Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer (ESPA)
Comprehensive Aquifer Management Plan

Advisory Committee

Meeting Notes

Date: February 28, 2008
Time: 10:00 am - 5:00 pm
Location: Idaho State University
1784 Science Center Dr, 83402 Idaho Falls

MEETING AGENDA

1. Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review and Meeting Note Finalization

2. Briefing: Status of 2008 Progress Report and Input from Board and Legislature

3. Presentation and Discussion: Soft Conversion and Crop Mix Reports
   - Bryce Contor – IWWRI

   Goal: Committee understanding of effect of soft conversion and crop-mix changes on the ESPA water budget.

4. Water Budget Adjustment Analysis
   - IDWR

   Goal: Committee understanding of refined analysis of phased water budget project implementation

5. Lunch – Provided for Committee Members

6. Water Budget Adjustment Analysis (Continued)

7. Presentation and Discussion: CAMP Fish and Wildlife Issues, Opportunities and Challenges
   - Kim Goodman and Will Whelan

   Goal: Committee understanding of the fish and wildlife issues, opportunities and challenges as they relate to the development of CAMP.

8. Discussion: Next Steps and Future Meeting Agenda Development

9. Public Comment

All presentations are posted on the ESPA ebsite

I. INTRODUCTIONS, AGENDA REVIEW AND MEETING NOTE FINALIZATION

Attendees introduced themselves following an introduction by the facilitator, Jonathan Bartsch, and his colleague Jennifer Graham. An overview of the agenda and the finalization of the notes from the February Committee meeting rounded out the opening of the meeting.

II. BRIEFING: STATUS OF 2008 PROGRESS REPORT AND INPUT FROM BOARD AND LEGISLATURE

Jonathan noted that he had met with Board on the 24th of January to discuss the Progress Report and discussed the initial recommendations and other editorial modifications. The 2008 Progress Report was finalized by the Board on the 31st of January via a teleconference call.

Jonathan and Hal Anderson (IDWR) presented the report and testified to the both the Idaho Senate Natural Resources Committee and House Natural Resource Committee. While there was little time for discussion, the update seemed to be well-received by the legislature.

Randy MacMillan remarked that Jonathan and Hal did an excellent job, presenting a fair and balanced report. He also stressed that significant work lies ahead. The Natural Resources Committee, particularly on the Senate side, posed questions. In particular, they would like to see a cost-benefit analysis for any proposed projects, specifically new surface water storage. Hal noted that the lack of questions/concerns from the Senate and the House is a good indicator of their comfort with the ESPA process. The more pointed questions were not associated with this process, but were rather more related to specific issues of interest to members of the Committee. Another indication of Senate support is the unanimous approval to move forward with similar processes in other aquifers across the state using the ESPA process as a model.

It was noted that along with the high visibility of this process comes a responsibility to develop a plan that is acceptable to all of those around the table. It also raises the importance of funding, as a comprehensive plan that demonstrates broad benefits and has support of the participants has a better chance of attracting dollars. A significant ESPA contribution is going to be required to do this.

Roy Mink also noted that his impression is that there is strong support from both legislative sides, that it was a very positive meeting and that the legislature wanted to continue to be updated on progress.

III. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION: SOFT CONVERSION AND CROP MIX REPORTS

A. Crop Mix

Bryce Contor presented the findings from the Crop Mix analysis. Bryce's first presentation on crop mix is a summary of a written report prepared for the Water Resource Board.

Questions

1. ***Did you distinguish between surface water and groundwater lands?***
   No—don't have the information to distinguish between surface and ground water use.

2. ***Is all the land analyzed on the ESPA?***
   The analysis includes all irrigated acres overlaying the ESPA.

3. ***Is there a margin of error in the 120,000 acre feet?***
   There is a .04 to .10 margin of error and the 120,000 acre feet is mid-level between that margin of error.

4. ***How many total acres irrigated in 2006?***
   4 million, plus or minus 10%. Change in acres is not a part of this picture. This is only based on a change in crop units.

5. ***Can you clarify the source of the number of acre feet from surface irrigation?***
   If you take an acre foot out of river and put it on the farm—if you change consumptive use on farm, you change the recharge. The problem is that sometimes people also change diversions. If one is not going to grow alfalfa, what am I going to do with water that would be used for alfalfa?

Comments

- In an ordinary market situation, it should be feasible to induce people to fallow. However, this is not an ordinary market and I don't see the situation changing. For example, dairies are going to take a lot more acres in barley than in corn. More information about dairies is needed to address this question.

