

**SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL  
AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT  
WATER RESOURCES ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**City/County Library Community Room**  
995 Palm Street  
San Luis Obispo

Wednesday, April 5, 2006  
1:30 p.m.

---

1. **Introductions**
2. **Approval of March meeting minutes**
3. **Public Comment**
4. **Ongoing Updates:**
  - a. San Luis Drainage Alternative – No report.
  - b. Paso Groundwater Banking Group – A tour of the Polonio Pass Water Treatment Plant, combined with a Presentation and Panel Discussion on Groundwater Banking, will be held on April 12, 2006 at 4 pm.
  - c. IRWM – See attached staff report.
  - d. Other:
    - i. Mobile Lab Availability
    - ii. Rainfall and Reservoir Update (see attached table)
    - iii. State Infrastructure Bonds
5. **Presentation by Ron Munds from the City of San Luis Obispo regarding Assembly Bill 2717 – Landscape Task Force.**
6. **Countywide Master Water Plan Discussion Topic – Review of "Open Recommendations" from 1998 Master Water Plan.**
7. **Future Agenda Items:**
  - a. **Countywide Master Water Plan Discussion Topic – Draft Table of Contents and set future topic discussions.**
  - b. **Low Impact Development – Donnette Dunaway, Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board.**  
**--- Adjourn by 3:30 PM ---**

**Next Meeting:      Wednesday, May 3, 2006 from 1:30 to 3:30 at the City/County Library**

**Visit Water Resources on the Web at: [www.slocountywater.org](http://www.slocountywater.org)**

L:\UTILITY\APR06\WRAC Agenda 4-5-2006.doc

**Purpose of the Committee:**

To advise the County Board of Supervisors concerning all policy decisions relating to the water resources of the SLO County Flood Control & Water Conservation District. To recommend to the Board specific water resource programs. To recommend methods of financing water resource programs.

*Excerpts from WRAC By-Laws dated 1998*

SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL  
AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT  
WATER RESOURCES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes

March 1, 2006

---

Approximately 1:33 pm; Chairman Winn called the meeting to Order

- 1) Introductions of Members and Attendees – Quorum Established
- 2) Approval of January and February 2006 Meeting Minutes – One clarification was requested by Member Greening for #4.a. of the February minutes – San Luis Drainage Update (“...no public comments were made *at this workshop* relevant to...”). Upon motion of Member Greening, second by Member Winholtz, and vocal vote, minutes of the January 4 and February 1, 2006 meetings of the Water Resource Advisory Committee (WRAC) were approved.
- 3) Public Comment – Member Mulholland shares the City of San Luis Obispo Utilities Division’s report on AB 1836/SB 1166 regarding flood protection bonds; speaks to estimated annual costs to SLO City of \$740,000 (translating to a 10% rate increase), cost per type of connection, and that funds are earmarked for delta improvements. Discussion ensues regarding the likelihood of AB 1836/SB 1166 success, State Committee/Special District review of alternative bills and funding sources, and need to correspond with representatives. Member Bianchi speaks to Whittier Narrows Wastewater Treatment Plant studies of prescription drug chemicals in discharge, concentration of chemicals, use as a tracer in groundwater recharge, DNA tracing. Discussion ensues on similar DNA tracing studies in Morro Bay Estuary, SLO City; exposure studies; Health Department and WRAC coordination. Member Chipping speaks to the oil well drilling and water extraction project (PxP Treated Water Project) in Price Canyon, its water generation rate, watershed designation, treatment needs and inclusion in the Master Water Plan. Discussion ensues on the sale of the water to Pismo and the oil company’s responsibilities. Member Eby speaks to the resignation of Michael LeBrun, recruitment of an interim and permanent General Manager for the Nipomo CSD; SLO County Board of Supervisors consideration of modifying the Growth Management Ordinance, Kim Murray as County Planning Dept lead. Chairman Winn speaks to Title 6 and impact on CSDs.
- 4) a. San Luis Drainage Update – Discussion ensues regarding emails and reports indicating preference of in-valley alternative, successful treatment studies, and lack of operating costs in estimates. Mark Hutchinson, SLO County Public Works Environmental Programs Manager speaks to the Bureau of Reclamation’s review of cost estimates and the County’s administrative preparations.  
  
b. IRWM – Mark Hutchinson, SLO County Public Works Environmental Programs Manager reports that no announcement has been made regarding the implementation grants, State Board hearing rescheduled to March.

c. Paso Groundwater Banking Group – Chairman Winn summarizes the agenda for the next meeting in April (tour of Polonio Pass and panel discussion), and May meeting with the Shandon Advisory Committee. Member Greening comments on scheduling of the April meeting and consideration of travel time/other meeting conflicts and being sure to discuss legal and administrative issues as well as the physical issues that will mainly be addressed in the Groundwater Banking plan. Discussion ensues on fatal flaw analysis prior to legal/administrative debate, CCWA representation, Kern Water Bank as an example, alternatives analysis.

