



Palouse Basin Aquifer Committee

University of Idaho PO Box 443011

Moscow, ID 83844-3011

Phone: (208) 885-6429 Fax: (208) 885-6431

pbac@uidaho.edu www.uidaho.edu/pbac

April 19, 2007 Meeting Minutes

Pullman City Hall, East End (Large) Conference Room

Attendance

X	UI: Michael Holthaus (Vice Chair), Water Systems Manager	X	WSU: Keith Bloom Director, Const Servs, Cap Plan Dev
	UI: Joe Kline, Director, Utilities and Engineering	X	WSU: Rob Corcoran, Asst Dir, Arch, Engr & Const Services
X	Moscow: Tom Scallorn, Water Dept Superintendent	X	Pullman: Mark Workman, Director of Public Works
X	Moscow: Aaron Ament, City Council Member		Pullman: Art Garro, Maintenance & Operations Superintendent
	Moscow: Les MacDonald, Director of Public Works	X	Pullman: Barney Waldrop, City Council Member
	Latah County: Paul Kimmell Citizen and County Representative	X	Whitman County: Mark Storey (Chair), Director of Public Works
X	Latah County: Tom Stroschein, County Commissioner		Whitman County: Jerry Finch, County Commissioner
X	Colfax: Carl Thompson, City Administrator	X	Colfax: Andy Rogers, Public Works Supervisor

Visitors and Others

David Hall, PWCN; Cheryl Morgan, Self; Bill French, PWCN; Rob Buchert, Palouse Conservation District; Nancy Chaney, Moscow; Steve Robischon, PBAC.

Call to Order

Mark Storey, PBAC Chair, called the meeting to order at 2:04 pm.

1) Approval of the March 15, 2007 Meeting Minutes

The March minutes were approved by consensus.

2) Unfinished Business

DOE \$250K Framework Project

There was no specific discussion related to prioritizing this project at the last WRIA-34 Planning Unit meeting. At next month's May 9 meeting, priorities will be discussed and tentatively there will be a vote on the project priority. Buchert noted that Jerry Fairley had made a strong point about the need for the project.

The group discussed whether to submit additional projects for consideration by the Planning Unit, and agreed by consensus to a motion to forward three projects: the framework project as PBAC's number 1 priority, the Cunningham Farm monitoring well project as the number 2 priority, and a project to drill monitoring wells in the Kamiak and Four Mile gaps as the number 3 project.

Morgan asked whether funding for such a project is still within the DOE budget. Storey replied that the project does not appear as a line item in the DOE budget, but that there may be opportunities for project funding outside the traditional Watershed Plan Implementation funding process. A workshop will be conducted May 17 (same day as the next PBAC meeting) in Moses Lake that will include discussion related to DOE funding. Buchert and Morgan will attend and offered to car pool with any interested parties. Buchert will report on the workshop at the June PBAC meeting.

Storey reported on a proposal from Jim Osiensky to synthesize information from theses that have been published over the past decade, as well as additional reports/information that have been generated, in return for provision of summer salary. The committee decided to defer acting on the proposal until such time as more is known about the status of the DOE funding of the Framework project.

Robischon was directed to search for the Cunningham Farm proposal as previously submitted to the EPA. In the event any of the proposals are forwarded by the Planning Unit to the DOE for funding consideration, a specific proposal format will be required. Buchert will forward the DOE form to Storey and Robischon.

Hawkins Companies Transfer Requests

Robischon reported that scanned information related to the proposed water rights transfers has been posted to the PBAC site. New documents on the site include information provided by the Washington Departments of Fish and Wildlife and Ecology, as well as protests filed by the City of Moscow and PWCN/Sierra Club/Moscow Civic Association.

Robischon was directed to make the information available for public access, but to include a disclaimer as to the potential incompleteness of the contained documents and a referral to the Washington Water Conservancy Board for complete information.

Data Release Policies

Robischon reported Jim Craig from the Latah County Prosecutor's Office had contacted him. Craig will write a letter to the attorneys representing each of the entities to inquire as to their interpretations of the requirements, and inform Robischon with any conclusions that can be utilized to formulate a PBAC data release policy.

