

March 15, 2011
Meeting Summary for the Treasure Valley
Comprehensive Aquifer Management Plan Advisory Committee
(Meeting #11)

Meeting Goals

1. Review the draft outline designed by the drafting group and obtain consensus on moving forward with drafting the document. .

List of Advisory Committee Participants and IDWR Staff

Adamson, Brent	Fuss, Michael	Rhead, Scott
Barrie, Rex	Goodson, Stephen	Ronk, Jayson
Berggren, Ellen	Howard, Matt	Shoemaker, Gary
Bowling, Jon	Jones, Chris	Stewart, Lon
Burnell, Barry	Larson, Bill	Ward, Rick
Case, Vern	Leatherman, Megan	Woods, Paul
Dane, Russ	McKee, Lynn	Zirschky, Mark
Decker, Kevin	Nelson, Greg	Harrington, Helen – Staff
Deveau, Paul	Patton, Brian	Miller, Neeley – Staff
Dixon, Dave	Peter, Kathy	Ball, Diana – Staff
Duspiva, Gary	Pline, Clinton	
Funkhouser, Allen	Prigge, John	

Welcome, Introductions, and Meeting Expectations

Ms. Helen Harrington started the meeting by reviewing the agenda and explained that the agenda for day two would be determined at the end of day one. She provided a brief update on the work that was accomplished by the drafting group, which was created at the last meeting and consists of Rex Barrie, Russ Dane, Matt Howard, Chris Jones, Kathy Peter, Rick Ward, Paul Woods, and Brian Patton. Ms. Harrington then provided a brief overview of the review process that the drafting group would use to present the draft TV CAMP document outline to the full Advisory Committee (AC).

Mr. Brian Patton commented that this version of the draft outline was also presented to the Idaho Water Resource Board at the regular Board meeting held on March 10 and 11. The Board provided positive feedback and commended the AC and Drafting Group for their cooperative efforts in moving forward towards an estimate date of July 2011 to submit a draft TV CAMP document for the Board's approval. Mr. Patton also shared specific comments from the Board members:

1. Drafting group and RAFN subcommittee should include representation from all groups, specifically irrigators
2. Expectation that TV CAMP will identify gaps in data and study needs

3. Appreciation for TV CAMP AC and Drafting Group efforts in establishing draft outline, which is very helpful to the Board
4. Overall, the outline appears to be moving in the right direction

Drafting Group Presentation of Proposed Outline

The drafting group presented a brief overview of the six main sections of the developed outline. The AC provided feedback and was in agreement that the general flow of the outline made sense as the core framework for the draft TV CAMP document.

Drafting Group / Advisory Committee Detailed Discussion of Outline Components

With the general framework of the outline established, the drafting group worked through the specifics of each of the main sections and subsections with the AC. The review process provided for a beneficial exchange of ideas between committee members and the drafting group, specific language and scenarios were identified and incorporated based on the consensus of the entire committee, and direction was established for the drafting group to move forward in compiling a draft document for review at the next meeting.

Several key topics were considered and discussed:

- Relevance of Star
- Critical need for flow and continuity between sections of document for overall understanding by reader and beneficial use of document
- Prioritize issues – timing, importance, and urgency
- Structure of Background section
 - Physical: ground water and surface water
 - Organizations (appendix) and Challenges
 - Laws, rules, and policy
- Address general outline issues:
 - Existing water
 - Organizations that manage water
 - Laws and rules that apply

Following review of the outline and discussion among AC participants, the Drafting Group was directed by the AC to proceed with drafting the recommended TV CAMP document with staff. It is anticipated that there will be at least one review and revision meeting prior to submitting the draft TV CAMP document to the IWRB in July. Those meetings will be determined based on availability of the full Advisory Committee and will be coordinated and facilitated by Department staff.

Review Outcome of Discussion

The discussion generated substantial and productive feedback. The Advisory Committee was able to come to consensus on the components of the draft outline. Appreciation was extended to the drafting group for their successful efforts in designing the draft outline and specifically to Mr. Paul Woods for leading the draft outline review and discussion and

keeping the committee on task and on schedule, thus eliminating the need for a second day of meetings.

Public Comment

Liz Paul, Idaho Rivers United, suggested several changes to the draft outline and made recommendations for consideration to the Drafting Group and Advisory Committee

Ms. Paul announced that the next Idaho Rivers United program is scheduled for March 29, 2011, and the program will be “Flood: Marvel or Disaster”.

Bruce Smith, Moore Smith Buxton & Turcke, Chartered, commented on the draft outline and RAFN document.

