Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer (ESPA)
Comprehensive Aquifer Management Plan

Advisory Committee

Meeting Notes

Date: March 27, 2008
Time: 10:00 am - 5:00 pm
Location: Twin Falls City Council Chambers
305 3rd Ave East, Twin Falls ID

MEETING AGENDA

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

2. Briefing: Pristine Springs Purchase Agreement
    - Clive Strong – Deputy Attorney General

    Goal: Committee understanding of the Pristine Springs purchase agreement.

3. Presentation and Discussion: Weather Modification
    - Shaun Parkinson - Idaho Power
    - Hal Anderson - IDWR

    Goal: Committee understanding of Idaho experience with weather modification on the Payette River, status of the weather modification analysis and potential impact of weather modification on the CAMP.

4. Presentation and Discussion: ESPA Economic Analysis
    - WestWater Research – Harry Seely

    Goal: Committee understanding of the economic analysis scope of work and input

6. Briefing: Fish and Wildlife Sub-Committee Presentation and Discussion: Adaptive Management

    Goal: Committee update on Fish and Wildlife Sub-Committee discussions.

7. Presentation and Discussion: Adaptive Management Approaches
    - Diane Tate – CDR

    Goal: Committee understanding of issues and opportunities when developing an adaptive management plan and Committee input into ESPA adaptive management plan.

8. Discussion: Next Steps and Future Meeting Agenda Development

9. Public Comment

All PowerPoint presentations posted on www.espaplan.idaho.gov in PDF format.

Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review and Meeting Note Finalization

The meeting opened with introductions from the facilitation team: Diane Tate, Jonathan Bartsch, and Jennifer Graham. The group reviewed notes from the past meeting, and asked for revision of one paragraph to clarify meaning. Jonathan offered to work with committee members over the break to refine the notes. Attendees introduced themselves.

Briefing: Pristine Springs Purchase Agreement

Clive Strong gave a presentation on the progress of the Pristine Springs purchase agreement, a deal brokered by the state with funding from several sources. He stressed that this agreement is an example of what the state can do to develop longer-term solutions, and said that the state is looking at the Strawman proposal of 2004 for ideas and guidance while the CAMP plan is under development. The proposed acquisition reduces demands on spring flows, a category of management action identified in both the Strawman and the CAMP Matrix. Flows from Pristine Springs will help meet the Blue Lakes water right call, in a manner sufficient to satisfy the order as presently structured.

Clive described the location of the Pristine Springs property, shown on several maps within the presentation. The tract includes 400 acres of land and water rights of 225 cfs (see presentation). The acquisition involved significant collaborative negotiation among the parties, which includes the City of Twin Falls. As a part of the arrangement, Twin Falls will acquire the right to divert water to fill its existing water rights and a new water application prior to some of the Pristine Springs water rights to provide for current and future water supply needs. Lance Clow, Mayor of Twin Falls, noted that this deal is an excellent example of how potentially adversarial parties can work together for a solution, thanking the City Manager Tom Courtney. Groundwater users also expressed support for the deal, noting that it alleviated a water call that would have been otherwise difficult to satisfy.

Questions

1. ***Who will own the real estate?***
   The state will maintain ownership of the real estate. Pristine Springs will continue to lease the property for at least 2 years, and maintain limited fish production.

2. ***How does this meet the Blue Lakes call? Any response from Blue Lakes?***
   The Blue Lakes delivery call would have required curtailment of a large number of acres to provide the 10 cfs required by the Director's Order.

This deal provides Blue Lakes immediate relief, as opposed to relief that would have come over time through the curtailment process.

3. Are you converting non-consumptive to consumptive rights by sending water to Twin Falls?

No, there is no conversion to a consumptive right. Twin Falls will file a new municipal water right application, which will be junior to other rights. By the Water Board subordinating Pristine Springs water right, Twin Falls will have the next most senior water right when diverting from SunnyBrook Springs.

4. How was this deal put together?

It was a complicated deal, requiring a lot of negotiation and back and forth discussions.

5. Was this one of the properties offered during the time the IWRB requested offers?

This deal was under consideration at that point in time, and there had been discussions on both sides but no formal offer was pending. Blue Lakes did submit an application to the Board.

