October 20th Meeting Summary For the Treasure Valley Comprehensive Aquifer Management Plan Advisory Committee

Planned meeting goals:

1. Develop options to address Goal 2: Avoid and manage future conflicts.
2. Identify need for information and education of conflict management alternatives. Identify members for drafting subcommittee for Goal 2.
3. Learn about the Corps Storage Feasibility Study through a status update.
4. Learn about the status and results of the climate change/variability study.
5. Review, revise, and continue to seek agreement on strategic actions for CAMP Goal #1. Identify members for drafting subcommittee for Goal 1.

List of Participants

Ron Abramovich	Paul Deveau	Kathy Peter
Brent Adamson	Gary Duspiva	Clinton Pline
Jamie Anderson	Allen Funkhouser	Scott Rhead
Michelle Atkinson	Michael Fuss	Lon Stewart
Rex Barrie	Stephen Goodson	Warren Stewart
Gayle Batt	Matt Howard	John Thornton
Ellen Berrgren	Chris Jones	Rick Ward
Jon Bowling	Bill Larson	Paul Woods
Russ Dane	Brian Patton	

Note: Sixty-five percent of the appointed members attended this meeting.

IDWR Staff: Helen Harrington, Neeley Miller, Sandra Thiel

Facilitation team: Joe McMahon, Daisy Patterson

Welcome, Introductions, and Review of Agenda

The Facilitation Team, the Advisory Committee and the public observers all introduced themselves. Joe McMahon and Daisy Patterson reviewed the meeting goals and agenda for the day.

Helen Harrington delivered a message from the Board describing some of the CAMP parameters. She said that the Idaho Water Resource Board does not intend to change State law with CAMP, and she reminded the Committee that the success criteria agreed on in the May meeting also says that CAMP recommendations must

comply with State law or reasonable changes in law. (Success Criteria are attached to this document as attachment 1.) Helen said that the Board will ensure that the CAMP does not diminish or modify the Prior Appropriation Doctrine nor the IDWR Director's power of duties.

Informational session: DCMI water conservation and reuse

The Committee listened to the following three presentations on water conservation and reuse. See the IDWR website for PDF's of all three presentations.

1. Dr. Calvin Finch, San Antonio's Water Conservation and Drought Management
2. Stephanie Raddatz, United Water's Conservation Plan
3. Clint Dolsby, City of Meridian's Reclaimed Water System

Dr. Calvin Finch, San Antonio Water System

Dr. Calvin Finch presented an overview of San Antonio Water Service's (SAWS) plan for water conservation and drought management.

Metering. Everyone in SAWS service area is metered.

Source water. Dr. Finch explained that approximately 70% of the San Antonio region's water comes from the Edwards Aquifer. He quoted other sources including surface water from Canyon Lake, Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR) water from the Carrrizo Aquifer, and some water from the Trinity Aquifer.

When asked if SAWS has any surface water storage, Dr. Finch mentioned there is some surface water used from lakes west of San Antonio. Dr. Finch said that voters wouldn't accept the idea of a storage facility a few years ago, but SAWS does utilize ASR water.

Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR). Dr. Finch talked about SAWS use of an ASR facility in the Carrizo Aquifer area. When asked about the percentage of water that can be retrieved once it is placed in an ASR, Dr. Finch explained that SAWS has an agreement with the local groundwater district where the ASR is located. He said that agreement allows SAWS access to 100% of what they put into the ASR. Dr. Finch described how the water creates a kind of "bubble" of tension, which means that the quality upon extraction is roughly the same as the quality was at insertion into the ASR – the water doesn't mix with the water in surrounding aquifer. He said that because the water quality is good, the only treatment required is minimal chlorination and the addition of fluoride. Dr. Finch pointed out that conditions have not reached the point where they have had to try to extract exactly as much water as they have put in, but they expect that, with general ASR mechanisms, one should be able extract at least 90% of the total water inserted into the ASR.

Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) involvement in the San Antonio region. At the moment, Dr. Finch was not aware of any BOR activity in the region, though he was

aware of an attempt to get BOR involved in potential brackish water plant treatment projects in Texas.

Delivery to agricultural users. Dr. Finch said that SAWS does not deliver to agricultural users. He said that SAWS has close relationships with the neighboring agricultural providers who also draw from the Edwards Aquifer. Dr. Finch made the point that the peaks for agricultural use are in May or June while the domestic peaks usually occur in July.

Public or private utility? Dr. Finch said that SAWS is a quasi-private utility. Even though the staffing streams are separate, Dr Finch explained that SAWS is governed by City of San Antonio.

