



Meeting Summary For the Treasure Valley Comprehensive Aquifer Management Plan Advisory Committee for the April 28, 2010 Meeting

Draft of 10 May 2010

On April 28, 2010, the Treasure Valley CAMP Advisory Committee met for the first time. The Advisory Committee met in the Trophy Room of the MK Nature Center in Boise, ID. The objectives of this meeting were to

1. Discuss the purpose and goals of the CAMP process.
2. Refine and begin to build agreement on the ground rules.
3. Discuss the issues the Advisory Committee expects to address, understanding that the issues may change as the process progresses. Start listing the criteria that recommendations must meet in order to move forward from the Advisory Committee to the Idaho Water Resource Board.
4. Build a work plan that presents the overall goals and products of the CAMP and guides the next few meetings.

List of Participants

Advisory Committee

Ron Abramovich
Michelle Atkinson
Rex Barrie
Jon Bowling
Barry Burnell
Russ Dane
Paul Deveau
Dave Dixon
Gary Duspiva
Matt Howard
Chris Jones
Bill Larson
Lynn McKee

Greg Nelson
Brian Patton
Kathy Peter
John Prigge
Scott Rhead
Jayson Ronk
Jeff Scott
Gary Shoemaker
Lon Stewart
John Thornton
Rick Ward
Paul Woods
Janice Yerton

IDWR/IWRB

Helen Harrington
Neeley Miller
Sandra Thiel

Future Demand Team

Saqib Najmus
Elias Tijerina

Members of the Public

12

Note to Absent Advisory Committee Members

As a general note, the Facilitation Team would like to recognize that some of the Advisory Committee members were not able to attend this first meeting. None of the actions suggested in this document are final, specifically the groundrules, list of issues, and decision criteria. The Facilitation Team will distribute these documents prior to the next meeting for your review prior to finalizing during the discussion that occurs at the meeting.

However, the meeting dates listed at the end of this document are firm, so please place those on your calendars.

Introductions, Process Overview, and Groundrules Discussion

Brian Patton welcomed the AC members on behalf of the Idaho Water Resources Board (IWRB). In the future, IWRB members will attend meetings when possible.

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

http://www.idwr.idaho.gov/WaterBoard/WaterPlanning/CAMP/TV_CAMP/PDF/2010/04-28-2010_Purpose-Goals.pdf

The Advisory Committee discussed the groundrules presented in the situation assessment, which can be found online at:

http://www.idwr.idaho.gov/waterboard/WaterPlanning/CAMP/TV_CAMP/PDF/TVReportVer10B.pdf

The groundrules provided by the Facilitation Team in the assessment were intended to provide a starting point for this discussion, and the Facilitation Team will modify the draft to reflect changes requested by the Advisory Committee. **Preliminary decision:** The groundrules as drafted and with suggested modifications are tentatively accepted.

Public input

The Advisory Committee would like to develop an online commenting mechanism for members of the public to submit information that might be too detailed or lengthy for the public comment periods at future Advisory Committee meetings. IWRB staff will explore this matter.

Preliminary decision: Public comment periods will be 15 minutes long, and those intending to provide comment will need to identify the they are commenting on via comment cards prior to speaking during the comment period.

Future Demand Presentation

Saqib Najmus and Elias Tijermia provided an update, answered questions, and gathered feedback on the preliminary findings of the Future Demand Study. The presentation from Messrs Najmus and Tijermia as PowerPoint slides is online at:

http://www.idwr.idaho.gov/waterboard/WaterPlanning/CAMP/TV_CAMP/2010docs.htm

Data quality and meaning. Several questions during the discussion addressed what was, and was not, included/accounted for in the statistical analysis of water used in the basin. The data from water companies does not include private wells or agriculture and does not

include pressurized lawn irrigation water. The data does include treated water that is used for irrigation. All of this data referred to withdrawals from the aquifer, not consumption.

One question suggested that there might be a downward trend of water production signified by data from 2008 and 2009 (from Average Annual Historic Water Use). The Future Demand Team stated that there may be several reasons for this, and United Water may have data that clarifying those reasons.

Some Advisory Committee members wondered when the aquifer carrying capacity would be factored into the Future Demand Study.

Distinguishing types of usage. The Advisory Committee requested that the Future Demand Team differentiate uses so that Domestic, Commercial, Municipal, and Industrial (DCMI) water isn't lumped into one urban pool. The Future Demand Team stated that they are separate, and the Team emphasized that those descriptions are based on land use rather than job code.

Land use conversion. The land use discussion continued with a request for more information on trends and goals for agricultural use conversion to urban use. The agricultural community has and needs to contribute records and data to help clarify this issue in this specific basin. The Future Demand Team stated that there are several variables that influence the predicted change in water use when converting from one use to another, and they will look for that data to understand the local variables.

Consistent methods for data analysis. An Advisory Committee member questioned whether the state water plan is making the same assumptions as the water demand team.