6. Where is the money coming from?

The IWRB will provide $15 million from Legislative appropriations and will seek a $10 million short term note. The note will be provided as bridge loan while the city of Twin Falls obtains authorization to fund its $10 million portion of the transaction. The Ground water users will obtain a $10 million loan from the Idaho Water Resource Board. Thus, when the loan is repaid, $10 million dollars will be restored to the Idaho Water Resource Board revolving fund. The intent is to use the funds paid back to the revolving fund for future water projects

7. How was the price determined? How did you decide who paid what?

While there was a general evaluation of the assets, the negotiation turned on the amount necessary to motivate the seller to agree to sell – willing buyer/willing seller.

8. Regarding the hydropower assets, will the money they generate go to the IWRB?

Yes, the power revenues of about $100,000 to $120,000 annually, minus a management fee will go into the revolving fund.

9. Where will the city water be taken out?

At the source of each water right. The water rights from Sunnybrook Springs will be conveyed over to the city's current system.

10. Will all water rights be owned by the state?

Yes. The ground water districts will have the right to make beneficial use of 10 cfs for mitigation purposes, subject to a payment of $11 million A Trust arrangement to hold the water assets, will be established between the state and the Ground Water Districts.

11. Once the $11 million is paid off, the State still retains the right to that 10cfs?

There is going to be a point in time when the trust is dissolved, and then the 10 cfs would become the property of the groundwater districts

12. Are the groundwater users allowed to divert that water somewhere else?

No, the water is to be used to meet mitigation requirements at Blue Lakes.

13. How does a trust operate? Is it based on a generic model? Where can I learn more?

This will be a generic trust agreement. It is in the process of being drafted, and once completed will become available as a public document.

14. Are there other projects underway that might change demand in the system?

Other discussions are underway but we have no firm proposals to present at this time.

Comments

- I'm concerned about using public funds to purchase a water right and then granting access to that water right to specific individuals. If the water right is in the name of the state, and access is granted to the groundwater districts for mitigation purposes, what happens when mitigation is not required? Is that water protected from appropriation?

- [In response to above] It will be a great day when that water is no longer needed for mitigation, and we have to answer that question. We're not using public funds to satisfy a mitigation obligation. We're actually leveraging dollars, by putting the water right in a trust. Security is needed to ensure the obligation is fully satisfied. We're leasing some of the rights to groundwater users to meet an existing need, and not doing anything outside the normal standards of water law and water transactions. The state has a stake in resolving the problem, and the state is facilitating a resolution, which is the right role for the state to play.

- [Jonathan Bartsch] From a facilitator viewpoint, I see this as an example of what can be accomplished when you look at a broad range of interests and try

to see how they can be met together. This is a great example of what this committee can be doing on a broader scale to create the CAMP, both from a negotiated agreement perspective, and from a funding perspective.

- [Gary Chamberlain, IWRB] The legislature responded to this request for supplemental funding because they're watching this process closely, and know that the decisions we come up with will be looked at for the next 50 years. I don't think the funds would have been made available if they didn't think we were going somewhere. The Board will make the final decisions, and right now nothing is off the table. Fallowing, recharge, they're still on the table. We have to seize opportunities as they come available. Everyone deserves credit for making this deal come together.

Presentation and Discussion: Weather Modification

- Shaun Parkinson - Idaho Power
- Hal Anderson - IDWR

Shaun Parkinson, Idaho Power (IPC), gave a comprehensive presentation on the company's history and experience with cloud seeding for snowpack enhancement (see presentation on website).

Questions

1. ***If cloud seeding increases precipitation in the target watershed, what does it do to watersheds that are downwind? What about evapotranspiration?***
   Research on downwind impacts suggests that a well-run program will have negligible effects, or may even increase precipitation. However, if you over-seed a cloud or seed one without enough water vapor in it, downwind impacts may occur. Meteorologists monitor each storms conditions to assess its 'seedability'.

   We don't expect an increase in evapotranspiration during the winter months, when we are seeding to increase snowpack. It is important that the program be well run and implemented in a professional fashion (meteorologists and other technical experts).

2. ***What is the average precipitation in the Payette Basin, where your studies were done? Does it matter if you're seeding in a region with a high annual precipitation versus low?***
   If the temperature and other conditions are equal in both regions, you will get more volume (acre-feet) of additional precipitation in areas with higher precipitation levels. The annual precipitation throughout the Payette watershed ranges dramatically – from very low in the lower elevations to quite high in the mountainous areas. The studies for the Payette assessment were conducted such that the results would be representative of the seeding target area. As long as you

have the right temperature structure in the storm passing over, you can see an increase in precipitation with cloud seeding activities.

