## AQUIFER STABILIZATION FRAMEWORK

<u>1.</u>		active: Stabilize <u>at 2001 levels throughout</u> the ESPA <u>and discharge</u> in a manner that keeps hany acres of farmland in production, and as many businesses in operation, as possible. <u>1</u> <b>Goal:</b> See Surface Water Framework while respeacting Idaho Law, Constitution and Sustainability Policying the Resource.	
2.	plan	agement Framework: Develop a management plan, implement <u>and enforce</u> the , observe groundwater levels, adjust plan as needed to achieve and maintain ilization.	<b>Commented:</b> Generally agree but compliance is critical to the success of the Plan
3.	Man	agement Plan Overview (additional details below)	Commented: Generally Agree
	3.1	<ul> <li>Water in:</li> <li>(a) Preserve incidental recharge.</li> <li>(b) <u>Efficiently e</u>Expand managed aquifer recharge to address certain areas of the ESPA.</li> <li>(c) Increase inflows from tributary basins.</li> <li>(d) Continue cloud seeding.</li> </ul>	
	3.2	<ul> <li>(a) Expand conversions.</li> <li>(b) Implement an achievable and enforceable diversion reduction/<u>consumptive use</u> program.</li> </ul>	Commented: Generally Agree these are the tools available to decrease withdrawals
	3.3	(c) Better management tools & incentives. Implementation: (a) Pragmatic Eenforcement process.	Commented: Generally Agree
		<ul> <li>(b) Designated checkpoints &amp; adjustment process (adaptive management).</li> <li>(c) Stakeholder committee. <ul> <li>(i) Monitor plan implementation.</li> <li>(ii) Make adjustments at checkpoints.</li> <li>(iii) Work collectively to develop management tools &amp; incentives.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
4.	Wat	er In (Groundwater Augmentation)	
		<ul> <li>Preserve incidental recharge.</li> <li>(a) Incentivize incidental recharge.</li> <li>(b) Consider effects of IWRB &amp; USDA infrastructure grants on aquifer stabilization, and encourage <u>state-sponsored</u> recharge to offset impacts <u>– Recharge solely in</u></li> </ul>	Commented: Generally Agree with State sponsored programs
	4.2	hands of State?-         (c)       Consider effects of out-of-basin water transfers on aquifer stabilization.         (d)       Sustain the interest of Milner 0 flow and Two Rivers Doctrine.         Expand managed aquifer recharge.	Commented: Not part of a GWMA Plan
	7.2	<ul> <li>(a) Increase IWRB goal from 250k AF to 350k AF <u>consistent with law and agreements</u>-</li> <li>(b) Expand recharge capacity above American Falls to address certain areas of the <u>ESPA</u>.</li> </ul>	Commented : Generally agree with identified comments
	4.0	<ul> <li>(c) Continued state funding of managed aquifer recharge.</li> <li>(d) Leverage state &amp; federal funding to expand aquifer recharge.</li> <li>(e) Incentivize private recharge - inconsistent with 4.1.b.</li> </ul>	
	4.3	<ul> <li>Increase inflows from tributary basins.</li> <li>(a) Regulate groundwater diversions in tributary basins through the Plan.</li> <li>(b) Encourage state to take actions needed to regulate tributary basins.</li> </ul>	Commented: Generally agree so long as IDWR has necessary data and modeling
	4.4	Continue cloud seeding. (a) Work with Idaho Power and IWRB to ensure cloud seeding continues.	<b>Commented:</b> Generally agree with recognized benefits to parties
5.	Wat	er Out (Groundwater Conservation)	

