



Meeting Summary For the Rathdrum Prairie Comprehensive Aquifer Management Plan Advisory Committee

Final version, Jan 15, 2010

Meeting Location, Date, and Time:

Idaho Fish and Game, Coeur d'Alene, December 18, 2009, 9 a.m.-4 p.m.

Attendance

Advisory Committee:

Chris Beck
Todd Tondee
Paul Klatt
Jim Markley
Andy Dunau
Mike Neher
Ken Windram
Philip Cernera
Bruce Howard
Jon Mueller
Bruce Cyr
Alan Miller
Kermit Kiebert

Public:

Chris Ryffe
Gary Stevens
Dale Marcy
Terry Harris
Bob Smathers
Mike Denny
Bill Irving

IWRB Members:

Bob Graham
Chuck Cuddy

IDWR Staff:

Helen Harrington
Bob Haynes

Attending via phone from Boise:

Brian Patton
Kevin Lewis
Brenda Tominaga
Norm Semanko
Neeley Miller

Meeting Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. What and Why of CAMP process
3. Review of the Ground Rules
4. Future Demand Study Presentation
5. Overview of Rathdrum Prairie issues that need to be addressed
6. What do we need to know and how do we learn it?
7. Review of Work Plan, the next meeting's agenda, and scheduling

1. Welcome and Introductions

Bob Graham and Chuck Cuddy, the Rathdrum Prairie Sub-Committee of the Idaho Water Resource Board, provided welcoming remarks to the group. Bob emphasized the Board's appreciation of the commitment of the Advisory Committee members, and he encouraged the group to work towards consensus in their recommendations. Bob and Chuck both discussed a strong desire to have further representation of environmental conservation interests on the Advisory Committee. Bob encouraged the group to select their own path as they meet the goals of the CAMP process. The Board would like to see the Advisory Committee consider a wide range of options to achieve CAMP objectives.

During introductions, Advisory Committee members shared specific reasons for participating in the CAMP process. The list of reasons or issues mentioned included:

- Water quality
- Water availability
- Wastewater management
- Water is central to all that we do
- Concern with how water is managed on the Columbia from the ocean to headwaters
- Hydropower customers rely on water for power as well as other needs
- Water is the new oil
- Land development will affect our future

2. What and Why of CAMP process

Helen Harrington, Idaho Department of Water Resources, discussed the CAMP purpose and goals. Information from her presentation can be found on the Rathdrum Prairie CAMP webpage on the IDWR website at:

http://www.idwr.idaho.gov/waterboard/WaterPlanning/CAMP/RP_CAMP/RathdrumCAMP.htm

Discussion following the presentation included the following questions/points:

What happened to the Rathdrum Prairie Groundwater Management Plan? Some Committee members participated on the Ground Water Management Plan advisory group, and they wanted to know the differences between that plan and the CAMP. The Ground Water Management Plan is administrative, and it attempts to regulate the resources based on current conditions. The CAMP is not regulatory, and the purpose of CAMP is to plan for meeting water demand 50 years into the future.

With the variety of plans and processes on the Rathdrum Prairie, Committee members expressed concern that there might be challenges when communicating with the public about this specific plan. The list of plans and processes included:

- Aquifer Protection District
- North Idaho Adjudication
- Idaho Ground Water Management Plan
- CAMP
- The State Water Plan

Advisory Committee members raised two issues that will need to be dealt with during CAMP: (1) disposal of wastewater and (2) exportation of water to areas that don't have enough water to support development.

3. Review of the Ground Rules

The Advisory Committee reviewed the draft Ground Rules, which outline the purpose, roles and responsibilities of the Board, Advisory Committee members, Ad Hoc Resource Network, and facilitators. A new draft, integrating Advisory Committee feedback, will be distributed to the Advisory Committee for review and decision making at the next Advisory Committee meeting. A marked copy of the ground rules is available on the IDWR website.

During the Ground Rules discussion, Advisory Committee members suggested revisions, asked questions and provided input. Changes were focused on the sections on the Ad Hoc Resource Advisory Network, Technical Support, and Public Participation.