3. ***Have you looked at how a similar program could be applied in the upper Snake River, or other areas?***
   One potential limiting factor: temperatures may be too low for seeding in some areas, but other than that we see a lot of potential seeding opportunity in the upper Snake basin. It was noted that the weather modification study now underway is to evaluate the feasibility of seeding the upper Snake.

Comments

- Two primary concerns: If you increase precipitation production on a particular watershed, then the likelihood of decreasing participation on downwind watershed would increase. Also, you could be increasing evaporative loss from snow pack that is there. In response to the downwind watershed concern, it was noted that a well-run program is essential for effectiveness and sustainability of such a program.
- [Shaun] One thing I didn't address. When we went to the PUC for permission to seed in the Payette basin, they asked us to identify and apply research -- trace studies – that indicated this kind of operation had worked in other places, and could work here (in the Payette).

Hal Anderson, IDWR, continued the discussion on weather modification and focused his presentation on studies underway for the Upper Snake (See presentation). Hal discussed research currently being conducted by North American Weather Consultants to assess the feasibility of conducting weather modification programs in the Upper Snake in an effort to increase winter snowpack. The study includes an overall program design, if weather modification is deemed feasible, and quantification of potential costs.

Hal discussed the statutory authority of the IDWR Director to consider weather modification and coordinate efforts. Of all of the ESPA management options, weather modification is the only one with the potential to actually increase supply. Hal mentioned that the State of Wyoming has invested up to $8 million in feasibility studies, and is very involved in weather modification. Final results of the study will be presented to the Committee in the fall of 2008.

Currently, nine counties in southeastern Idaho are participating in a self-funded weather modification program. It began in 1982 with state seed money to respond to drought of late 80's and 90's. The results of that program were never evaluated to determine effectiveness, and the current analysis will try to determine the effectiveness of that process.

Hal mentioned that it is very difficult to quantify the effectiveness of cloud seeding programs, which may be one reason why some are skeptical. However, research has shown that weather modification can increase water supply if conducted in an appropriate

fashion. You need to have a long-term program in order to be able to take advantage of opportunities as they arise – the systems must be in place ready to respond. Weather Modification programs need to be professional and sophisticated, because not all clouds should be seeded. From Hal's perspective, any state program will need local participation to encourage the Legislature to provide funding.

Questions

1. If we're looking at long-term, multi-year efforts, what is the toxicity of the silver (iodine) used for seeding? Could it be a TMDL issue?
No lake is currently listed for silver. Some are listed for metals in general, but the focus tends to be on cadium and mercury. California utilities have been doing cloud seeding with silver iodide for 50 plus years, and PG& E is growing their program. They've done sampling of reservoirs and streams and have found no increase in silver over background levels in the watershed—reservoirs, soils. Those watersheds are similar in some ways to some of ours (mined, etc.).

2. How much does a ground generator cost?
The first batch of generators Idaho Power bought cost $30,000 and they didn't work. Following that experience, Idaho Power designed and built their own units, and fabricating a new one runs $10,000 to $15,000. We don't have the cost of running the generators broken down per hour.

3. How much money does IPC spend on cloud seeding?
About $850,000 per year. The cost depends on number of hours for flying, fuel costs, flare and seeding solution costs and consumption, etc. It works out to about $8.50 an acre-foot, which includes in-house costs and everything else.

Comments

- [Hal Anderson] The State of Wyoming is interested in a cooperative program with Idaho. There are water users in Wyoming who'd like to see additional flows in the river through cloud seeding. In the past Wyoming conducted analysis of effect of cloud seeding programs and noticed most of benefits would be realized at Palisades, and so lost interest in pursuing that particular program. However, recently they have indicated an interest in exploring opportunities for mutual benefit.

- One take away is that with weather modification, we could overdo a good thing. Coordination is essential, and we have to understand the downwind impacts.

- Our biggest challenge is that if extra water falls determining who it belong to. If the public pays, does it belong to the public? What if private entities help fund? The extra water is both nobody's and everybody's at the same time.

- If the state owns the water then the state should run a cloud seeding/weather modification program. And if there are adverse impacts, it will be easier if the state is running things.

- Costs could be as high as 1 to 2 million a year for an ongoing weather modification program in the Upper Snake.
- Could we set up a weather modification taxing district to spread costs? I see this alternative as a contingency tool, and it is contingent upon conditions being right. This goes into overall mix of tools.

