



Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer (ESPA) Comprehensive Aquifer Management Plan

Advisory Committee

Meeting Notes

Date: Thursday, October 25th, 2007

Time: 9:00 am - 5:00 pm

Location: Hagerman Valley Senior and Community Center, Hagerman ID

MEETING AGENDA

1. Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review and Meeting Note Finalization
2. Briefing and Discussion: Licensing of Hydropower Water Right at Milner
3. Presentation and Discussion: Management Alternative Matrix and Preliminary Evaluation
4. Briefing: Climate Impact Fall Seminar
5. Lunch
6. Discussion: Funding Options
7. Briefing: Status of Management Alternative Technical Analysis and Quantitative Goal Evaluation
8. Discussion: Preliminary Advisory Committee Outcomes and Report to Board 2008
9. 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

The Advisory Committee reviewed the September meeting notes, revised the attendance list, provided minor editorial comments and finalized the notes.

LICENSING OF HYDROPOWER WATER RIGHT AT MILNER

IDWR Director Dave Tuthill presented to the Committee on a range of issues including: an update on Statewide issues, Surface Storage Opportunities, Aquifer Study, 2008 Warning Letter, and the Milner Dam Hydropower License Status Update. Tuthill expressed his appreciation to the Committee for its work and suggested that the ESPA planning effort is leading the way for other aquifer studies in Idaho. He noted that other aquifers need a similar planning process and that much is expected of the Committee.

Statewide Status Update

Tuthill outlined a number of water management challenges in the 21st Century. What has changed from the past, he noted, is that while all of the previous water needs continue to exist, new water needs have arisen, including endangered species issues, increased urbanization, climate change, and groundwater mitigation. Tuthill mentioned that the state is in a fortunate position to address these challenges due to the engagement of key stakeholders including the executive, legislative and judicial branches as well as the water board, local governments, water users, environmental groups and the general public.

Additional Surface Water Storage

Tuthill noted that the Idaho forefathers built 4 million acre feet of storage in the Upper Snake over the past century. However, compared to other basins in the west, the Upper Snake has a low ratio of storage to outflow. There are several opportunities for additional large scale storage, including rebuilding Teton Dam, raising Minidoka Dam, and developing Twin Springs Dam and Galloway Dam. The Bureau of Reclamation will conduct a reconnaissance-level study on the Teton Dam this year. Tuthill recognized the environmental impacts and possible tradeoffs from any of these projects. However, given the challenges facing water users, Tuthill noted that he supports pursuing feasibility studies for these projects. In addition, the Department has recommended to the legislature the funding of eleven aquifer planning studies, with the ESPA as the highest priority.

2008 Warning Letters

The Department recently sent out letters to water users warning of possible curtailment in 2008. Many factors will determine whether curtailment is necessary, most importantly the weather and precipitation. Tuthill presented that if the precipitation levels are above normal next year, administrative curtailment will likely not be required. If the 2008 water year is similar to 2007, curtailment of 500,000 acres could be expected. If the next water year is like 1977, the worst year on record, curtailment could be back to 1950 right levels, approximately 800,000 acres. The maps (presented in the PowerPoint presentation) show areas that would be curtailed based on a 10% impact to the affected water right.

While the Department is willing to participate in finding alternative solutions to water shortages in 2008, such as mitigation plans, the only other option is administrative curtailment. Tuthill mentioned that a number of operational definitions are currently being challenged and will be determined in upcoming legal proceedings.

Hydropower Water Right at Milner

The final topic raised by Tuthill was the hydropower water right held by Twin Falls and Northside Canal Companies at Milner. The following is a history of this right:

- Subordination condition not added to the original permit, which was issued on June 29, 1977
- Extensions of time requested in 1982, 1987, 1990 and 1992
- Extension approval in 1987 contained the following language: “The rights for use of water acquired under this permit shall be junior and subordinate to all other rights for the consumptive beneficial use of water, other than hydropower and

groundwater recharge within the Snake River Basin of the state of Idaho that are initiated later-in-time than the priority of this permit and shall not give rise to any right or claim against any future rights for the consumptive beneficial use of water, other than hydropower or ground water recharge within the Snake River Basin of the state of Idaho initiated later in time than the priority of this permit.”