When possible, science that is used to make decisions in the Advisory Committee will be reproducible, peer-reviewed, utilize regional data, and provide assumptions and baseline data sources.

Much of the discussion focused on the need to engage with the public in a meaningful, timely manner. The group agreed that public comment periods should be at the beginning and end of each meeting. As reflected in the next draft of the Ground Rules, the public will also have an opportunity, as time permits and with Advisory Committee permission, to question presenters and provide input as requested by the Advisory Committee members.

4. Future Demand Study Presentation

Christian Petrich and Jennifer Sukow from SPF Water Consulting in Boise delivered a PowerPoint presentation on the Future Demand Study via conference call line. The PowerPoint presentation is available at the IDWR website. These questions followed the presentation:

1. How does the quality of the water use and population data compare to the USGS study?
2. Allen Miller, Slide 7. How are the spatial distribution and density relevant in this unique aquifer where the cone of depression is almost immeasurable due to high transmissivity?
3. Todd Tondee, Slide 11. What is the relationship between per unit use (170-190 gpd/unit) and per capita use (gpcd)?
4. How were water use estimates derived from water rights, given that actual usage is less than the quantities shown on the water right?
5. Bruce Howard. How will changes in impermeable surface area over the 50 year period be addressed?
6. Bill Irving, Slide 4. How will climate change be incorporated when the BSU study will not be done until June?
7. Jim Markley. How will exportation of water to places of use outside of the study area be included in the demand projections?
8. What is the date (i.e. year or years) used to develop the baseline water use data?
9. Will potential minimum instream flow requirements be addressed?

5. Overview of Rathdrum Prairie issues that need to be addressed

Advisory Committee members asked that the options be discussed in more detail at the next meeting when all members have had a chance to review the Issues and Options section in the Assessment report found at:

http://www.idwr.idaho.gov/WaterBoard/WaterPlanning/CAMP/RP_CAMP/LDP/presentations.htm

The Advisory Committee added the issue of exportation of water for development, or prioritization of future rights (i.e. whether water will transition from other uses to domestic and be transported to places where water is not already available.)

The Advisory Committee discussed prioritizing issues and options based on complexity. They decided the following issues should be discussed after the Advisory Committee has made some progress on the other options:

- Existing water uses and rights
- Wastewater treatment and disposal
- Land and water use, including demand driven by growth
- Civic and political will
- Transboundary issues
- Coeur d'Alene Tribe's water rights

The following issues will be on the agenda for the afternoon of the next meeting:

- Surface-Ground and quality-quantity interactions
- Water supply and availability
- Water quality

6. What do we need to know and how do we learn it?

The Advisory Committee requested presentations on the USGS, the Spokane Valley-Rathdrum Prairie Aquifer Atlas, and an overview of water rights issues. The first half of the next meeting will be dedicated to building a shared understanding of aquifer "101." While the Advisory Committee members are not expected to become experts on hydrology or other aquifer specialties, the presentations will provide them with a basis for future discussions.

The Advisory Committee may explore scientific or technical studies in the future as specific questions about issues and options are presented.

7. Review of Work Plan, the next meeting's agenda, and scheduling

Though the Advisory Committee selected meeting dates that conflicted with the Board schedule, so the Facilitation Team is gathering feedback on new dates. The next meeting will occur begin at 8:30 a.m. and adjourn at 4:30 p.m.

The next meeting agenda will include the following items:

- Two public comment periods, and the start and end of the meeting
- Review of meeting #1 and discussion of how to focus on our specific task given by the Legislature and IWRB.
- "Aquifer 101" Presentations on the USGS Study and the SVRP Atlas
- Discussion of options and issues; Which options merit our initial attention?

The Facilitation team encourages the Advisory Committee to review the Assessment Report from the IDWR website and the SVRP Atlas. Advisory Committee members are also expected to consider issues and options not included at the assessment so those items can be added to the discussion list at the next meeting.