As an interim approach, Robischon was directed to, in receipt of a written submission, supply information to requesting parties, unless the amount of information required provides too onerous to generate. Should the task be too time consuming, Robischon is to refer requestors to the entities responsible for the generation of the data. In addition, Robischon is to report information releases (what and to whom) to appropriate entities.

3) New Business

FY07-08 Budget

Robischon handed out a draft first cut of a potential FY07-08 budget based upon the assumption that increased administrative assessments are approved by all entities. Discussion ensued about the need to get all entities on board with the increase. A motion to include the research funding in the assessment resolution drafted by Pullman last fall was approved, and PBAC members will continue working toward ensuring assessment approval. An additional motion was passed (Bloom against) authorizing a 7.5% salary increase for Robischon beginning July 1.

Robischon provided a brief summary of the proposed budget noting that monitoring expenses have moved from the research to the administrative category and that there will be approximately \$50,000 available for new research projects in the coming fiscal year.

Workman will provide Robischon with the revised assessment resolution.

PBAC/UI Administrative Agreement

Robischon announced that the UI has expressed the need to change the administrative agreement with PBAC. The current agreement is for PBAC to provide an annual \$3,500 direct payment in lieu of indirect overhead charges. The new agreement will need to be consistent with other UI agreements in charging overhead. The overhead rate will be negotiated between UI and PBAC. In the near term it appears likely that for the coming fiscal year a direct fee arrangement will remain in place, but outyear administration will require a new, overhead-based agreement.

FY07-08 Call For Research Project Proposals

Robischon handed out a draft call for research proposals for the coming fiscal year. The call refers to a list of “questions” proposals should address. To provide an opportunity for the research community to provide input regarding those questions they feel are important, Robischon solicited input from the CAG, WoW, PCD, IWRRI, WWRC, and the Water Summit Organizing Committee. Robischon passed out responses received for PBAC review.

Workman indicated the need to allow for the potential of multi-year projects in the call. Robischon will aggregate the responses into a single document, and PBAC members will review and rate (high, medium, low importance) the questions. The group will then decide on any cutoff level for the questions, and a call for preliminary proposals can be distributed in early May. Robischon was directed to include the CAG on distribution for the aggregated list.

4) PBAC Projects Progress Report

Robischon reported that work continues on the projects, and that two of the students have submitted drafts of their theses.

5) Citizens Advisory Group Report

Robischon reported three resignations from the CAG: Bill Brock, Bill Elliot, and Ben McLuen. Elliot has been replaced by his alternate, Dr. George Grader. Current vacancies include representation of Idaho Municipal Provider, Idaho County/Rural, Technical and Other. Robischon relayed CAG's request to fill the Technical position with Dr. Fritz Fiedler, and the Other position with Mr. Bill French. A motion passed unanimously to approve the appointments.

The CAG continues to work on conservation issues, and could utilize assistance getting the ball rolling. They have also discussed taking their recommendations to elected officials as well as to PBAC.

6) Budget Report

Robischon summarized the current status of the budget. Current budget projections indicate a deficit of approximately \$60,000 for FY07. Robischon was directed to email a copy of the budget report to PBAC members.

7) Other Reports and Announcements

CRB GWMA Stratigraphic Groundwater Mapping Project

Robischon presented a press release announcing a \$1.5 million allocation by the Washington Legislature to the Columbia Basin GWMA to extend mapping of the subsurface geology in the Area.

Water Summit Organizing Committee

Ament reported progress from the recent committee meeting. Agenda design is nearly complete, and selection of speakers will occur next month. Buchert reported that the other working groups formed at the last Summit have been folded into the Organizing Committee as subcommittees.

Moscow Reservoir Project Reservoir Design Presentations

Robischon reported that final presentations of the project designs will be conducted May 4, beginning at 2:30 PM, at the UI Commons in the Crest Room. The designs present will include initial cut and fill details and will act as a bridge between the current Landscape Architecture class (LA362) and a follow on course (LA459) next year.

WRIA-34 Planning Unit Meeting

Buchert reported that work continues on the wording of the final watershed plan. Next month will include a prioritization exercise in the morning and an afternoon presentation by Robischon on Palouse Basin ground water management history.

Idaho Otter Water Summit

Robischon presented a press release for the Summit indicating that Les MacDonald and Joe Kline had been invited to attend, and noted that Governor Otter had appointed Dave Tuthill as permanent Director of IDWR.