- If Idaho Power has designed a good generator, we should make sure any state program benefits from that expertise. Why go outside the state for something like that when we have our own experts here? While establishing and conducting the program in a professional fashion, we should look for opportunities to leverage existing Idaho knowledge and experience.

Presentation: Hells Canyon Relicensing & Section 401 Certification

- Jim Tucker - Idaho Power

Jim gave a brief presentation on IPC's Hells Canyon Relicensing and its proposal to the Idaho and Oregon DEQs for a Temperature Enhancement Management Program (TEMP) that is part of IPC's application for CWA §401 Water Certification for the Hells Canyon Complex (HCC). The program being proposed includes a WIF (Watershed Improvement Fund) and WAF (Water Acquisition Fund). IPC has proposed to contribute $1M/yr to the WIF and $2M/yr to the WAF, a total of $120M over the 40-year life of the license, for projects within the watershed that benefit water temperature. The WIF will involve on-the-ground projects, such as riparian work, channel modification, etc. that benefit water temperature conditions. The WAF will involve projects that result in the increase of flows in the river. The WAF will not be limited to water acquisitions, but may involve projects that result in increased spring or return flows to the river, or other projects that will help in ameliorating water temperature conditions by increasing river flows during critical temperature periods, generally the hot summer months. If the proposal is accepted by the States, IPC will be looking for projects and partners and cooperators on projects that will assist in the implementation of measures to benefit water temperature conditions in the watershed above the HCC. Given the focus and objectives of the CAMP, IPC's program may provide opportunities for working together for the overall benefit of the watershed.

Questions

1. Have you determined the source of your temperature load? Elevation? Solar radiation? How was the TMDL developed?
Brownlee Reservoir moderates inflows, so the flows out of the HCC are generally cooler that the inflows. Nonetheless the HCC was still assigned a slight temperature load allocation for the outflows from Hells Canyon Dam in the fall of

the year. The load allocation is based on modeling done when the SR-HC TMDL was developed. IPC has investigated various ways to address this load allocation, including building a temperature control structure at Brownlee. However, such structures have inherent problems, including adverse consequences for downstream fish and habitat. Such structures also address a symptom rather than the actual problem, in this case water temperatures upstream. IPC modeling indicates that if the temperature of inflows into Brownlee Reservoir during the summer months met water quality standards, that the outflows from Hells Canyon Dam in the fall would likely also meet standards. IPC's proposed watershed program is intended to implement upstream measures that will result in water temperature reductions upstream of the HCC that will assist in meeting IPC's load allocation below the HCC, with the added bonus of improving overall water quality upstream.

2. For the WIF or the WAF, could this committee review potential projects that might have a beneficial affect on temperature and suggest them to IPC?
If IPC's proposal to the DEQs is accepted and becomes part of the water quality certification for the HCC, IPC will be looking for opportunities, and for partners, for projects that might be beneficial for temperature purposes for the watershed, and also improve water quality parameters. There appear to be numerous potential opportunities for projects below Milner, and perhaps some above. It seems reasonable to expect that some of these projects could not only provide benefits to instream temperature conditions but also to the the watershed overall, and certainly may fall within the objectives of this committee.

3. Does the extra water help with salmon flows and net mitigation?
Logically, adding water to the river to offset temperature will help fish and wildlife, including salmon, as well as recreation, hydropower and overall water quality. It will not count, however, as part of the federal salmon flow augmentation program. Also, this is not "extra water", but part of the overall water budget that will either return or stay within the river system through appropriate management programs. The only way to bring extra water to the basin is through programs like weather modification.

Comments

- [Jonathan Bartsch] This is a great introduction to potential opportunities to accomplish what IPC needs to accomplish while also meeting the interests of this Committee. How do we go about figuring out the next steps in this process? This program could potentially be a source of funding to help us accomplish our goals and objectives.

Presentation and Discussion: ESPA Economic Analysis

- WestWater Research – Harry Seely

Harry began his presentation by outlining the goal of the presentation including feedback to WestWater on the scope of the study, and to provide an outline the economic approach to the committee. The study is currently in the scoping and information gathering phase, with outcomes expected in May (see presentation).

Questions

1. Would you able to conduct analyses of different uses? Will you be able to determine what an increment of water is worth for this particular use?
We will work toward that idea recognizing that there can be very different economic values and effects. The study is taking a regional approach, and not looking at a particular farm or user. For instance, for the dairy industry there is less literature on how water is related to production, and not a lot of data available. In the past, we looked at the impact of water on feed availability – do you have to bring it in? Does that reduce herd size? The University of Idaho has some information on this which we will look at. For aquaculture the question is how do changes in water supply affect the industry? We will be looking to the aquaculture producers to help us answer those questions. Flow changes also affect hydropower. How do we include small hydropower producers? How do we use the best available information to translate flow changes into impacts on producers?