- In 1993, proof of beneficial use was supplied for 5714 cfs and completed the submittal requirements of the permit holder.
- On September 5, 2007 the Department issued a “Notice of Intent to Issue License.”

Tuthill noted that it was unusual that the 1987 extension specified that the use was subordinate to all beneficial uses except hydropower and groundwater recharge. Legal action by the permit holders has followed the NOI to Issue License, and the Director has decided not to proceed with issuance of a license pending the court process.

Questions and Comments

Q: The 5,700 cfs, does that mean that’s the amount of the water right every single day of the year? A: It is a 1977 water right, so that’s the amount whenever it is in priority. During the irrigation season, it isn’t in priority very often.

Q: The subordination clause that was left out of the license, was that an IDWR oversight? In 1923, I know that a similar clause was missing in a license. Who was responsible for not finding these? Is it ever challengeable? A: (Tuthill) I don’t know why it was left off. I know that the standard at the time was to add subordination conditions to water rights like this one, and I don’t know why the Milner right didn’t receive one. The Department didn’t start adding these clauses routinely until the 1930’s. It should also be remembered that this right was published prior to the immediate access provided by computers and likely went unnoticed until 1987. The question we are discussing is whether it is appropriate for the Department to modify a condition that has been in place for 20 years, or should the Department issue the right as it has been standing?

Comment: In 1987, the subordination condition placed on this right was a negotiated condition. There were financing reasons as to why subordination was included, i.e. the permit holders needed to get funding to construct the power plant facilities.

Comment: The project was built based on the permit language acquired from the Department; one obtains financing based on the permit language. After you’ve acquired your permit and submitted proof of beneficial use, it would be deeply concerning if the Department was allowed to go back and change the terms of that permit.

Comment: The current hearing process ensures that all impacted parties are aware and provides opportunities to be involved; we didn’t have this type of process back when the license was issued.

Q: When did the objections from the impacted parties start to come forward? A: 2007.

Q: Isn't there language in the State Water Plans that says "zero flow at Milner" unless a hydropower right is in priority? Or has this been modified by the requirements for fish?

A: By state law, the minimum in-stream flow at Milner is zero. However, the hydropower facility at Milner has a FERC license, and there are requirements in that license for a target flow of 200 cfs at Milner.

Comment: The backbone of economic development is on acquiring a permit and moving forward on the basis of that permit. This project could not have been built without relying on the language in that permit.

Q: When will the comments received on the NOI to license be available on the website? A: Hopefully the documents will be available within the week.

Q: I understood the original permit was in 1977? And then changed in 1987 to subordinate recharge? Who did the financing on the project that was constructed?

A: We don't currently know who financed the project but this can be identified. Bonds may have been issued.

Comment: I would suggest that when a groundwater user receives a permit, they are also proceeding on the same permit expectations. When you receive a permit, you can't say that those conditions are not going to change, especially if other types of permits, including groundwater, are facing modifications. The subordination provision for Milner was left off for a specific reason, the same reason it was left off of other dams.

Comment: It is hard to compare the benefits of power generation and recharge; there must be a dollar amount from the benefit of water flowing through the power plant that could be compared to the benefit/cost of recharge.

Comment: (Tuthill) In a prior appropriation state such as Idaho, we don't make a cost/benefit comparison in determining a water right.

Comment: The Committee could examine however, ways to make both sides whole by finding money to mitigate for the lost power generation and using the water for recharge. This could be a role for the Advisory Committee.

Comment: There is information at the PUC regarding how much power is generated at Milner, and the records go back as long as the dam has been there. Some digging may be necessary, and I (Lynn Tominaga) will ask them how to make it available.

Q: Is the public ready for the rebuilding of Teton, especially with the calls for removal of the four dams on the lower portion of the river? A: The reasons for wanting to remove the four dams are very different from the Teton dam issues.

Q: At our last meeting, someone pointed out that the Teton dam site is geologically flawed. Are those problems insurmountable? A: (Tuthill) That is why we asked the Bureau of Reclamation whether it could be done, and they said it could. The original early dam failed as a result of piping through the front of it.

Q: Are there management alternatives that have previously been considered that are not 21st century strategies? A: Projects that were once reviewed and discarded need to be examined again in light of the current and future challenges; one example is additional storage at Galloway. The dynamics and economics are different now, and we need to look at all alternatives.

