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IID Water Use and Overruns/(Underuse)

Cumulative Annual Overruns/Underuse 2003-2011

104,532 AF overruns

(819,980 AF) underuse
2011 Decree Accounting notes an IID overrun of 93,190 AF and an end-of-year overrun account balance of 82,662 AF. As of January 1, 2012 the Lake Mead elevation was > 1,125’ and ISG Surplus Conditions governed its operation; a three-year payback applied with a minimum payback the greater of:

- 20% of overrun account limit (20% of 310,000 AF = 62,000 AF)
- 1/3 of overrun account balance (1/3 of 82,662 = 27,554 AF)

2013 payback obligation = 62,000 AF
2014 payback obligation = 20,662 AF
IID Overruns vs Underuse (2003-2012*)

*estimated
IID’s 2012 Overrun & Payback Obligation

As of December 31, 2012 the Lake Mead elevation was = 1,120.27’; these reservoir conditions require the total overrun account balance to be paid back in full in the calendar year immediately following publication of that year’s decree accounting records (i.e., 2014). IID’s estimated 2012 overrun is approximately 150,000 AF.

2013 payback obligation = 62,000 AF

2014 payback obligation = 20,662 AF + 150,000± AF

≈ 171,000 ± AF
Annual System of Apportionment

From a complexity and timing standpoint, modifying the current Regulations for Equitable Distribution Plan (last revised April, 2009) provides the best implementation mechanism.

• Eliminate the EDP’s “Declaration/Termination of Supply/Demand Imbalance” criteria (Section 3.1a) and all “SDI” references within the EDP, so the annual probability analysis for the apportionment trigger and its related decision-making are replaced with an annual apportionment that is effective January 1 of each calendar year.
1) A **provision to suspend the annual apportionment** based on certain lower-demand water use conditions that might exist in the third and/or fourth quarters of the calendar year.

2) A **provision to allow for limited supplemental water deliveries** should the internal water bank be insufficient, with defined water-user payback requirements to ensure IID can optimize, and yet manage, its 3.1 maf cap (a mini-overrun policy for each farm unit, if you will, but with defined requirements established to ensure those who overrun are responsible for the cost of the payback).

3) Intra-district water bank **procedures that would better facilitate farm-unit water use, release and acquisition of apportionments**. This could include quarterly or periodic tracking and trend analysis, reporting requirements or fee assessments to minimize unused apportionments or hoarding.
Additional EDP Tools for Consideration

4) An agricultural water user advisory board to assist in the administration of the water bank or determine if the outsourcing of the intra-district water bank's administration would be more efficient or cost-effective under defined conditions and reporting requirements that do not delegate the IID board's decision-making authority.

5) A provision to define and enact apportionment fallowing mechanisms to meet certain IID water supply management objectives (i.e., overrun paybacks, intentionally created surplus, etc.).

6) A provision requiring the use of efficient water management practices or participation in an IID-sponsored conservation program in order to purchase supplemental water supplies from the intra-district water bank.
Additional EDP Tools for Consideration

7) A provision to categorize all water users paying the agricultural water rate at the same priority of apportionment or to reprioritize these customers within the agricultural category (fish farms, algae farms, permanent crops, etc.)

8) A provision to revoke apportionments from delinquent water users and related provisions to reassign these apportionments.

9) Consideration for the use of apportionments from IID-owned agricultural lands to meet district-wide water management goals.

10) Consideration for the use of apportionments from historically unfarmed agricultural lands to meet district-wide water management goals, support the intra-district water bank or be reapportioned among existing farmable acreage.
Next Steps

• Adopt an adaptive management mindset for moving forward as implementation provides new insight.
• Formation of a near-term advisory committee, an outgrowth of the multi-committee recommendations initially proposed by Mr. DuMars and adopted by the IID board via Resolution 35-2012. Initially a single committee would work with Mr. DuMars and IID to focus on issues of critical water management importance to IID in 2013 and include most notably apportionment and conservation implementation. A subset of this committee would then be tasked with community outreach efforts during this transitionary period.