Stephanie Raddatz, United Water, Boise

Funding for conservation plan. Stephanie explained that United Water has a predetermined, allowed amount that will be recovered later from ratepayers. United Water has spent $130,000 over the past 3 years.

Customers. Stephanie said that United Water has 83,000 connections and serves an approximate population of 240,000.

Conservation estimates. Stephanie explained that the conservation estimates included in the graph of declining per-capita water consumption does include industry. She pointed out that the per-meter customer shows similar decline to the per capita consumption graph. She also said that United Water is currently in the process of determining what conservation practices are most influential in that 33% decline.

Coordination with City of Boise. Warren Stewart said that United Water is driven by the Public Utilities Commission, but in a drought, United Water would work with the City of Boise to implement policies like even/odd day watering.

Rate Sensor Program. Stephanie stated that the rain sensor program has been going on for two years. When asked about the success of the program so far, she explained that the program is being revaluated to see if there are better mechanisms for sensor distribution so that more users will sign up for the program. She said that in two years, United Water has distributed 1200 rain sensors.

Clint Dolsby, City of Meridian Public Works

Agency rules and potential for mandates. Clint mentioned that the rules for reclaimed water may be different in various states. He said that the City of Meridian is working with DEQ to clarify and improve rules.

Clint and Warren Stewart said that right now, most reclaimed water systems are financially motivated, and United Water doesn't expect agency mandates soon.

Heroes Park. When asked if Heroes Park has a water right associated with the land, Clint said that there was a pressurized irrigation system present at the park before they began applying reclaimed water. He said that the city will continue to pay the

assessment fee, and the pressurized irrigation system will continue to be maintained as a backup system.

System savings. Clint suggested that reclaimed water may help save surface water, but the Committee expressed concerns that reclaimed water may limit discharges into the Boise River. The concern was that the decrease in discharges would lead to shortages for the downstream users with natural flow rights.

Dialogue on Conservation and Reuse

Conservation and reuse (or reclaimed water) seemed to be an emerging and important issue. One of the main concerns of the Committee was how to promote both conservation and reclaimed water use without penalty to water right holders or downstream rights. IDWR has established that the right to reclaim water exists if the entity that initially utilized the water then uses the reclaimed water for permitted purposes; IDWR says that the right to reuse ends with discharge. One question that emerged was, "Can reuse of a water right mean that downstream rights who relied on return flow then demand a release of reservoir water?" Another question that came up was, "If reuse decreases the amount of water available to downstream water rights holders, is additional storage a solution?"

Informational and dialogue session: Technical, planning, and policy implications of studies of future water demand

Helen Harrington presented information on the uncertainties and unknowns in three studies which attempt to predict various elements of future water demand in the Treasure Valley. See Helen's presentation on the IDWR website.

Dialogue on Uncertainty and Unknowns with Future Demand

One of the main points that emerged following the presentation on the three future demand studies was that the use of the word "conversion" does not mean a change in ownership of water or a shift in water rights from the current holder to someone else. Rather, "conversion" refers to a change in use. Recommendations from the Committee do not involve eliminating any existing entity, and the role of the supplier is important in reducing future conflicts.

The Committee considered the demand described in the three studies and what that demand will mean for future supplies. Many Committee members think the Treasure Valley is, in fact, facing a potential water shortage. Some members referenced the drought in 1992

Advisory Committee product decisions:

1. Idaho water law and rights of water users will be respected, not changed, in the recommendations.
2. The valley has 633 Kaf that may convert from agricultural uses to other uses. This is a key number and issue for the future of the valley.
3. Water stays with the land or owner of the right, but who delivers is separate from how the water is used. There is no intent to eliminate any entity.
4. The Committee needs to look at how conservation and reuse can be accomplished without penalty to either the water right owner or those affected by return flow.

as an indicator that the current supply is not adequate in times of extended drought. The Committee also discussed two factors that may also influence supply of and demand for water: climate change and conjunctive administration. The Committee discussed whether they know enough to make recommendations at this point and whether the group should stay with the plan that aims for a March completion. After the group discussion, each member of the Committee stated his or her preference for moving forward.

The main points from the Committee members suggested that the group should:

- Accept that we are dealing with incomplete data and uncertainty;
- Take what we have learned (and learn a bit more) and move to making recommendations;
- Aim for the planned target completion date (3 or 4 more meetings);
- Don't waste time or tax payer dollars; and
- Spend time discussing issues that relate directly to the aquifer (for example, what are the sensitive areas of the aquifer, and the potential to use the aquifer for storage)

The Committee decided that the best way to move forward with recommendations for CAMP would be to develop a master framework, or a matrix, to organize the ideas that have emerged so far in the process. This matrix would include recommended actions, triggers, risks, and consequences. The matrix could be organized by the CAMP goals created by the IWRB. The matrix would account for spatial and temporal issues, as well as relative benefit and cost. Other options discussed included (1) an approach where individuals would brainstorm specific recommendations and then prioritize as a committee; and (2) an approach where the Committee would divide into groups to develop recommendations and then discuss a framework afterwards.