Q: What can we expect the Governor to mention in his State of the State address? I'm dismayed how people who participate in the process tend to disregard public interest – I think people are very interested in water as an issue. A: (Tuthill) I'm meeting with Governor Otter next on November 12th during his "Capitol for a Day" meeting in Wallace. He is very interested in water, as well as a variety of other important state issues. When we're talking about water, he's very engaged, but there are also a lot of other issues that require his attention.

MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVE MATRIX AND PRELIMINARY EVALUATION

Jonathan Bartsch asked the Committee to review two documents: the 11-page matrix of management alternatives produced by the facilitators, and the one page summary volunteered by Rich Rigby (distributed at the meeting). After discussion, the Committee recommended that both a complete matrix (with categories modified) as well as a one-page executive summary be developed.

Comment

- The longer format is excellent; it causes you to think through the process, and provides a useful organization. A summary table which already illustrates a conclusion avoids the thought process. The fact that you have blanks in here illustrates that there are still topics that need to be discussed and considered. You have to go through this thought process in order to arrive at an opinion. A summary table could be an outcome further along in the process.
- There is a place for both formats. I like having a table where I can see all of the columns at one time and compare them. I also like the longer table too because it contains the information we've discussed. I'd like to see you do both. We need to know what the benefits are, and the next step is to figure out where those benefits will be seen.
- I like the one-page table, but eventually the management alternatives need to be prioritized.
- I'd like to make sure that the evaluation matrix is thoroughly vetted before the Committee uses the document as a decision making tool, especially the costs.
- There are things missing in both of the documents. In the shorter document, the "firm yield" and "average yield" fields are very important. I suggest that we incorporate these concepts into the longer document.
- Could we split out issues and constraints? Also, the source of water?
- Rich Rigby: I put together the shorter table to help me think through these issues and have the basic facts in one place. How much is this going to cost? How much water is it going to produce? Those are critical. I produced this originally just for myself. However, I don't think there is a common understanding on the critical issues and critical questions. Maybe we are together, but I think we're still talking past the issues a lot of the time. Let's start getting clarity on some of these issues, like how much can you recharge – we need to get specific versus conceptual.

Recharge Comments

- On recharge: some may be getting numbers from what would happen if we had a wet spring? The 45,000 ac-ft is an average. I like the shorter document, but think that we need to think outside the box, not just inside the box. If we can only do 45,000 with the Board's water right, let's think about how to find other sources of water to increase recharge, and not necessarily be limited by what currently exists.
- Before Palisades's construction and the winter water savings, canals used to run 500,000 ac-ft in the winter, and that water contributed to recharge. We can recharge this amount if we address the water availability questions and issues.

Other comments and changes to the specific management alternative matrix are recorded in the document itself. Changes will be made to the matrix to reflect these comments, and a revised version provided to the Committee for review prior to the December meeting.

CLIMATE IMPACT FALL SEMINAR

Brian Patton (IDWR) presented a summary from the annual Boise Climate Impact Fall Forecast Meeting. Patton noted that the Climate Impact meetings usually address long term issues but that this seminar primarily focused on the 2007 water year and the forecast for 2008. The 2007 runoff, it was noted, was only half of normal across the state, which was very surprising. A La Niña event is developing for 2008 with wetter weather predicted for Idaho. Patton noted that the average increase in winter precipitation with a La Niña event is 6%. Idaho should be wetter than normal but it is not clear if a La Niña event is enough to offset the general warming trends. An additional factor to consider is that the soil moisture is so depleted that even a good water year could still result in average runoff.

Comments and Questions

Comment: (Randy MacMillan) I also attended the Climate Impact Group Seminar meeting and learned that the modelers are still not sure what happened in 2007, i.e. why the weather behaved the way it did. Patton mentioned that the first part of the water year looked fine but then it basically turned off.

Q: Could climate change affect the quantitative goal, does it effect how storage is released? A: One impact of climate change is increased uncertainty. The CAMP process has many uncertainties to face, climate change being just one of them. There are two thoughts: 1) in examining the effectiveness of measures, we should not consider the best case scenario (alternatives should be reliable over range of water supply), and 2) an adaptive management plan is needed to follow implementation of the plan and account for the range of uncertainties. Climate change is an issue that will play out over a very long time and we may need to build into the adaptive management mechanisms frequent review of the plan's effectiveness.

