management issues. We do not need to reinvent the wheel.
Comment: Other states have very different situations and have usually used curtailment to address the issues.

The Committee agreed to put lessons learned from others states on the agenda at a future Committee meeting.

Public Comment

Jack Barraclaugh
I am concerned with the statements that there is not information on x, y, z , when some of these issues have been studied as far back as 40 or 50 years ago. We are making a big mistake by ignoring what has happened in the past, for example there was a plan to measure 400 wells every third year. A lot of people are not taking into account other information when making presentations. Again comments and questions are not being properly answered and the Committee is going slower than is needed because we are not drawing on past. Mr. Barraclaugh agreed to put together a list of reports, with a one-line description, for Committee consideration.

The Committee is making a tactical mistake if you don't make an interim report, you don't need to make conclusions but a progress report. A report back will relieve anxiety especially if you tell them your general plan.

Attendees:

Advisory Committee Members

1.	Vince	Alberdi	Twin Falls Canal Co.
2.	Hal	Anderson	IDWR
3.	Randy	Bingham	Burley Irrigation
4.	Barry	Burnell	Idaho Department of Environmental Quality
5.	Rebecca	Casper	Ball Ventures
6.	Scott	Clawson	Water District 110
7.	Lance	Clow	City of Twin Falls
8.	Tim	Deeg	Water District 120
9.	Craig	Evans	Water District 120
10.	Lloyd	Hicks	Burgess Canal Company
11.	Rich	Rigby	Bureau of Reclamation
12.	George	Katseanes	Blackfoot
13.	Alex	LaBeau	Idaho Association of Commerce and Industry
14.	Albert	Lockwood	Northside Canal Company
15.	Randy	MacMillan	Clear Springs Foods
16.	Roy	Mink	IWRRI
17.	Allison	Beck-Haas	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
18.	Don	Parker	Water District 110
19.	Dave	Parrish	Idaho Fish and Game
20.	Jeff	Raybould	Fremont-Madison Irrigation District
21.	Dan	Schaeffer	A&B Irrigation District
22.	Steven	Serr	Bonneville County
23.	Dean	Stevenson	Magic Valley Ground Water District (MVGWD)
24.	Jim	Tucker	Idaho Power
25.	Max	Vaughn	Minidoka County Assessor

26.	Will	Whelan	The Nature Conservancy
27.	Kim	Goodman	Trout Unlimited

Other Attendees

28. Jerry Rigby – IWRB
29. Lynn Tominaga - IGWA
30. Jon Bowling – Idaho Power
31. Brian Patton – IDWR
32. Harriet Hensley – Attorney General's Office
33. Diane Tate – CDR Associates (facilitator)
34. Jonathan Bartsch – CDR Associates (facilitator)
35. Matt Howard – BOR
36. Stan Clark
37. Jack Barraclough
38. Senator Siddoway