

ESPA Comprehensive Aquifer Management Plan

Facilitation of a Framework for Presentation to the 2007 Idaho Legislature

Public Meeting Presentation by CDR Associates
Jonathan Bartsch and Diane Tate
October 11, 18 and 19, 2006



Goals of Presentation

- Provide an overview of the ESPA
- Introduce ESPA Framework Process
- Discuss roles – facilitation team, Board, stakeholders
- Receive input from the public
- Identify next steps

Agenda

- Why this Process?
- Overview of the ESPA
- Overview of the Framework process
 - Discussion of Roles
 - Opportunities for Engagement
- Themes heard during interviews
- Emerging elements of a Framework
- Questions and Discussion

Why this Process?

- Senate Concurrent Resolution 136
 - “These (disputing) parties are negotiating a framework for settlement that makes it critical that the State of Idaho Water Resource Board establish public policy with regard to the future management of the aquifer system”
- First phase – develop a Framework and present to 2007 Legislature
- Second phase – Comprehensive Aquifer Management Plan




Overview of the ESPA

- Located within the Upper Snake River Basin
 - The Upper Snake River Basin encompasses all or part of 20 counties, and approximately 35% of Idaho's land area (29,000 square miles)
- The Eastern Snake River Plain Aquifer (ESPA) underlies approximately 10,000 square miles, or 13% of the State of Idaho

Upper Snake River Basin

Land Ownership


-  Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer Boundary
-  Bureau of Land Management
-  U.S. Forest Service
-  State of Idaho
-  Private
-  Bureau of Reclamation
-  Department of Energy
-  Tribal Lands
-  Idaho Dept. of Parks and Recreation
-  National Park Service
-  National Wildlife Refuge



Aquifer Characteristics

- Layered basalt, thousands of feet thick in some places
- General direction of ground water flow: northeast to southwest
- Hydraulically connected to the river
- Two major aquifer discharge areas:
 - American Falls (about 2 MAF/yr)
 - Thousand Springs (about 4 MAF/yr)

Eastern Snake River Plain Aquifer



What Recharges the Aquifer?

- Direct precipitation
- Underflow from tributary basins
- Seepage from streams overlying the aquifer
- Leakage from canals
- Deep percolation of excess irrigation water

Who Uses the Aquifer?

- Municipal and domestic water wells
- Agriculture – irrigation with groundwater
- Agriculture – irrigation with surface water that is fed by spring discharge into river
- Springs – aquaculture and other uses
- Commercial/Industrial wells
- Tourism – “Thousand Springs” and other attractions
- Wildlife/environmental benefits

Why Manage the Aquifer?

- Water availability varies, but demand stays relatively constant
- Shortage in available water for some users
 - Example: Decline in spring flows in the Thousand Springs reach

Overview of the Framework Process

- Project Launch in August
- Initial interviews with stakeholders in September
- Public meetings in October
- October/November: Facilitation team drafts Framework with stakeholder input
- Public meetings in December to get reactions and comments
- Presentation to Legislature in January

Roles

- Idaho Water Resource Board
- Facilitation Team
- Department of Water Resources
- STAKEHOLDERS

Link to Decision Making

- Framework decisions
 - Identify goals and alternatives
 - Determine level of management – minimal, modest, and aggressive alternatives
 - Funding strategies and fee structure
 - Interim implementation measures
- Decision makers – the Board

Outreach to Stakeholders

- Contacted over 60 individuals and groups
 - Water users: spring, surface, groundwater
 - Groundwater districts, canal companies, irrigation districts
 - State and federal agencies
 - Local government/municipalities
 - Water-dependent industry & local business
 - Environment and wildlife
 - More that we missed? Tribes?

Opportunities for Engagement

- Public Meetings
- Comment forms
- Direct contact with Facilitation team by email, phone, individual or small group meetings
- Website: www.espaplan.idaho.gov

Themes from Interviews

- General areas of agreement
 - Widely held but not unanimous opinions
- Divergent views
 - Issues with a range of opinions and outstanding questions
- Emerging Framework elements
 - A first glance at possible issues to be addressed in the Framework

General Areas of Agreement

- The times have changed
 - Farm practices and farm economics
 - Aquifer levels and discharges
- The aquifer needs management
 - What does management entail? What is the goal of management?
- Ensuring implementation of the Comprehensive Aquifer Management Plan is critical

General Areas of Agreement

- The Model – significance tied to the way it is used
- Recharge is important and supported, but won't solve the problem
 - Political, physical, technical, legal and financial hurdles exist
- CREP is a good start but it won't solve the problem either

General Areas of Agreement

- Strained relationships
- Some issues cannot be resolved through a management plan
 - What are the options to address localized, individual impacts?
- Desire to keep water users as whole as possible
 - A “healthy” aquifer benefits everyone in the long term

General Areas of Agreement

- Funding should come from everyone, including the State
 - Must be put to good use, with results that can be measured (and agreed ways to measure them)
 - Must be fair – different levels for senior/junior, surface/ground/spring?
 - Water will eventually be an issue of concern for the entire state, not just ESPA

Divergent Views

- The reality and role of the aquifer
- The “health” of the aquifer
 - Definition of a “healthy” aquifer, and how to measure aquifer health or decline
- Role of environmental and aesthetic issues in Framework
 - Not a major issue for some stakeholders, but others concerned these issues are not being adequately addressed

Divergent Views

- Prior appropriation
 - Absolute mandate for curtailment in times of shortage? Implemented within the context of economic development for the state?
- Water: an economic good?
 - Should the free market be used to find the “most valuable” use of water? How does the prior appropriation system interact with market valuation?
- What is fair?
 - Perceptions of equity and equal impact

Emerging Framework Elements

- Goals and objectives for aquifer management
- Management alternatives
 - CREP, recharge, conversion, buyouts, others?
- Funding strategies
- Interim measures
 - What can we start doing now?

Emerging Framework Elements

- Goal: Sustainability
 - Water Budget: Balance supply and demand?
 - Economic sustainability for the region?
 - Keep aquifer level from declining further?
 - Keep spring discharges from declining further?
 - Funding for long term programs? Buying water rights?

Emerging Framework Elements

- Goal: Some degree of predictability and equivalent treatment
 - Domestic wells: Monitoring? Ensure continuity/protection of water supply?
 - New residential and industrial development interdependent with existing agricultural and other uses
 - Ensure new development water sources make sense given surrounding uses

Emerging Framework Elements

- Funding: Something from everyone
 - Statewide sales tax? Political hurdles?
 - State surplus funds?
 - Per acre/share levy for water users in the Eastern Snake Plain?
 - Appropriate State percentage and local percentage?

Emerging Framework Elements

- Potential interim measure: recharge
 - Important and supported, but won't solve the problem
 - Interest in exploring opportunities for recharge within the coming year

Next Steps

- Develop and refine goals and objectives based on public input
- Outline draft management alternatives
- Detail funding principles and level of funding required for management alternatives
- Identify and refine interim measures

Questions for Discussion

- What issues/concerns do you have related to the process of developing a Framework?
- What are your thoughts on possible goals for aquifer management?
- What comments do you have on the management alternatives?
- How should the ESPA management alternatives be funded? Principles?