Chaney announced that she had participated in a telephone conference with Tuthill and others, and that Tuthill had mentioned several items of interest: Low snowpack this season, but reservoir carryover from last year should avert major problems. Development Moratoriums in the Coeur d'Alene and Teton basins. No firm dates yet, and no legislative funding for adjudication of the Palouse. IDWR declined to submit comments to DOE regarding the Hawkins transfers. IDWR supports the idea of direct use of treated surface water.

New Whitman County Land Use Request

PBAC has received SEPA documentation for a pole building to be constructed at the Wheatland Express site for boat and RV storage. No ground water is proposed to be used for the development.

Palouse River TMDL Meeting

A meeting has been scheduled April 25 in Colfax at the Best Western Hotel, beginning at 6:30 PM, to introduce the TMDL process and studies that will begin on the Palouse River (main stem) and Rebel Flat Creek.

Watershed Planning and Columbia River Management Workshop

The workshop will be held May 17 in Moses Lake at the Best Western Lake Inn.

Colfax Water Savings

Colfax water use for the months of January-March in 2007 is down 11.7 million gallons (24%) from 2005. Rogers reported that the savings are primarily due to identifying and fixing leaks and conservation.

8) Next Meeting Date

The next regular meeting of PBAC has been scheduled for

May 17, 2007

Moscow UI Facilities Services Center, Jack's Creek Meeting Room, 2:00 PM

9) Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 PM.

Submitted for review and approved at the May 17, 2007 PBAC meeting.

Steve Robischon, Executive Manager

Summary FY08 Budget

<i>Income</i>	Administrative	95,000	Income
	Research	80,000	
	Total	175,000	
<i>Expenses</i>	<i>Administrative</i>		Expenses
	Salaries	41,500	
	Fringes	15,000	
	Monitoring	16,000	
	UI Support Fee	3,500	
	Annual Report	4,000	
	Office Support/Supplies	1,200	
	Synoptic Logistics	4,500	
	Misc/Contingency	2,500	
	Subtotal	88,200	
	<i>Research</i>		
	Shallow System	12,000	
	Deep System	12,000	
	New Projects	50,000	
	Subtotal	74,000	
	Total	162,200	

Admin Balance	+ \$ 6,800
Research Balance	+ \$ 6,000
Total FY08 Balance	+ \$12,800

Assessment Income				
	Administrative	Research	Total	
Whitman County	\$5,000		\$5,000	Whitman
Latah County	\$5,000		\$5,000	Latah
Pullman	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$40,000	Pullman
Moscow	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$40,000	Moscow
Colfax	\$5,000		\$5,000	Colfax
Washington State	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$40,000	WSU
University of Idaho	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$40,000	UI
	\$95,000	\$80,000	\$175,000	

Palouse Basin Water Management - Call for Preliminary Proposals

The Palouse Basin Aquifer Committee (PBAC) is a voluntary, cooperative, multijurisdictional group comprised of representatives from the cities of Pullman, Moscow, and Colfax, Whitman and Latah counties, Washington State University and the University of Idaho. PBAC's mission is to ensure a long-term, quality water supply for the Palouse Basin region.

In support of its mission, PBAC has supported research projects aimed at increasing understanding of those issues pertinent to water management in the basin. PBAC is considering continuation of this support for its upcoming 2007-2008 fiscal year.

PBAC envisions granting one or two project awards in amounts ranging from approximately \$15,000 to \$30,000. Work on the project(s) should target completion by June 30, 2008. Preliminary project proposals must be received no later than June 15, 2007. Up to four preliminary proposals will be selected for further consideration, and invited full proposals will be due by July 16.

Preliminary proposals will be evaluated primarily by the degree to which the proposed project addresses one or more of the questions posed in the accompanying attachment.

Preliminary proposals are to be submitted in electronic format, either on acceptable electronic storage media or (if file size allows) attached to an email addressed to stever@uidaho.edu, on or before June 15, 2007.

General inquiries may be directed to Steve Robischon, Executive Manager, Palouse Basin Aquifer Committee, PO Box 443011, Moscow, ID, 83844-3011 (208.885.6429).