- There are fundamental changes in agricultural economics going on today. The amount of corn, for example, being grown for ethanol, changes in prices for wheat, other products. The market is going to drive this, not us and will make accomplishing a 350 kaf change from crop-mix very difficult.

- This seems like a lot of water. The cost question is important, as it seems it would be a cheaper alternative and keeps land in production; you can still get a benefit from the water.

- We need to think about how we'd pay for crop mix substitution. How do you administer this approach and make it work? While it is a way to reduce demand without having serious impacts, what is it going to cost?

- There is a need to know the mix of acres for groundwater and surface water. If we are going to use crop mix as a management alternative, we need to know what side of the equation they are on.

- We need to differentiate between ground water and surface water sources in this study.

- A concern was raised about the potential imposition of changes affecting water rights

Much discussion centered on the issue of monitoring and administering crop mix reductions. Comments on this subject follow:

- One of the big challenges is potatoes. When we buy down potatoes, it is difficult to determine how much the farmer was going to plant. Was the farmer going to really plant 80 acres? Agreements are now being built so that the members will plant the full 100 acres if we don't buy the 20 acres. A program would need to demonstrate what the historic withdrawals were and then agree on a percentage of aquifer reductions. They could figure out a way to reduce the withdrawal and achieve their goal, then they would receive the incentive. This would simplify the administration of the effort and put the responsibility on the irrigator.

- [In response to comment above] Let the grower figure out on his own what he is going to do to reduce withdrawal. There are so many difficulties in trying to track otherwise.

- What matters is difference between what an irrigator pumps and what makes its way back to the aquifer. It is consumptive use you have to worry about.

- One of the easy ways to determine the amount pumped is to look at power consumed (co-efficient) and then determine the reduction in that consumption from that base number. Let the farmer figure out what he wants to plant. Let the farmer make that economic decision himself. In other words, there are some outside influences in terms of how much water is saved or gained.

- This sounds wonderful and could be short lived, as the economics of farming is based on easy in and easy out—agriculture often has to bear consequences of overgrowing a crop. It is important to remember that the long-term aquifer balance is important.

Following the exchange, Jonathan posed the following question to the group, "*How much more effort would the committee like to see invested in this*?"

The question of financial limitations to support additional research in this area was raised. The inconsistent variables of rainfall and market, makes some hesitant. The group was reminded that there are going to be challenges to funding each and every strategy and this strategy could result in significant benefit. It was therefore suggested to not take this option off the table based on financial issues. Other Committee members concurred, emphasizing that all of these alternatives are going to be hard and expensive. It was also suggested to divorce the alternative from the question of who pays, adding that if farmers pay, they will look for the most cost-effective solution. The benefit of changing the crop mix would be consistent with the goal of keeping people in business while changing the water budget. It was added that the committee is not at a point where it can speculate about bundling up a program or paying for it. This could be a payment in kind for farmers.

In summary, the issues that require further exploration are: 1) surface and ground water differentiation (if technically possible); 2) costs and how to support those costs; and 2) implementation strategies. Specifically, there needs to be an estimation of number of acres that would respond to a particular incentive and a clarification of the crop mix on surface water lands and ground water lands. There are two ways to gather this information: 1) obtain existing data from the USDA Field Study or 2) generate many sample points. Steve disagreed and offered an alternative way of getting this information via layers, infrared photographs, remote sensing and suggested talking to Tony Morris (USDA) about crop typing.

B. Soft Conversions

The next presentation focused on the results of the soft conversion analysis, which involves converting ground water to surface water development where there is an existing water rights and the infrastructure for both facilities (surface and groundwater). Soft conversions reduce groundwater pumping and increase incidental recharge. An increase

in surface water diversions is required in order to facilitate increased recharge to the aquifer.

Comments

- The scenario you present uses the incidental recharge as the water source for the soft conversion.

- There are approximately 300,000 acres of mixed source lands

- The canal capacity was determined by taking the highest number of acre feet delivered in a specific year (figure 2 from report) and examined the third largest month in the period of record as the capacity of the canal.

- An advantage to soft conversions is there is a lot of value for water on top of the ground and if you can provide it, there are significant energy savings.

- Limitations to soft conversions are: 1) the number of acres available for conversion, 2) demand for irrigation and 3) canal capacity at the peak periods.

- The canals are an integral part of making this work. It was noted that caution is required with soft conversions and how canal companies deal with the delivery of water to the converted acres. It is not only a question of canal capacity, but also the capacity to deliver.