Next Meeting and Adjourn

No future meeting date was established. Ms. Harrington suggested that a complete draft document might be available by the end of April or first part of May for the first review by the full Advisory Committee. The plan is to provide the draft document to the entire Advisory Committee for a review period of two weeks and then schedule a meeting date and time to discuss with the Committee. The IWRB currently has regular meetings scheduled in Boise on July 28 and 29, 2011, and September 8 and 9, 2011. It is anticipated that the final recommended document will be submitted to the IWRB for review and approval at one of these meetings.

The committee requested that Ms. Harrington explain the formal process for approval of the draft TV CAMP document by the IWRB. Ms. Harrington explained that a 60-day public comment period is required and at least one public hearing is required for public testimony prior to the IWRB formally adopting the TV CAMP document.

Meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:15 p.m.

TV CAMP – Preliminary Draft Outline

- 1. Executive Summary**
- 2. Introduction**
- 3. Background**
- 4. Future Challenges to Providing for Reliable Sources of Water and Avoiding Conflict Over Water Resources**
- 5. Actions Needed to Provide Reliable Sources of Water and Avoid Conflict over Water Resources**
- 6. Implementation**

TV CAMP – Preliminary Draft Outline

1. Executive Summary (concise description of challenges ahead and recommended actions)

- a. This is important because . . .
- b. The following actions needed to meet these future challenges include . . .
 - i. (insert after; synthesize Actions)

2. Introduction

- a. Creation of TV CAMP by legislature/IWRB
- b. Goals of TV CAMP

3. Background and Current Conditions

- a. Introduction
 - i. Surface water and ground water both supply water to the Treasure Valley
 - ii. Recognizing the interconnection (do not have a clear understanding timing/extent/location)
 - iii. Recognizing the contribution of surface water to ground water
- b. Ground water system
 - i. Regional setting
 - ii. Hydrogeology
 - iii. TVAS recharge
 - iv. TVAS discharge
 - v. Water levels
 - vi. Ground water areas of concern
 - vii. Water quality
 - viii. Well construction
 - ix. Ground water flow direction
 - x. Limitations and Gaps
- c. Surface water system
 - i. Primary source of water for TV
 - ii. Watershed – description, drainage area 2650 square miles, tributaries, etc.
 1. Fisheries/biological flows
 2. Recreation
 3. Aesthetics values
 4. Surface water quality
 - iii. Reservoir system
 1. Operated cooperatively by USBR and ACOE
 2. Capacity - ~1maf – space to irrigation entities and limited DCMI;
 3. Irrigation for ~225,000 acres

4. Flood control
 5. 152,000 af of space to maintain winter flows in the Boise River downstream of Lucky Peak
 6. Hydropower
 - iv. Canal/drain system – miles, acres served, etc.
 1. Canal, lateral, and drain system
 - v. Flows
 1. 30-year average -- ~2maf flow past Lucky Peak into valley; ~1maf flows out of valley.
 2. Variability
 - a. Historical annual: 658,000 in 1977 to 3,500,000 af in 1997.
 - i. Insert hydrograph (30 year average, volume, carryover storage)
 - b. Average seasonal: ~700 cfs low summer flows to ~20,000 cfs peak spring flows
 - i. Display variability (seasonally and annually) of flows (summary hydrograph)\
 - vi. Limitations and Gaps
- d. Water Use
- i. Ground water (TVHP)
 - ii. Surface water
 - iii. Charts/maps (historical use pattern maps, population changes over time)
 - iv. Limitations and Gaps
- e. Water Management and Administration
- i. Water Organizations/jurisdictions
 1. Responsibilities of major entities [IDWR, IWRB, District #63, Irrigation districts/canal companies/lateral associations, Boise Project Board of Control, Municipal providers, Bureau of Reclamation (ACOE not included in water management and administration) self-supplied DCMI]
 2. State law associated with requiring the continued use of irrigation water for landscaping
 - ii. Flows regulated to Star
 1. Fully appropriated during irrigation season
 2. Winter maintenance flows - paraphrase language from decree
 - iii. Below Star demand typically met by return flows
 1. Water available for appropriation below Star

- iv. Stewart (senior) and Bryan (flood) decree rights and step down priorities carried over into SRBA decrees.
 - 1. Step-down priority system. (see Water Master Report)
 - v. Rental Pool and Water Supply Bank
 - 1. Water Bank
 - a. History
 - b. Activity
 - 2. Rental Pool
 - a. History
 - b. Activity
 - c. Flow Augmentation /Nez Perce Term Sheet (~40kaf)
 - vi. Ground water rights not currently administered
 - 1. See language from 1995 Ground Water District Legislation (2452?) – disorganization of various entities and bringing them into an organized group.
 - vii. Finalization of SRBA in TV will allow for administration of both surface and ground water rights in the future if necessary.
 - viii. Limitations and Gaps
- f. Conclusion/wrap-up/transition into next section