Comment: All climate change does is increase uncertainty and it is hard to imagine more uncertainty with this ESPA planning effort.

Comment: If climate change is real, more spring rain and less winter snowpack will be the result. We lose the water storage that is in the snowpack and we need to build more storage to remain on par with where we are today.

Q: The Bureau of Reclamation releases water in the spring time for flood control. If the weather changes will it determine when and if you release water from the reservoir? Response: From a reservoir space holder perspective, there is too much emphasis on flood control, the outflows in the summer are based primarily on demand.

Q: At some point in the process we will begin too look at impacts of the management schemes; will the model be adapted to account for climate change? A: Yes, climate change is an input to the model.

Comment: Don't put it climate change aside but put it beside – we need to assume that we will have below average precipitation, i.e. that we will be dryer over time. If an alternative is only beneficial in the 2 best water years in 10, then we should be skeptical of what we will be able to accomplish with that alternative. We need to go with a plan that will work in lower water situations.

Comment: Additional storage will give us the opportunity to better manage the water supply because even if it is warmer it doesn't mean that there will be less precipitation. Less snowpack does not necessarily mean less precipitation.

Q: What is the cycle between El Niño and La Niña events? A: El Niño and La Niña occur on average every 3 to 5 years although intervals between events have varied from 2 to 7 years, according to the National Weather Service.

Comment: Additional storage would be useful and the ability to readily recharge the aquifer as well – we need more storage

Comment: It is premature to discuss climate change further since we have so many other tasks to discuss.

Diane Tate summarized the discussion by noting that climate change will be addressed specifically in the adaptive management strategies (to be developed).

FUNDING OPTIONS

Diane Tate presented stakeholder input received during the development of the Framework (2006) regarding ESPA funding principles. Tate noted that the Committee had previously expressed the need to begin discussion of funding options early in the process. After discussion, the Committee agreed to examine funding options and strategies in conjunction with the examination of the management alternatives, and to include a funding box within the matrix for each alternative.

Tate asked the Committee if any of the options listed in the Framework should be taken removed from consideration.

Comment and Discussion

Comment: We need to remove the acre-foot levy strategy as it creates disincentives to incidental recharge.

Comment: What about other water users who may be using water on a volume basis, such as dairy and power? We could remove an acre-foot levy for agriculture but keep a volume base approach for other uses. For municipal and business uses there is no other way to measure use except for a per-acre foot.

Comment: The sales tax approach will be tough to change in the short term; I like the per head fee with a change in income tax formula (\$10 per head); this could be readily implemented.

Comment: A property tax increase will be tough to implement.

Comment: The Strawman proposal outlined various categories of funding and responsibilities. We should look at how this proposal divided up responsibilities and discuss whether this is a reasonable approach.

Comment: In the Strawman proposal it required \$5 per acre, however our users won't pay it until we understand what it will be used for – it doesn't work to say 'just trust me'. We need to know that the money is going to solve the problem and that there will not be a constant request for additional funding.

Comment: We should strike an increase in property tax, these are the fewest payees. We need to increase the number of citizens who pay, which suggests using a sales tax strategy

Comment: An increase in sales tax will not fly in Idaho.

Comment: We cannot just ignore the sales tax strategy since the rest of the state has water issues as well.

Comment: The Governor/legislature will not dedicate a portion of sales tax for any one issue, not for schools or water. We are left with the strategy of deciding what we want to do with water and

justifying allocations each year. Right now the Governor and legislature are dead-set against a dedicated fund – we may need to change this attitude but it is the reality. I like Director Tuthill’s approach to say we need 30 million over 10 years. The plan should outline the approach for funding in a way that meets the current perspectives of the legislature.

Comment: The type of collection method will be determined by the projects we implement. We need to outline exactly how resources are going to be spent before we can have a reasonable chance of receiving it. For example, a \$100 million need indicates a sales tax strategy, while a \$1 million need equals another strategy. One way to think about this is that there could be different strategies according to the individual management alternatives selected.

Comment: We need to develop the management ideas and then pursue funding strategies, including other federal/entity funding mechanisms.

Comment: It is useful to understand the legislative budgeting process and approach it from that perspective.

Comment: I would like to add a strategy – a tax on bottled water (consumption tax). It is a nice irony, like taxing cigarettes

Comment: Funding for ESPA issues will need to be focused on ESPA payers since there are a limited number of options when rest of the state gets involved.