2. Are you aware of studies the State and others have done to document the economic benefits of recreation, i.e. what the service industry and recreation industry bring to the economy? ***?***
Recreation is challenging to get your arms around. There are multiple steps required to evaluate economic benefits due to recreation. Given our time constraints, probably the best we can do is share/summarize what others have done. The risk is that we don't have the information. If you're trying to value environmental flows, they are almost always criticized for undervaluing the resource. We're open to ideas on how to incorporate environment into analysis using an economic framework.

3. Are you seeking to find a value for each additional increment in water supply? If it takes a certain amount of water to grow a certain crop, there is no additional value for an additional increment.
In most cases it goes the other way – an increment of water lost means an increment of crop value lost. The two are the same from an economic standpoint.

4. Will the final product be a model?
We will present preliminary information to the Committee at the end of May and seek comments from the group. We'll follow up with written documentation, and all of the models we use will be the Committee's to use or not use moving

forward. For aquaculture it is a separate model. We will try to get a handle on how spring flows are affected.

5. Are you going to incorporate the collective effect of consumptive versus non-consumptive?

Yes, to the extent that information comes out of the hydrology models. Water supply is an input into the economic analysis. We are not looking downstream; confining the analysis to the ESPA boundaries. Within some categories, there are downstream uses for that water. In those cases we will try to capture those downstream uses in the economic analysis.

Comments

- [Randy MacMillan] I am concerned about what this committee does with the information generated by this analysis. We have not had a discussion as a committee on how to take the economic information and come up with a plan that we have consensus on. At some point soon we need to have that discussion. Aquaculture producers are very concerned about any effort that creates a tiered system for delivery of water. You have priority rights to deliver water. If we introduce economics as the determining factor, aquaculture would lose out. If that is what happens with the information generated by this economic study, there is no incentive for us to participate in the process. The concern is what the committee ultimately plans to do with the information. We need to stay close to the matrix – here are the alternatives and tell us the pluses and disadvantages to those alternatives.

- [Jonathan Bartsch] We need to come back to that question, and also think about next steps for integrating all of the information available. How does this plan come together? What are the criteria and standards? How can we accomplish the goals and objectives and achieve a broad agreement?

- [Rich Rigby] One of the early problems in the ESPA was competing economic studies. This information can be divisive, and we need to think carefully about how to approach it.

- [Harry Seely] We are looking to the Advisory Committee for input on how to make this study something that will benefit the policy-level discussions you are charged with developing.

- The study should focus on helping us answer cost-benefit questions, and the output should not be used to pit water user against water user.

- [Dave Parrish] Economic values for water bodies are available, and Fish and Game will pass along this information to Harry.

- Water quality issues should also be addressed – it costs a lot more to clean up a problem than it does to prevent it. Does this get incorporated into the analysis, i.e. if Twin Falls receives water that must be treated it costs more.

- How will we incorporate the numbers we get from this analysis into decision-making about the management alternatives?

- The incremental value of water will be different across uses. It doesn't take the same quantity or quality of water to grow wheat and corn as it does fish. Take the City of Twin Falls – if we use surface water, we have to go to the expense of filtering that water. No filtering is required for groundwater although there are costs of bringing it to the surface.

- I'm concerned about us questioning the analysis after the fact, and not having enough input in the design stages. It would help for us to know early on where you're getting your information.

- A Finance/Economics working group will be set up to initially help with analysis, and then look at funding management alternatives.

Update: Fish and Wildlife Working Group

Diane reported for the working group, which met for the first time on March 17th by teleconference. The next meeting will be April 4th, via teleconference (IDWR will also organize a conference room). Notes from the March 17th meeting will be sent to Advisory Committee Members. (see meeting notes for to-do lists). The working group will make a presentation at the next Advisory Committee meeting.

Presentation and Discussion: Adaptive Management Approaches

- **Diane Tate – CDR**

Diane gave a short presentation on Adaptive Management (see website), as requested by the Committee.

Comments

- Official Adaptive Management processes tend to have some specific goals. We, farmers and irrigators, are adaptively managing much more like people do everyday. Make those decisions based on experience or science or some other process. It is nice that we have the goal statement in the framework.