TO: Steve Robischon
FROM: Water of the West Steering Committee
DATE: April 13, 2007

RE: Potential Research Questions Concerning the Water Supply for the Palouse Basin

The following three research areas are based on questions posed by attendees at the 2006 Palouse Basin Water Summit, in which members of WoW participated. We have grouped inter-related questions into three project areas, because this reflects our interdisciplinary research approach. Should we be asked to submit a proposal under any of the three projects, our proposal would complement funding performed as part of WoW. We see this as an opportunity for PBAC to guide the research around the Palouse Basin case study, and offer collaborative ways towards a science plan for the Palouse Basin.

Project Area 1: Management across multiple jurisdictions in the face of scientific uncertainty

This project area encompasses both formal and informal mechanisms for coordinated management across state and county lines for the Palouse Basin which would include decision making tools and flexible mechanisms to be used in the face of scientific, social, economic and political uncertainty. Relevant inter-related questions include:

- What are the formal and informal mechanisms for managing ground and surface water basins across state lines?
- What is the social and political willingness in the Palouse Basin to submit to binding transboundary coordination versus voluntary coordination?
- What targeted monitoring will allow decision making to evolve with growth and as our understanding of the basin improves?
- Recharge to the aquifers is uncertain: how do the bounds provided by existing estimates affect the type and timing of water management decisions?
- Can a decision tool or community model be developed to aid water managers in assessing risk and uncertainty when making various water allocation/development/conservation etc. decisions?

Project Area 2: Water Demand

This project area includes demand characterization and assessing the willingness, feasibility, and legal and engineering mechanisms for reducing demand on the water supply. Relevant inter-related questions include:

- What is the actual willingness for and potential magnitude of voluntary conservation, and how can these be increased through education and outreach, understanding values, and technology?
- What is the willingness for and potential effectiveness of regulation that imposes non-voluntary conservation?
- What is the current and projected demand in the basin?

- What legal mechanisms exist for reducing per capita demand as the basin develops, including: assured supply laws, pricing mechanisms, regulatory methods?
- What is the magnitude of conservation expected under different scenarios of pricing and regulation?
- What technical solutions are feasible in the basin to reduce demand on the water supply, including water re-use?

Project Area 3: Water Supply

This project area focuses on the basin water budget and the feasibility, willingness, and legal and engineering mechanisms for increasing water supply through development of groundwater resources, surface resources for groundwater recharge, and direct surface water use/storage. The types of inter-related questions to be analyzed include:

- How do projected demand and desired growth affect willingness to pay for new water development in the Palouse basin?
- What is the water supply available for development of surface resources from both a hydrologic (where and when) and legal viewpoint?
- What engineering designs might be feasible for enhancing recharge?
- What are the planning-level costs of engineered recharge?
- What are the legal barriers/laws necessary to facilitate recharge?
- What engineering designs (locations, sizes, types, yields) might be feasible for surface water storage?
- What are the planning-level costs of surface water storage facilities?
- What are the legal barriers/laws necessary to facilitate surface water storage?
- What are the funding mechanisms available in the Palouse basin for development of surface water resources?

Legal analysis required under Project Area 3 would require interpretation of Idaho and Washington law which must be done under the supervision of an attorney(s) licensed to practice in those two states. The appropriate mechanism might be an internship with Ecology or IDWR.

Project Areas 2 and 3 should probably be addressed in tandem if surveys of willingness to conserve versus willingness to pay for new water development are to be meaningful, and particularly if those surveys show that some combination of the two is most palatable to local citizens.

We recognize that some of these questions have been addressed to various degrees by others. A preliminary literature review will be provided in the proposal(s), and we will seek to integrate existing knowledge across disciplines and with new information.

Some Ideas for PBAC Research Questions

CH 4-15-07

WATER SUPPLY

What is our best estimate of the current water supply available in the Palouse Basin? In the region's sub-basins?

How has the supply been changing over the last several decades? What are the region's hydrologic cycle and groundwater recharge situations?

WATER DEMAND

What is our best estimate of the current water demand in the Palouse Basin? In the region's sub-basins? How has the demand been changing over the last several decades?

For example, what are projected changes in population, residential housing, commercial development, and other influences on increased water demand? More specifically, for example, what comparative impacts on increased water demand result from significant changes in retail (e.g., big-box) versus residential development?