Comment: We should include funding options as part of the matrix and include the best way to fund each alternative. This way we bring the funding conversation to each of the management alternatives and have on-going conversations about funding.

Comment: The funding strategies will differ depending on who benefits and who supposedly harms the aquifer; this will determine who, when, what, and how you pay. I support linking the funding options with the management alternatives.

Comment: We still need to decide what we are funding, who will be involved and who will implement these actions before we can move forward.

Comment: The state legislature is looking at sales tax exemptions; maybe this is an area where we could find a new source of benefit – tax exemptions for those who contribute to the aquifer.

Comment: In the past the legislature has used general funds to supplement individual contributions to various projects. The only way to get state money is to come up with a plan, present it to them and then see if general funds are available. A property/sales tax increase doesn’t have a chance in the world.

Comment: We need to expand the funding discussion by outlining implementation steps including legislative, Board, Department actions and strategies. We need a critical path to implementation of the plan.

Comment: I am concerned about the scale of our discussion, we are low-balling this. If you don't have a dedicated stream of funding you cannot receive bonds. In Washington State, for example, the voters approved a tax increase to support water issues. We need to think bigger than we currently are, a couple million dollars is needed to plan projects not implement them. We will not fix this problem with a one-year appropriation. I also respect the notion that you need to know what the projects are going to be before you pay for it. My sense is that we are using monopoly money and that all options have equal value because they are free. How do we move forward most productively? We need to get a handle on the magnitude of funding that is needed.

Comment: Annual legislature appropriations won't work since many of these costs are front loaded, which indicates a bonding strategy. We need to use the Board's authority to develop a bonding mechanism and a dedicated source of funding. This is far more reliable than trying to pry money free from the state each year.

Comment: (Brian Patton) The Board does having bonding authority which was the method used to fund the Bell Rapids project and the Dworshak power project.

Comment: We need to include federal money in the mix; they may be able to help us fund this effort. Is the state talking with our congressional delegation of the importance on the federal side? A: Yes.

Comment: We need to be more specific and would want a want a 'gut check' from legislators before we invest lots of time in any particular. We need to be able to sell a package of funding measures and get them on-board with a plan, support it and sell as in the public interest.

Management Alternative Technical Studies and Quantitative Goal Evaluation

Brian Patton provided an update regarding the status of the quantitative goal analysis. Patton described the assumptions the Department has been using to determine the water budget changes. Patton also noted that the Goal Sub-Committee will be meeting on Thursday, November 8th to discuss the assumptions, preliminary results and how best to present the information to the overall Committee.

Comment: New storage is an assumption that will take a number of years to implement, are there alternatives in the near term? A: Yes we are assuming that additional storage would be built and that it would it take a number of years to implement. There are also short-term alternatives that will be discussed with the Sub-Committee.

Comment: I am interested in learning more about the groundwater model. (A: It was noted that the Committee has had two presentations on the model and it was suggested to review the meeting notes from the past summer.)

Q: What is the status of the weather modification analysis? A: The Department has selected a consultant to conduct the weather modification analysis and is currently negotiating the contract.

Q: Do you have data on the effectiveness of cloud seeding? Is it worth the money we are paying folks to conduct this activity? A: Neighboring states are spending millions of dollars on this strategy; we are “optimistically hopeful maybe” of the effectiveness of weather modifications.

OUTCOMES AND PRODUCTS FOR 2008

The Advisory Committee discussed the desired outcomes and products to be developed during the next legislative session. The Committee decided that a draft report will be developed that includes a summary of the process, issues discussed and short-term actions/recommendations. The draft will be developed after the November meeting, refined after the December meeting and finalized at the January meeting. It was noted that the report should be coordinated with the Director Tuthill.

Comment and Questions

Comment/Question: It seems like we have one critical/short-term situation, elevating Minidoka dam. Is this really our last chance to get the million dollars required to do that? Maybe Minidoka is the exception the length of the process. A: On the Minidoka dam it sounds like MID and BID (and BOR) need a commitment ASAP that the state is willing to support both the analysis and the entire amount of the construction.