- Water source for this is assumed to be supplied from the Salmon Flow Exchange and below Milner purchase.

- On this canal (Figure 15) their capacity is being used in June and July, so would not expect at this canal for them to raise canal banks. During these months we would not deliver to soft conversions.

- Randy Bingham shared the example of the Southwest soft conversion and noted that it works great. They diverted 27,000 cfs through their canal and it was feasible and economic. The savings in power costs paid for the structures (pumps). It was profitable for them to make the conversion. Soft conversions are an inexpensive and practical tool.

- Another canal operator agreed, explaining that in his service area there are about 15,000 cfs overlap of surface water and groundwater and that conversion would be simple. Also there is potential just outside of his area for those without surface rights who have potential for conversion.

- Twin Falls does this with surface water and the success is two-fold. They have a natural flow water right. Snake River transports it to us. Their recharge program is based on the natural flow water right early in the year and they diverted water back to

wells they were pumping. Based on USGS monitoring, this didn't affect the quality of the water. In early Spring, built up level in aquifer, then when hit shoulders, they helped generated this. Every canal has same issue, when reach shoulders, can take risk of running higher than normal.

Next steps for both of these studies were summarized as follows:

1) More discussion about priorities based on management assumptions
2) Update the matrix to include discussion points and data.
3) Talk to Bryce if there are more questions

IV. WATER BUDGET ADJUSTMENT ANALYSIS

To increase Committee understanding of refined analysis of phased water budget project implementation, Brian Patton presented a preliminary plan for ESPA CAMP Modeling Scenario with an Estimated Implementation Schedule. Brian noted the assumptions and timeframe for the new phased analysis based on the modeling scenario.

The purpose of the presentation was to update participants on the assumptions used in the previous analysis and to introduce a temporal element and implementation schedule. The analysis was in response to a request by the Advisory Committee to put together a realistic implementation time table for the various alternatives. Based on the previous alternative assumptions, the scenario was re-run to see what would happen.

Discussion

1. ***Did you try to assess whether the assumptions are realistic?***

   Some assumptions are more realistic than others. Minidoka Dam would be much more expensive than other options. The tools are set up so that the analysis can be run again excluding certain options. This analysis suggests what is possible from a hydrologic perspective, whether or not the Committee wants to implement is up for discussion.

2. ***With an implementation time frame of 10 years, what is the legislature going to say? I'd have difficult accepting that with a 10 to 15 year time frame. If drought continues and we have a ten year plan, then the concern is that it won't do us much good.***

It was clarified that the legislature asked the Committee to look at the long term implementation plan and bring forth a long-term strategy. They are tired of dealing with smaller parts of the puzzle. We've been tasked in coming up with a proposal that the majority of us can get behind that can go to the board. Jonathan added that the Committee needs to examine both immediate opportunities and at long-term goals.

3. ***Changing the water budget is going to take a lot of time and infrastructure developed.. It is going to take time to generate and develop that. While solving long term problems, what are the immediate and shorter term ways we can resolve these issues?***

The soft conversions could be put into place quickly along with buy-outs.

4. ***Salmon flows: is it realistic they can be moved below Milner?***

This has been done before-- in 2005 by the Water Districts. Work is being done with the Bureau of Reclamation to develop a 30-year pilot program in another basin.

5. ***It was suggested that there could be other forms of mitigation that could be developed and to create alternatives to administrative curtailment.***

It was noted that curtailment is not a management tool; it is an administrative tool. Hal (IDWR) added that currently there is voluntary curtailment and it is economically-driven.

Reach Gain Changes Water Budget Adjustments

Based on the assumptions and background provided, a summary of the reach gain changes that would result from a phased-in analysis was provided.

Discussion

1. ***Is there an assumption that CREP reductions will be permanent?***

Yes, for this scenario, assumption is CREP lands stay out of production.

2. ***Are you sufficiently certain of results so we can look at annual, average expected yield?***

Adding variation into a cost-benefit analysis adds a lot of complexity. We would be comfortable lumping three together and using the mean of those three.

3. ***Should we have confidence in the results or not?***

The purpose of the activity is not a prediction, but rather to look at the impacts if we pursued these set of options. To extent that we see additional hydrological constraints, we can assess the input and adjust the analysis.

4. ***How representative is past water availability indicative of future water conditions?***

This committee is going to need to deal with ambiguity. A plan based on an adaptive management approach that adjusts as things change is needed. We are not here to talk about the validity of the model. As long as those who developed the model are comfortable with the output numbers based on the input, the Committee should move forward. We are well past the point of deciding whether model is valid.

