

**Draft Assumptions
Long-term Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program
EIR and Economics Analysis**

	Assumption	Applicable Alternatives				
		1	2	3	4	5
1	Current program information would be used to estimate size of the program (e.g., number of growers, irrigated acreage).	X				
2	All irrigated agricultural lands operations would be considered to estimate the size of the program.		X	X	X	X
3	Irrigated agricultural lands operations would have the option of working directly with the Central Valley Water Board to obtain an individual waiver or waste discharge requirements. Current program information would be used to estimate the number of operations that would work directly with the Central Valley Water Board.	X	X	X	X	X
4	The Central Valley Water Board would coordinate with DPR and Agricultural Commissioners to gather pesticide tracking information.				X	X
5	Costs for the current ILRP will be determined using average reported coalition fees, and Central Valley Water Board staffing and waiver fees. Costs for coalition management plan development, program administration, and monitoring will be estimated using available reported overall coalition fee information.	X	X ^a			
6	Baseline conditions for management practices in place will be estimated using EQUIP grant, coalition data, and other available information. Management practices information for specific areas may be used to estimate the types of practices in place throughout the Central Valley.	X	X	X	X	X
7	Goals for Individual Farm Water Quality Management Plans would include: minimize waste discharge offsite in surface water, minimize erosion, match nutrient application to predicted crop uptake, implement wellhead protection.			X	X	X
8	Individual FWQMPs would include a time schedule where full implementation would take more than 2-years.			X	X	X

	Assumption	Applicable Alternatives				
		1	2	3	4	5
9	Growers or third-party groups would develop implementation time schedules where the Central Valley Water Board requires additional monitoring and/or management practices in areas where water quality objectives are not being met. These time schedules would be subject to Central Valley Water Board approval.	X	X	X	X	X
10	Goal for inspection programs would be 5% of growers annually.			X	X	X
11	Proposed surface water regional monitoring programs would be similar to the current ILRP surface water monitoring program. This assumption does not apply to tracking and groundwater components.	X	X		X	
12	Surface water monitoring data for watersheds or areas with less than two exceedances of applicable water quality objectives will be used to determine eligibility for reduced monitoring.		X		X	
13	Available groundwater nitrate data, vulnerability models, and DPR groundwater protection areas will be used to estimate areas of high priority for groundwater management practices.		X		X	
14	Available groundwater nitrate data and vulnerability models will be used to estimate where groundwater monitoring wells would be required.				X	X
15	Monitoring associated with FWQMPs only would not include water quality monitoring.			X		
16	Where required, Certified Nutrient Management Plans would be developed within 2-years of program adoption (tier 3 growers in Alternative 4, and all growers using fertilizers in Alternative 5).				X	X
17	In order to estimate assignment of areas or growers to appropriate tiers under Alternative 4: current surface water monitoring data, pesticide use, available groundwater nitrate data, and vulnerability models will be used.				X	
a. Additional information will be needed to estimate additional costs for Alternative 2's groundwater requirements. Such information would include estimates of costs to develop local groundwater management plans and other regional planning efforts to address groundwater quality concerns.						

For background on the long-term ILRP see:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/irrigated_lands/long_term_program_development/ilrp_longterm_alts_final.pdf