Lawn irrigation. Another Advisory Committee member wanted to be sure the Future Demand Team understood that the valley has two systems for watering lawns. Predicted water use volumes will change based on the different pricing structures applied to those systems. Therefore, the demand, or volumes needed may be different than what general analysis might suggest.

Distinction between public and private native lands. When considering native lands, the Advisory Committee would like the Future Demand Team to break out native lands into public and private to illustrate the limited potential that public land will go into production. (There is some assumption that native lands may be converted to agricultural lands in the future).

Domestic wells. The Advisory Committee also requested that the Future Demand Team account for domestic wells and explain how the future demand data might be merged with upcoming data from the climate change study.

The Facilitation Team will be organizing a conference call with the Future Demand Team and interested Advisory Committee members. The purpose of the call is to (1) follow up on current outstanding data requests; (2) identify other data gaps that can be filled by various entities around aquifer; (3) further refine the data and deliverables of the Future Demand Study; and (4) increase the understanding of how the data is being analyzed and presented.

Dialogue: What are the key issues that should be considered by the Advisory Committee in preparing its recommendations?

The Facilitation Team asked the Advisory Committee to determine the best use of time and energy. The Advisory Committee considered the list of issues and options developed during the assessment process. Using that list of issues and options, the Advisory Committee clarified, then added and subtracted from, the list to reflect the issues they want to address in the CAMP process. The Advisory Committee gave preliminary advice on how to sequence those issues so that the discussion would have a natural, logical flow from meeting to meeting. The following are the issues generated in the general sequencing that the Advisory Committee would like to use:

1. Water (supply) overview; watershed forecasting
2. Implications of land use conversions (specifically, but not limited to, ag-to-urban)
3. Ensure reliable/sustainable water supplies
4. Increase the efficiency of existing and future water use
5. Address the existing (fragmented) system for water management and administration
6. Improve flood utilization of flood waters
7. Protect, manage, and improve water quality consistent with the intended use in the Treasure Valley
8. Preserve the water related values of the corridor

This general progression of issues will be revisited at future meetings and adjusted as the need arises. **Preliminary decision:** The FT will use this list to begin developing a revised Work Plan and future meeting agenda, as amended by the AC from time to time.

Criteria for success, How should the AC evaluate potential recommendations?

The Advisory Committee raised the question of cost several times during the Issues and Criteria discussion. The subject of cost may be relevant to more than one (likely all) issues, and “cost” may refer to a wide range of subjects: construction costs, implementation and monitoring costs, administrative costs, political and social costs.

Preliminary decision: A draft of preliminary decision criteria was developed and is attached as Attachment A.

Work plan and Scheduling

The Advisory Committee reviewed the proposed list of key issues and the Facilitation Team will update the Work Plan for a schedule of topics for future meetings. The updated workplan will be provided prior to the next meeting on the IDWR website on the Documents page. The next three meetings are currently scheduled for May 20, June 10, and July 30, 2010.

Preliminary decisions: Items to be undertaken as a result of this meeting

1. Revise the ground rules [Facilitation Team]
2. Consider how to permit public input via web [IWRB staff]
3. Develop Work Plan and meeting agenda in accord with list of issues identified by the AC, and deliver a proposed agenda for the May 20 meeting [Facilitation Team].

Attachment A Treasure Valley Decisional Criteria to Evaluate Potential Recommendations, DRAFT of 01 May 2010, Ver1

This list builds upon comments from Advisory Committee Meeting No. 1 and guidance from the CAMP brochure as it paraphrases the Committee's assignment.

1. Does the proposed recommendation advance the four CAMP goals?
 - 1.1. Provide reliable sources of water projecting 50 years into the future.
 - 1.2. Avoid conflict (e.g., the experience in the Eastern Snake River Plain Aquifer).
 - 1.3. Prioritize future water investments.
 - 1.4. Bridge the gaps between future water needs and supply.

Source: IDWR CAMP Brochure

Does the (Is the) recommendation:

2. Have appropriate cost and cost-benefit ratio?
3. Respect property rights?
4. Comply with laws or within reasonable changes in laws?
5. Meet future needs?
6. Reliable/sustainable?
7. Considered the environmental consequences?
8. Contributes to increased knowledge of the aquifer/basin?
9. Consider consequences to other parts of the hydrological system?
10. Recognize and deal with uncertainty?
11. Support better-informed land use decisions?
12. Fair and equitable in its application?
13. Incent the best management practices of land use planning?

Viewing the Recommendations as a whole

14. Viewing the Recommendations as a whole, do the Advisory Committee's recommendations:
 - 14.1. Appropriately address the management of ground and surface water resources into the future?
 - 14.2. Guide IDWR's technical and management actions?; and
 - 14.3. Permit State agencies to exercise their duties in a manner consistent with the CAMP?

Source: IDWR CAMP Brochure