4. Future Challenges to Providing for Reliable Sources of Water and Avoiding Conflict Over Water Resources

- a. Fragmented ground water user community
 - i. No current umbrella organization for municipal ground water providers
 - ii. Challenges with funding, setting priorities, and creation of a ground water district
 - iii. Need a mechanism for coordination within the ground water community
- b. Increased variability of surface water supply
 - i. Increased variability means drought periods will increase in frequency and severity from historical norms.
 - ii. Wetter years that yield water that exceeds available ground water/surface water storage space does not provide supply for future demand.
 - iii. Inter-year seasonal variability: highs and lows will change
 - iv. Change in hydrograph due to earlier runoff due to warmer temperatures in early spring (Intra-year)
- c. Predictability and reliability of ground water supply
 - i. Studies to date indicate ground water supply and availability vary by location and predictability of future capacity is limited.
 - ii. Ground water as a future supply for DCMI may face limitations in various locations.
- d. Interconnectivity
 - i. Timing, extent, location...etc

- ii. Management of conflict
- e. Increased population and economic growth triggering transition from ag to DCMI use
 - i. 650 KAF could change from Ag to DCMI (WRIME)
 - ii. Demand projections show a wide range of possible scenarios for future water demand.
 - iii. Geographic variations (higher in basin more difficult, lower in basin not as big of an issue), trends associated with geography of recent water right applications
 - iv. hydrographs
- f. Ability of water infrastructure to meet existing and future needs
 - i. Aging and deteriorating systems (broad discussion)
 - 1. Agricultural, municipal
 - ii. Funding issue – who pays
 - iii. Modernization
- g. Maintaining Quality of Life
 - i. Aesthetics
 - ii. Recreational needs
 - iii. Property values, economic development, socio-economic values
- h. Limited understanding of the system hydrology
 - i. Difficulties associated with planning, management, forecasting, etc.
 - ii. Lack of data, weaknesses in the model(s)
- i. Meeting Environmental Needs
 - i. Biological concerns
 - ii. Water Quality
- j. Consolidated information Gaps

5. Actions Needed to Provide Reliable Sources of Water and Avoid Conflict Over Water Resources

- a. Enhance Water Planning and Management to maximize economic, environmental, monetary and non-monetary benefits to Idaho.
 - i. Improve ground water models and technical tools to meet administrative purpose and to facilitate decision making.
 - ii. Support water supply modeling and stream flow monitoring
 - iii. Measure water usage changes, reporting demand trends to IWRB
 - iv. Support drought planning to increase the resiliency of the water supply specific to the Boise drainage
 - v. Create a mechanism for coordination within the ground water community (e.g. creation of ground water district, or a hybrid ground water district incorporating all users including self-supplied domestic)
 - vi. Continue to increase transparency of planning process

- b. Additional storage and supply
 - i. Continue the study of the feasibility of potential surface water storage projects in a manner that comprehensively addresses supply options and avoids conflict
 - ii. Investigate the feasibility of Managed Recharge for meeting future water demands.
 - iii. Support the exchange of Reclamation's flow augmentation space in Lucky Peak (excluding stream flow maintenance) with replacement water supply consistent with the Nez Perce term sheet.
 - iv. Cloud Seeding
- c. Demand Reduction ("water conservation")
 - i. Use education to encourage conservation
 - ii. Encourage conservation and efficient use of groundwater in all cases.
 - iii. Encourage conservation and efficient use of surface water, where a viable/sensible opportunity exists taking into consideration the benefits of incidental recharge. Including encouraging the retrofitting neighborhoods with pressurized irrigation
 - iv. Encourage and support wastewater/gray water reuse
 - v. Encourage or support incentives for conservation
 - vi. Develop guidelines for conservation programs
 - 1. Consider conservation requirements for new water appropriations
- d. Conversion of Water Use from Agriculture to DCMI
 - i. Continue to support the use of surface water on those lands that convert from agriculture to DCMI utilizing the existing irrigation entities.
 - ii. Support voluntary cooperative arrangements between irrigation entities and municipal providers to deliver surface water recognizing the long-term challenges associated with maintaining HOA-owned systems.
 - iii. Encourage the use of Water Marketing to meet new DCMI needs including the use of rental pool and water supply bank
- e. Reasonably Anticipated Future Needs (RAFN)
- f. Ensuring Viability of Water Delivery Infrastructure
 - i. Support voluntary arrangements between irrigation entities and municipalities to ensure long-term maintenance of new residential irrigation systems.
 - ii. Ensure easements/access to canals for maintenance in face of growth.
 - iii. Continue to support considerations of security, both in terms of infrastructure and on water quality.
 - iv. Support the rehabilitation and modernization of water delivery infrastructure.
 - v. Explore opportunities to minimize fish entrainment in the canal systems.

6. **TV CAMP Implementation – develop with full committee after other sections are developed.**

DRAFT