- Will there be an adaptive management plan that covers all the actions, or one plan for each action?

- It will be difficult to put a plan together that addresses everyone's specific interests. This committee was formed and people were invited to the table to make sure that what we do in this group doesn't impact them adversely.

- We may have to look at each individual management alternative. Adaptive management to me seems like a buzz word. Often times, you automatically do it. Ultimately you look to see whether you've reached your goal and then adjust based on what you find. I think it is more of a common sense approach. Example: managed recharge. Monitor to see if you put the water into the system and monitor to see if recharged stretch you wanted to recharge and see if it meets your end goal.

- It is conceivable that we could meet each of our management alternative goals and not meet overall goal. One way to look at it is to see in a comprehensive way are we achieving what we want to do. Looking at this from a comprehensive view point, which may suggest another approach.

- Adaptive management simply means giving our final product permission to evolve.

- [Diane Tate] Would also like us to give some thought to the institution that will make decisions about adaptive management of the plan once it is in place.

- Adaptive management is about setting expectations when the plan is proposed and making sure people understand that we are pretty sure we don't have it exactly right so that people don't expect that they can walk away from it.

- We haven't yet talked about who is going to manage the aquifer. If I were on the IWRB, I would want a plan – how management will take place and by whom. Who is going to shepherd the plan after it is done? Is it the IWRB? IDWR? The Bureau of Reclamation?

- We should have the discussion of who will manage after we decide on the plan.

- Good management, and adaptive management, depends on how well things go when you're not there.

- There's a parallel to our situation: under the forest practices act, decisions are made about timber sales. Every four years an audit of the sales is conducted to answer questions like whether water quality is being protected. We can pattern our adaptive management approach off of existing examples around the state.

- Another example is the Henry's Fork drought management plan, which manages winter flows out of the reservoir. The same thing exists for Palisades, and there are many other models. We should not wait until we have decided on the plan to start thinking about long term management – maybe we could have that discussion sooner rather than later.

- Monitoring also deserves a longer conversation.

Discussion: Next Steps and Future Meeting Agenda Development

Jonathan and Diane asked the group for comments on developing the agenda for the April 24th meeting in Rexburg, which will include updates on both the Environment, Fish & Wildlife working group, and the Economic working group.

Suggestions:

- Discuss opportunities to work with Idaho Power on WIF and WAF projects.
- Discuss how the pieces we've been discussing will come together, and strategies for assembling the CAMP. (How do we weigh the pros and cons?)
- Have CDR develop a draft outline of the CAMP report for discussion.

Discussion: Next Steps and Future Meeting Agenda Development

No public comments were offered.

MEETING ATTENDEES

1.	Lance	Clow	City of Twin Falls
2.	Roger	Chase	City of Pocatello
3.	Steve	Howser	ASCC
4.	Charles	Correll	City of Jerome
5.	Linda	Lemmon	IAA/TSWUA
6.	Jim	Tucker	Idaho Power
7.	Vince	Alberdi	Twin Falls Canal
8.	Ted	Diehl	North Side Canal Co.
9.	Lloyd	Hicks	Burgess
10.	Randy	MacMillan	Clear Springs Foods
11.	Hal	Anderson	IDWR
12.	Kim	Goodman	Trout Unlimited
13.	Barry	Burnell	IDEQ
14.	Dave	Parrish	ID Fish and Game
15.	Rebecca	Casper	Land Dev. Interests

16.	Max	Vaughn	Minidoka Co. Assessor
17.	Craig	Evans	WD 120
18.	George	Katseanas	Domestic Wells
19.	Steven	Serr	Bonneville County
20.	Damien	Miller	USFWS
21.	Bob	Muffly	Middle Snake Regional Water Resource Canal
22.	Dee	Reynolds	Fall River Electric
23.	Rich	Rigby	Reclamation
24.	Randy	Bingham	BID
25.	Dean	Stevenson	MVGWD
Other Attendee			
26.	Peter	Anderson	TU
27.	Gary	Chamberlain	IWRB
28.	Jon	Bowling	IPC
29.	Brian	Patton	IDWR
30.	Roger	Fuhrman	IPC
31.	Helen	Harrington	IDWR
32.	David	Blew	IPC
33.	Bill	Jones	Spring User
34.	Walt	Poole	IDFG
35.	Jonathan	Bartsch	CDR Associates
36.	Diane	Tate	CDR Associates
37.	Jennifer	Graham	CDR Associates