Water-Level Changes from Phased-in Application of Water Budget Adjustments

This analysis is based on the same assumptions described in the Reach Gain Changes Budget Analysis. Similarly the outputs are changes, not predictions. The assessment was carried out in five places. Imaginary wells were inserted in the model and then the model was asked to predict changes in water level at the five locations.

Discussion

Comments

- It was noted that in Jerome County recharge is the most influential activity. Soft conversions are pretty low because lands are more available in the upper valley.

- It was noted that the hydrologic analysis is exactly what is needed to determine what can be done.

- These numbers, river reach levels and aquifer levels, mean different things to different people.

Questions

1. ***A reference point was requested so that it is clear whether the gain is good or good enough.***

It depends on the specific area. These numbers only have specific meaning to specific individuals. I don't know the particulars of the folks in A&B.

2. ***Is the benefit worth the cost in terms of the balance of the other things that can be done?***

Using the natural flow water right, during wet years up to a million acre feet and effectively zero in dry years. It takes 20 years to get there. It is going to take infrastructure to capture the recharge. As a Committee we need to look at it as a whole in terms of making good policy decisions.

3. ***Was the Water Board's water right just the 1200 cfs and the 800 cfs off of Big Wood included?***

Big Wood was not included. If you could recharge the BW, would have impact. We should do that analysis.

4. ***Cost effectiveness-depending on whether there was water available for that conversion—not sure if will be cost effective not only for A& B but for the state—could be looking at a billion dollar project.***

Getting a handle on that number (cost) is something the state is doing right now.

5. ***What is the blip between the cycles?***

It is a result of repeating the 27 years over and over again in the modeling effort. The focus is on the first 30 years to get an idea of the effect of the additional reach gains on the canals' natural flow supplies. The model demonstrates additional cfs on any given gain for that year and includes hard conversions, soft conversions, voluntary demand reduction and CREP reduction.

6. ***Can some of the unused water be used for recharge and conversions?***

This wasn't factored in. During those wet years, we assumed peaks would be used to recharge the system and conversion acres. It is not necessarily is spill past Milner. Water that the reservoir system can't hold may be spilled or used for other purposes. Water that would be available is new water that comes as a result of the development. All of the water that goes past Milner is used—the full augmentation in the later years would not be part of the water budget above Milner

7. ***Could the unused water be salmon water?***

No, it would not be salmon water. It is water that the reservoir system can't hold.

8. ***What effect will this have on hydropower?***

When this is on the table, Idaho Power will be willing to make a presentation on the impacts and benefits on hydropower.

9. ***As a land developer, it was emphasized that the primary concern is with growth. Are we going to have a conversation about growth? We are managing the aquifers to some end, part of that is growth—more people living in Idaho using more water. When is that going to happen? When do we (the cities, counties and I) need to give information?***

A well managed aquifer provides a way to respond to growth. … of Twin Falls suggested that municipalities need to do a better job to assure that water is being used appropriately. It is not an issue about sufficient potable water; it is water that is often being used for lawns. The City of Twin Falls is dealing with growth with pressurized irrigation, which is surface water dependent. This takes care of the peak issue. As the city grows, we are expanding into areas that formerly were farms. We are struggle with rural growth. Wells are on every five- acre parcel and there is no control on that.

10. ***Another Committee member shared an observation that the presentation regarding release of water indicates that if Idaho law says the state is dry at Milner, then are we in a position to fully implement a 135,000 acre feet of recharge. Is it legal for us to do this? Would the state declare it because it would benefit the entire state?***

Milner Gooding Canal is a federal canal, so the best way to solve this is to get a title transfer. The NEPA process is complete on this proposal and it is now sitting in Congress for approval. In 2005 had recharge because of actions of Bureau of Reclamation.

11. ***How detailed are we going to get at the end of the day. How are we going to focus for the rest of the process? Are we going to get down to the nuts and bolts of planning recharge projects, or will we say that recharge is good?***

We are going to provide policy-level direction about where the state is headed in terms of the Snake River Aquifer. The development of the CAMP is going to be detailed enough where people feel their needs and concerns are met. The first 10 year phase would be able to accomplish a significant amount of the long term goals. One Committee member noted that he imagines a plan that would be approximately double the size of the 'Framework' and a ¼ of a size of a final project proposal. It will be important to outline how decisions are made during implementation and who brings these things forward.