Also, what are the beliefs, attitudes and behaviors of residents of the basin concerning its past and current water situation? What is their vision for the future? To what extent would they be willing, for example, to make further changes in their behaviors?

What would the estimated impacts be of increased conservation efforts and other projected changes in resident behaviors?

FUTURE WATER SUPPLY-DEMAND BALANCE AND PUBLIC SECTOR RESPONSES

Based on all of the above, what are our best estimates of future changes in supply and demand over the next, say, 50 to 100 years? What are their implications for future growth and a sustainable supply of water in the Palouse Basin?

What are development and policy options that are do-able, realistic, cost-effective, etc., that local government could pursue to improve future water supply-demand situations in the basin? For instance, what does a socio-political, institutional, and legal analysis suggest are the prospects and impacts for cross-boundary, institutional arrangements and their effectiveness in inter-state basin management?

What are current tools, such as dynamic systems modeling that graphically displays effects of modifying assumptions and parameters, for more effectively educating the public as well as decision-makers; would they help increase understanding of current and future supply/demand situations and impacts? What might various uses and effects of these tools be? How effective might they be for involving various parties and aiding them to enhance socially-acceptable decisionmaking at a basin, multi-jurisdictional scale?

From	Palouse Conservation District <palousecd@pullman.com>
Sent	Tuesday, April 17, 2007 4:07 pm
To	'Steve Robischon' <stever@uidaho.edu>
Cc	
Bcc	
Subject	RE: FY08 PBAC Studies

Steve,

The following is input from the Palouse Conservation District and not WRIA 34. The WRIA group is going to decide on criteria and priority for funding future projects at the May 9th Planning Unit meeting. I assume this is what you're trying to accomplish with the "questions"? If so, here's my crack at it.

- 1) Does the project identify recharge areas?
- 2) Does the project address securing long-term water supply for the large municipalities (Moscow and/or Pullman)? Or phrased a little differently: Is the project accomplishing the greatest good for the largest population?
- 3) Does the project help the public's understanding of Palouse Basin Aquifer issues?
- 4) Does the project increase our technical understanding of the Palouse Basin Aquifer?
- 5) Does the project implement practices that curtail use or conserve a significant amount of water currently being drawn from the Palouse Basin Aquifer?

That's my two cents. It might be interesting to see what the WRIA process yields on May 9th, if you want to wait that long before requesting PBAC proposals. Thanks!

Rob Buchert
Palouse Conservation District

Steve:

In response to your request for suggestions for reviewing proposals for research, I have the following comments:

1. The PBAC mission and goals should be the primary factor in evaluating proposals. I would relate the evaluation of proposals on how they meet these specifically.

The questions I would ask would be:

- (1) How does this proposal relate to PBAC's mission?
- (2) What specific goal does this project propose to address? \
- (3) How does the proposed project meet the PBAC goal for balancing water supply and use?
- (4) Will the results of the project be directly applicable to fulfilling PBAC goals?
- (5) Are there tangible benefits from the project that can be articulated as they relate to long-range management of the hydrologic system?
- (6) What are risks or liabilities to this proposal?
- (7) Would the public support and find benefit if this project were funded?

2. The mission of PBAC is to stabilize ground water levels. The refinement of the water balance is critical to trying to address the supply and demand program. Without a refined water balance, it is difficult to know how to stabilize the levels. Are there elements of the water balance that can be refined, if an entire water balance project is not proposed? Some projects may be limited in scope, but if they can begin to quantify the supply and demand, they are valuable.

3. The CAG Recommendation #1 recommends development of "a sound applied geohydrologic characterization plan with input from the many scientists interested in the Palouse Basin aquifer system as well as input from a social and environmental perspective." If PBAC agrees with that recommendation, the questions that arise from that are if the proposal addresses any of that recommendation (perhaps a component or prep work that might lead to such a plan) and if the proposal addresses social and environmental issues of concern to the water sustainability of the basin. If PBAC does not agree with the recommendation, this can be ignored.

The Interstate Agreement allows for the administration of the ground water to be in accordance with the PBAC management plan. I would therefore hope that evaluation would include how the proposed project supports the management plan in general, as well as the specific goals. These comments are meant to be food for thought and preliminary ideas for you to consider. Please give me a call if you'd like to talk about these ideas.

Helen