

In cooperation with:



Idaho Water  
Resource Board

&



Henry's Fork  
Watershed Council

## Henry's Fork Basin Study

---

### Meeting Summary: Workgroup Meeting 4

November 19, 2010

---

**Meeting date:** November 16, 2010

**Summary prepared by:** Mark Bransom – CH2M HILL

**Attachments:**

1. Meeting agenda (for the Henry's Fork Basin Study item included as part of the regular Henry's Fork Watershed Council (HFWC or Council) meeting agenda for November 16, 2010)
2. PowerPoint presentation
3. Revised Goals, Objectives, Screening Criteria Matrix

### Introduction

As noted above, the discussion of the Henry's Fork Basin Study (Study) summarized herein was conducted as an agenda item during a regular meeting of HFWC. The HFWC has agreed to provide a forum for Stakeholders to participate in the Study. The Council and other interested stakeholders represent the Study Workgroup.

This meeting summary is organized according to the headings/topics listed in the Study meeting agenda (Attachment 1). Attendance at the meeting was recorded on the sign-in sheet prepared by the Council.

John Petrovsky opened the Basin Study discussion (refer to attached slide presentation) by reviewing the meeting agenda. As part of the introduction John referred to the proposed formation of a Core Workgroup and acknowledged need for flexibility and adaptability in the formation and engagement process of that Group. The primary functions of the proposed Core Workgroup were reiterated: 1 – Ensure representation of all major constituencies; 2 – Ensure continuity of participation throughout the Workgroup Meeting process to reduce “back-sliding” and allow for continued forward progress as each meeting builds upon the previous meetings. At a later point in the meeting it was stated that at subsequent meetings those who have indicated willingness and ability to serve as core group members will do so. All other participants not in the core group will be given an opportunity at each meeting to ask questions, and/or provide comment or other input.

John provided a Process Summary for the benefit of new meeting attendees. John requested feedback on the Workgroup Meeting 3 Summary; workgroup members who commented suggested the summary was complete. John then facilitated discussion of the subsequent agenda items; summaries provided below.

### Issues, Opportunities, Constraints, and Ideas – Finalization of List

The objective was to finalize the Workgroup Meeting 3 agenda item to develop a comprehensive list of issues, opportunities, constraints, and ideas to shape the Study and the alternatives analyses. Several members raised the issue of the importance of completing a needs assessment or having targets, e.g., flows or storage volumes as a framework for consideration of the degree to which alternatives achieve desired benefits. The members offering comments generally felt the issues, opportunities, constraints, and ideas list was thorough and complete.

## Interpretation of Issues, Opportunities, Constraints, and Ideas

John provided an overview of a draft matrix intended to present the interpretation of the list of issues, opportunities, constraints, and ideas that is constructed in two parts: Part A – Translation into Goals & Objectives and First Phase Alternatives Screening Criteria; and Part B – Input to Alternatives and Study Process.

## Use of Goals, Objectives, and Criteria Matrix

Comments from the Workgroup on the draft matrix are summarized here:

- Socioeconomic and Environment Section: heavy on economics, light on social
  - Socioeconomic vs. Social Values
  - Upper Yellowstone River Task Force – see approach to social values considerations
- Wild and Scenic eligibility
  - Are we considering waters not studied but potentially eligible? → YES
- Protect or sustain and enhance/improve → Focus on Protect and Enhance
- Should consider cost and benefit. SE 3 -add criterion→ Relative cost as a decision factor
- Add: enhanced storage capacity at existing facilities
- Administrative challenges facing groundwater storage
  - Is groundwater considered new storage or existing capacity? → Should be considered “new storage”
  - In the CAMP (Comprehensive Aquifer Management Plan) process, new storage is not specified as a need
- One perspective is that the need for more water supply is inherent/obvious, therefore, OK to focus on potential for new supply in the basin

A revised Goals & Objectives and First Phase Alternatives Screening Criteria matrix is attached for review and comment.

A number of additional suggests and comments were offered to enhance the Workgroup process and engagement in the Study. A summary of those follows:

Consider providing links on Reclamation’s Basin Study website to study drivers and requirements, including the State legislation, Special Study requirements, WaterSmart requirements for the Study. In addition members requested addition to the website of a calendar of events, and notification of updates of references or availability of new resources.

## Wrap-Up

John wrapped the meeting up by reminding the Workgroup of the schedule and agendas for the upcoming meetings. The next meeting – Meeting 5 - will be on Wednesday January 12, 2011; the subject of the meeting will be a presentation and discussion of potential surface storage alternatives and potential groundwater storage (and potential recovery) alternatives.