Others noted that they are ready for next phase of the discussion: reaching agreement on what we are going to do, priorities, cost/cost benefit and determination of environmental impacts. Jonathan that as the process needs to keep moving forward and that while we are thinking about the whole, we also need to think about the components of the plan important to our interests. As interest groups advocate for their constituents'' perspectives, there is value to be added.

V. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION: CAMP FISH AND WILDLIFE ISSUES, OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES

Kim Goodman (Trout Unlimited) and Will Whelan of The Nature Conservancy presented on the role and interests of the Fish and Wildlife representatives on the Advisory Committee.

She explained that their role on the committee is to:

- Work with the other interests on this committee
- Respect the fact that people's livelihoods on this process-quality of life and legal considerations
- To get buy-in at the legislature, important to show broad support. Can help do that.
- Help assure that the process is balanced
- Provide opportunities for stakeholders

Their interest is to assure that fish and wildlife interests, such as those outlined below, are added to the matrix:

- Representing the variety of fish and wildlife views
- Sustaining the springs.
- Shaping the flow in ways that could avoid detriments to fish and wildlife and could also provide some opportunities to do something good for fish and wildlife.

Kim, Will and Damian proposed that a technical work group be formed to look at fish and wildlife information, filter it and bring it back to this committee. They would rely on CDR on logistics to make this happen.

Discussion

Comments

- **Without the nuts and bolts, it is difficult to predict what will happen to fish and wildlife. Also, we can't take the tools presented and say that will result in the reduction of 'x' number of trout.**

We know if we reduce river flows, there will be an impact on natural resources. We are here as advisors. Once we get the tools, we will look honestly at positive and negative effects. There are some tools that could have benefits and some negative, and there are ways to mitigate those effects.

Damian Miller of the Fish and Wildlife Service explained that their interest is to look at ways to minimize negative effects while assuring cold, clean and connected water. As we think about the matrix, he will be looking for ways to maintain good water quality, keep streams connected so migratory species can move for spawning, minimize any warming to minimize impact on species reliant on cold water. The Hagerman Hatchery is also of interest. Minidoka Refuge is of interest; we'd want to explore any possibility of increasing the water level there.

- **Others sought clarification of the information that the fish and wildlife interests need, noting that a lot of work had been done to pull together data which demonstrates impacts of adjustments to water budget on river flows.**

A part of it is information gathering and a part of it is assessing what it means. We need to have some conversation to figure out how to do the balancing. The fish and wildlife

interests don’t want to slow the process and understand that there are going to be sacrifices and limitations to what we can do. We want to figure out what some of the opportunities are—we can talk through some of those technical analyses in a smaller work group

Questions

What are the parameters that you are going to look at?

Here is how it is viewed: we live an imperfect world. We have no interest in turning back the clock. The sideboards we live with are the system we have today and the changes being contemplated by these management alternatives. We realize that we are one of a number of multifaceted interests. Our organizations define success as what we get done and not what we prevent others from doing. We are convinced that we can manage an aquifer in a way that is better to the farmers, good for the land, good for development and good for fish and wildlife.

IGWA shared the example of CREP where they work hand in hand with Fish & Game, which works well. His concern is that he doesn't want to see parameters so wide that it creates problems for moving the process forward.

The Advisory Committee agreed to the formation of a working group which will hold open meetings, but will consist of a core group to carry the task forward. The fish and wildlife interests at the table encouraged the other parties to share their expertise on these issues. The working group will share updates during regularly scheduled Advisory Committee meetings. The scope of the working group will need to be determined, as there are some projects which are going to trigger the NEPA process and would consequently fall outside the prevue of this group.

NOTE: The following individuals volunteered to join the fish and wildlife interests in the formation of a working group: Lynn T., Randy M., Tim D., Randy B., Jim T, Craig, Peter A. and Jeff R.

VI. COMPREHENSIVE MANAGEMENT PLAN ECONOMIC ANALYSIS

Hal (IDWR) provided an update on progress in the economic analysis, as the Board statutes require consideration of economic factors. Due to the complexity of carrying out an economic impact analysis and the amount of information to be gathered, this analysis was contracted to WestWater Research. This is a firm with solid experience in water transaction evaluations across the country. They are available and not involved in any of the litigation. The goal is to have the first analysis completed by May.

