The purpose of the Recharge Working Group meeting was to begin the review of the 2010 project submittals for recharge. Four project proposals were reviewed including 1) Development/Expansion of Egin Lakes as a managed recharge site, 2) Recharge monitoring and expansion in the Idaho Irrigation District area, 3) Managed recharge operations for 2011 and 4) Mile Post 31 Recharge site construction.

**Egin Lakes**
The group identified the need to revisit the hydrologic modeling results for the Egin Lakes site at the April 2 meeting, in order to determine beneficiaries and additional project contributors.

It was noted that a biological evaluation, including the instantaneous diversion rates, was needed. The source of water for the recharge site is from Henry’s Fork, with the Board’s recharge right and/or storage water.

A number of questions were raised about the funding contributions and whether there was direct benefit to Water District 110 and 120 and others. Additionally, more information was sought regarding the difference between capital costs for the project, increased capacity and what the system for ongoing monitoring/evaluation is.

It was noted that all projects in 2010 should have a monitoring plan to use as a feedback loop for the Implementation Committee. The Committee must be able to evaluate the projects on a consistent basis moving forward.

What is the difference between the FMID proposal and the full build out of the site, as proposed by the Implementation Committee? Response: Partial build out (2 miles versus 8 miles) has less construction requirements, but would not preclude full build-out at a later time.

**Idaho Irrigation District**
There was no discussion on the IID proposal although after the meeting it was clarified that Idaho Irrigation District has offered 60% of the cost share for the proposal.

**Managed Recharge 2011**
The Working Group discussed the managed recharge effort for 2011 (the Board has already allocated $400,000 for 2010 recharge) and whether proponents will need to contribute 60% of the costs. If so, participants will need advance timeframe to determine
if/when they will contribute 60% of the managed recharge costs. Another question raised is whether the Board should continue to fund recharge money regardless of user contribution? It was noted that Board contribution to recharge reduces the pool of funds for the grant/loan program.

**Mile Post 31**

It was raised whether the MP 31 recharge site was the best place for recharge. Some information has suggested that it is better for a retention pond than recharge. In order for Working Group members to be confident in this effort that costs over $1 million, MP 31 would need additional tests before construction. City of Twin Falls may be interested as a project sponsor, but would not provide the entire source of the cost-sharing funds.

**Funding**

Working Group members identified a number of challenges in identifying funding participants for the 2010 versus the long-term mechanism envisioned in the Plan.

Projects for this year need to get the best bang for the buck, especially since there are a lot of good projects that all cannot be implemented.

Ideally project sponsors should look for cost-sharing partners and be the champion of the projects.

**Next Steps**

IDWR to develop hydrologic data regarding the MP 31 and Egin Lakes site

Working Group members – identify potential funding contributors for projects, outside what is presented in the proposals

Determine how to move forward with proposals if they do not have the 60% funding identified.
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