Comment: From BID’s perspective the designs and drawings are being developed as we speak. The environmental analysis will begin in March. We need to know that if enlargement is feasible, the state will build the enlarged structure. It should be noted that everything we’re doing right now will be thrown away if the state says they want to do something. We’re not going to stand and wait anymore because a lot of opportunities have been provided and funding partners did not come forward.

Q: Is it really a dead issue? Is there any sense worrying about it? Fact or fiction?

A: (Rich Rigby) The budget is currently being proposed to Congress and the Bureau has to come up with half of the money for rebuilding. The budget for rebuilding Minidoka is set and construction dates are scheduled. We would have to postpone the federal government’s budget process in order to make it happen. If the state is going to support enlargement, they have to be committed. Raising the dam is a bigger issue than just replacing it – there are bigger environmental issues too. What I am told is that it is too late, so that’s the message I’m delivering. I’m not saying it can’t be fixed, but the commitment has got to be there. It was in May of 2004 that we gave a presentation to the Interim Committee, and since that time there has been zero commitment to make that happen. There isn’t anymore time to make that decision.

Comment: We may find when we evaluate Minidoka enlargement we don’t have a project. Then we’ll have the cost of delay and lost opportunity with the other money.

Comment: We may need to form a sub-committee to study this Minidoka project, to help us make an intelligent decision and make a good recommendation to the board, so that we could come up with something to tell the board in January.

Comment: What about pursuing high lift pumping, or recharge or CREP? We could ask the IWRB to investigate purchasing high lift water and start the process of requesting money from the legislature.

Comment: We earlier approved a sub-committee to develop the management alternative matrix further. That same group could talk about short term recommendations, assuming a very limited number of actions or studies; we could run that process through the full Committee in December and at that meeting someone will prepare a report, we approve that in January (mostly a progress report on options under consideration), then we make only a few recommendations to the legislature as interim actions.

Q: Has the state seen any economic impact to drying up Bell Rapids? This is something to consider if we're talking about large-scale reduction in irrigation. A: There has been economic study of economic impacts that might be caused by large scale curtailment. The report is on the Departments website under Interim Legislative Committee section.

Comment: I think the question this group has to answer is not should we dry anyone up, but who should we dry up.

Comment: We had lunch with the Director who noted that a report could include the following:

- Explanation of processes we're using
- Issues and topics covered so far
- Ideas we've had so far; could also include what is controversial and what is not
- State explicitly that we feel it is too early for specific recommendations
- Raise issue that there will be significant funding needs for one-time projects that we expect to come from the state, i.e. dam construction
- May be criticized for not giving substantive recommendations, but probably only by people that don't understand we're a long term group

Comment: I am concerned that with a short legislative session this year, we will want to submit our report sooner, especially if we have short-term funding requests. Response: I don't know how you get something done sooner if you're going to give details on projects. There are some things we can say in a specific way without having all details

Comment: The only concrete thing we can really do is purchase high lift water, we know that for \$36 million dollars we could pick up 80,000 ac-ft of water. If we're looking for something solid that we can be behind this might be it; we know Judge Redden will want water for ESA and I don't see why we wait on that one.

Management Alternative Matrix

Numerous suggestions were made regarding the process to develop further the management alternative matrix. The Committee decided to have CDR further refine the matrix and consult Committee members as necessary to complete the Matrix. The facilitators will attempt to keep the document simple and focus on clarifying and filling out of the matrices, so the management

alternative discussions are more focused. The next draft will be distributed before the December meeting.

Next Committee Meeting

Thursday, November 15, 2007 in Burley (Best Western Inn) from 10:00 am – 5:00 pm

Attendees:

Advisory Committee Members

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

Other Attendees

26. Lynn Tominaga - IGWA
27. Jon Bowling – Idaho Power
28. Brian Patton – IDWR
29. Harriet Hensley – Attorney General’s Office
30. Diane Tate – CDR Associates (facilitator)
31. Jonathan Bartsch – CDR Associates (facilitator)
32. Matt Howard – BOR
33. Stan Clark - Eastern Water Rights Coalition

34. John Simpson – Attorney
35. Bill Quinn – IDWR
36. Bob McLaughlin – IDWR
37. Dave Tuthill – IDWR Director
38. Lyle Swank – IDWR
39. Bill and Deloris Jones – SW Recharge District
40. Ted Diehl – NSCC
41. Bill Thompson MID
42. Elaine F??