The first step in the process is to develop a work plan. IDWR would like to take the information generated by the Committee to help develop the scope the work of this consultant group. Some data is available already through sources the consultants are familiar with and they may also get some information from the committee members themselves

The scope of their analysis involves looking at each of the management alternatives and determining their cost of implementation, their effects within the economy and effects associated with acquisitions, retiring lands, effects on properties, value of the water, hydropower and fish. We are trying to get a handle on the cost-benefit issues. If it would be of value to bring them

before the committee, that could be arranged. The Committee encouraged WestWater to participate in the next meeting.

Discussion

Comments

- ***It was underscored that the research conducted by WestWater contributes to decision making. It is important that we avoid 'data wars.'***

  One way to avoid the issue is to frame the questions properly.

- ***It would be beneficial if could present the draft work plan before they start work, to make sure that the framing of the questions is sufficient.***

- ***It is important that economic analysis not create a hierarchy of values. If the information is used in this way, it could destroy the consensus-based process.***

  The researchers are there to answer the Advisory Committee and the Board's questions and contribute to policy based discussions.

- ***What kind of assistance can WestWater provide to our deliberations as we move forward?***

  This economic analysis can identify those actions which would have the 'biggest bang for the buck.'

It was that suggested forming a technical group to work with this consulting firm. There is a general level of interest in the group (with at least one member stating preference for teleconferencing or web-based meetings) in forming a committee. In addition to working on the economic analysis, this work group could also advance the funding discussions for the CAMP. Like the Fish and Wildlife Committee, updates from this committee will be a standing meeting agenda item. The economic sub-committee will meet after the next meeting and subsequent to WestWater's presentation to the entire Committee.

VII. NEXT STEPS AND FUTURE MEETING AGENDA DEVELOPMENT

Next Steps

1. Update the management matrix with data and discussion points from today's meeting—information related to crop mix and soft conversions, the recharge piece in addition to the editorial comments given to Diane.
2. Launching of a Fish & Wildlife Working Group: Sending out message to AC, develop and circulate agenda for first meeting
3. Share the proposed workplan for the economic study by WestWater

4. Launching of a technical working group/committee to work with WestWater on the economic analysis and, later, to work on funding strategy
5. Future Advisory Committee agendas will include updates from the two committees
6. Hydropower presentation: for April Meeting.

Agenda Development

- Weather modification
- Adaptive management
- Funding sub-committee
- Fish & Wildlife sub-committee briefing
- Hydropower presentation on effects of these factors (will let us know April meeting

The next meeting will be in Twin Falls, City Council Chambers on Thursday March 27, 2008.

MEETING ATTENDEES

Advisory Committee Members

1.	Dave	Parrish	Idaho Fish and Game
2.	Scott	Clawson	WD 110 & 100
3.	Kim	Goodman	Trout Unlimited
4.	Linda	Lemmon	TSWUA/IAA
5.	Will	Whelan	TNC
6.	Dee	Reynolds	Fall River Electric
7.	Damien	Miller	USFWS
8.	Steve	Howser	ASCC
9.	Jim	Tucker	IPC
10.	Rich	Rigby	Reclamation
11.	Steve	Serr	Bonneville Co.
12.	Hal	Anderson	IDWR
13.	Lance	Clow	City of Twin Falls
14.	Rebecca	Casper	Land Development
15.	Craig	Evans	WD 120
16.	Vince	Alberdi	TFCC
17.	Randy	Bingham	Burly Irrigation
18.	Albert	Lockwood	NSCC
19.	Randy	MacMillan	Clear Springs Foods
20.	Dean	Stevenson	MVGWD
21.	Tim	Deeg	IGWA
22.	Don	Parker	WD 110

OTHER ATTENDEES

23.	Peter	Anderson	TU

24.	John	Gerstle	TU
25.	John	Bowling	IPCO
26.	Stacey	Taylor	IWRRI
27.	Gary	Johnson	IWRRI
28.	Greg	Moore	IWRRI
29.	Paul	Pelot	IWRRI
30.	Matt	Howard	BOR
31.	Walt	Poole	IDFG
32.	Steve	Burrell	IDWR
33.	Lyle	Swank	WD 1
34.	Alan	Kelsch	Committee of 9
35.	Stan	Clark	EIWRC
36.	Harriet	Hensley	Idaho AG Office
37.	David	Clew	Idaho Power
38.	Mike	Webster	Governor Otter's Office
39.	Harold	Mohlman	A&B Irrigation
40.	Lynn	Tominaga	IGWA
41.	Jennifer	Graham	CDR
42.	Jonathan	Bartsch	CDR