Advisory Committee process decisions:

1. Do not extend the process by several months.
2. Small group work will be more efficient, as long as we ensure all core decisions stay with the full Committee.
3. Increase our focus on the aquifer.
4. Will use a matrix to help evaluate options and scenarios.
5. Will consider using small groups for special issues (see below).
6. We know we will not have all the data we seek, so we must be able to function with uncertainty.

The Committee decided to break into small groups and use the options to meet future demand developed in the June meeting to complete the matrix. The facilitation team reminded the Committee that the list of options in Attachment 1 is just a start and that other ideas should be recorded in the matrix as they emerge. The Committee stated that the small groups should report back to the Committee so that decisions can be made collectively, not in the smaller groups. The matrix, the small groups, and the list of options can be found in the various tabs of the spreadsheet in Attachment 1.

The facilitation team suggested that some issues might be best addressed by some special issue groups. Like the small groups, these special issues groups would not make decisions for the larger Committee. Instead, they would gather and organize more information on the issues and bring those ideas back to the larger Committee for decisions. Some of the topics that might benefit from special issues groups are:

- Easing conversion from agriculture to DCMI
- Implications of conjunctive administration
- Storage including aquifer storage
- How to encourage efficiency and conservation without penalty to the water right holder?

Informational session: Storage Feasibility

Ellen Berrgren, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, presented an update on the Lower Boise River Interim Feasibility Study. Please see her presentation online at IDWR's website.

Following Ellen's presentation, a Committee member asked if the feasibility study were funded in 2011, when would the study be completed? Ellen said it would be 3-5 years.

Next Steps, Future Meeting Dates, Final Questions

Next steps

IDWR staff divided the Committee into four groups based on the discussion regarding small groups in the middle of the day (Attachment 1). The Committee decided to meet with those groups after the meeting adjourned to:

1. Select a facilitator (or co-facilitators) and a reporter;
2. Determine what kind of assistance each group would like from IDWR staff;
3. Consider whether the matrix design is complete; and
4. Begin to fill in the matrix, or determine how the group will work together to fill in the matrix

Even though some of the small groups may elect to convene prior to the next Advisory Committee meeting, the Committee agreed that the next meeting should allow time in the morning for the small groups to continue their work. The Committee decided that the first half of the day would be with small groups, and the second half of the day will be spent as one large group.

Future dates and meetings

- October 29 – Deadline for comments on the Future Demand Study
- November 10 – Next Committee meeting (location TBD)
    - Morning: small groups meet to continue work on matrix
    - Afternoon: Committee meets to listen to reports from small groups and continues progress on matrix

- December 14 – Advisory Committee meeting
- January 7 - Advisory Committee meeting
- February – Meeting date to be determined in November

Public Comment

Liz Paul pointed out that new demand, or new users, do not necessarily create the need for a new supply of water. As suggested in the earlier presentations from United Water and San Antonio Water Service, Liz said that new and continued conservation and reuse strategies have the potential to lower the per capita usage, meaning there would not be an increase in demand for water even if population growth occurs.

Lynn Tominaga said that he would like to see more reconnaissance of recharge infrastructure and sites. There may be an opportunity for free electricity from Bonneville Power as there is both excess flow and energy created during certain seasonal times.

Attachment 1

Decisional Criteria to Evaluate Potential Recommendations

Draft of 1 June 2010 Ver 3

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. Avoid a taking, disminishment, or modification of existing property rights (land and water rights, contractual rights)?
4. Comply with laws or within reasonable changes in laws?
5. Meet future needs?
6. Reliable/sustainable?
7. Do we adequately understand the impacts of any proposed change: impacts to environment, hydrological system, economics, and other parties' expectations?
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 informed land use decisions?
12. Fair and equitable in its application?
13. Incent the best management practices of industry, agriculture, and land use planning?
14. Does the recommendation have irreversible consequences?

Viewing the Recommendations as a whole

15. Viewing the Recommendations as a whole, do the Advisory Committee's recommendations:

15.1. Appropriately address the management of ground and surface water resources into the future?

15.2. Guide IDWR's technical and management actions?; and

15.3. Permit State agencies to exercise their duties in a manner consistent with the CAMP?

Source: IDWR CAMP Brochure