5.1	Diversi	on reduction program:	<b>Commented:</b> Generally agree consistent with goals
0.1	(a) D	etermine the amount of conservation needed to stabilize and recover the ESPA after	and benchmarks
		counting for actions to increase inflow to the aquifer.	
	(b) A (i)	llocate maximum sustainable <mark>yield</mark> among user groups. User groups determine allocation among patrons, taking into account priority	Commented: Need to define
	(1)	need for uniformity across areas, date and other relevant factors.	
	(ii		
	(	will be allocated a pro rata share. Equity given consideration of priority.	
5.2	Manage	ement tools (Okay if objective/measurable):	Commented: Generally Agree
	•	onservation incentives	Commented. Ocherany Agree
	(i)	End-gun removal program	
	(ii	) Groundwater conservation easements (Colorado/Kansas)	
	(ii	) Modified CREP (conservation without fallowing)	
	(b) G	roundwater Market (Fox Canyon/Mammoth Water)	
	(i)		
		demands that are not capable of on-farm reductions, and to incentivize the	
		growing of low water use crops.	
		) Develop software specific to ESPA.	
5.3	Enforce		Commented: Need for strict enforcement. History has
		xcess allocation may be carried forward. Sideboards to be determined. <u>No</u>	shown that leniency is abused.
	· · /	xcess use must be remedied by purchasing allocation from other users and/or	
		educing use the following year. <u>Yes and Penalty</u> excess use is not remedied the following year, a penalty equal to X% of the excess	
		se will be imposed, and the full amount (excess use + penalty) must be remedied	
		e following irrigation season by fallowing.	
	u	e following inigation season by fallowing.	
Ada	ptive Ma	nagement (McVey Statement)	<b>Commented:</b> Generally Agree. Adaptive managemer
6.1	Progres	ss toward aquifer stabilization/ <u>recovery</u> evaluated at predetermined intervals.	recognizes uncertain given
		see <del>our policy</del> surface water framework.	
6.2		stabilization <u>Goals</u> monitored regionally.	
	· · ·	efine <mark>regions</mark> .	<b>Commented:</b> McVay questioned appropriateness.
		stablish regional groundwater indices.	Does the regionalization discussion influence whether
	(i)	5 5	tributaries are addressed?
~ ~	(ii	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
6.3	,	management plan as needed to achieve and maintain stabilizationgoal.	
	· · /	djustments may be made to groundwater augmentation actions based on learned	
		xperience and opportunities for enhancement. djustments to groundwater conservation program may be made to achieve and	
	· · /	aintain aquifer stabilization. Adjustments may not be uniform between regions	
		anitan aquiter stabilization. Adjustments may not be uniform between regions_	
	2	s needed to initially address areas of concern. Hot spots	
		s needed to initially address areas of concern. Hot spots.	
		<u>s needed to initially address areas of concern. <del>Hot spots.</del> evelop relationship between regions.</u>	
Stak	(c) D		
	(c) D	evelop relationship between regions.	<b>Commented:</b> Generally agree with comments noted
	(c) D <b>ceholder</b> Meets <u>1</u>	evelop relationship between regions.	<b>Commented:</b> Generally agree with comments noted
7.1	(c) D <b>ceholder</b> Meets <u>1</u> (a) D	evelop relationship between regions.  Committee hree times annually to review progress.	<b>Commented:</b> Generally agree with comments noted
7.1 7.2	(c) D <b>xeholder</b> Meets <u>1</u> (a) D At desig	evelop relationship between regions. Committee three times annually to review progress. evelop reporting process. gnated intervals(benchmarks), evaluates changes to the management at may be appropriate to achieve and maintain aquifer stabilization.	<b>Commented:</b> Generally agree with comments noted
7.1 7.2	(c) D <b>xeholder</b> Meets <u>1</u> (a) D At desig	evelop relationship between regions. Committee three times annually to review progress. evelop reporting process. gnated intervals(benchmarks), evaluates changes to the management	<b>Commented:</b> Generally agree with comments noted
7.1 7.2	(c) D <b>Scholder</b> Meets 1 (a) D At designed plan that Submit	evelop relationship between regions. Committee three times annually to review progress. evelop reporting process. gnated intervals(benchmarks), evaluates changes to the management at may be appropriate to achieve and maintain aquifer stabilization.	<b>Commented:</b> Generally agree with comments noted

AQUIFER STABILIZATION AND FRAMEWORK