- 5) Presentation on the Rural Planned Development (RPD) Ordinance – John Nall, Principal Environmental Specialist of the Department of Planning and Building summarizes the ordinance contents and status, and requests that the WRAC provide a written recommendation on how the Board of Supervisors should proceed on the ordinance. Discussion of legal lots, water rights and ordinance implications, community water systems versus individual systems, impact of ordinance on development of conservation element and Master Water Plan, existence of a problem with underlying lots, relation to existing Ag Cluster ordinance. Quorum was confirmed. Focused discussion ensues on the recommendations for the RPD Ordinance project and its environmental determination. Straw vote on the following WRAC recommendation options:
- a. Negative Declaration determination for RPD Ordinance – 0
  - b. EIR determination for RPD Ordinance – 0
  - c. Abandon RPD Ordinance project altogether – 3
  - d. Abandon RPD Ordinance and form a technical committee to address the underlying lot problem - 8

A motion by Member Mulholland, and seconded by Member Eby, is made to submit the following recommendation to the Board of Supervisors:

**“Because of the impacts to water resources and the huge problem in the County with legal underlying lots, the WRAC recommends stopping the RPD process and quickly convening a task force made up of people with various expertise to study underlying problems, including person(s) with water resources expertise.”**

Upon motion by Member Sinton, second by Member Mulholland, and vocal vote, the meeting was extended for an additional 5 minutes.

A hand vote of 13 to 0 passes the motion. Staff is directed to draft written motion for Chairman Winn’s review and circulation to WRAC prior to transmittal to the Board of Supervisors.

- 6) Review of “Recommendations” from current Master Water Plan – Item deferred.
- 7) Future Agenda Items – Item deferred.

Meeting adjourned approx. 3:35 pm

**WATER RESOURCES ADVISORY COMMITTEE 2006**

<b>Organization</b>	<b>Representative</b>		<b>Jan</b>	<b>Feb</b>	<b>Mar</b>	<b>Apr</b>	<b>May</b>	<b>Jun</b>	<b>Aug*</b>	<b>Aug*</b>	<b>Sep</b>	<b>Oct</b>	<b>Nov</b>	<b>Dec</b>
Atascadero Mutual	Ken Weathers	M												
	John Neil	A												
Cal Cities Water	Henric Szopinski	M												
	Warren Morgan	A												
	Roger Brett	Staff												
Ca Mens Colony	John Kellerman	M		X										
	Gerald Elwood	A												
Cambria CSD	Bryan Bode	M												
	Jim Adams	A												
Camp SLO	Chris Wide	M												
	0	A												
City of Arroyo Grande	Joe Costello	M												
	Ed Arnold	A		X										
	Don Spagnolo	Staff												
City of Atascadero	Jerry Clay	M												
	Wade McKinney	A												
City of Grover Beach	Chuck Ashton	M		X	X									
	Larry Versaw	A												
City of Morro Bay	Betty Winholtz	M	X	X	X									
	Bill Boucher	A												
City of Paso Robles	Brad Hagemann	M	X	X	X									
	0	A												
City of Pismo Beach	Bill Rabenaldt	M												
	Dennis Delzeit	A												
City of San Luis Obispo	Christine Mulholland	M	X	X	X									
	Allen Settle	A												
	Ron Munds	Staff												
	Gary Henderson	Staff	X	X	X									
County Farm Bureau	Joy Fitzhugh	M	X	X	X									
	Jackie Crabb	A												
Cuesta College	Edralin Maduli	M												
	Terry Reece	A												
District 1	Steve Sinton	M			X									
District 2	Hal Fones	M												
District 3	Robert Mires	M	X	X	X									
District 4	Michael Winn	M	X	X	X									
District 5	Dan O'Grady	M	X	X	X									
Environmental at Large	Bill Bianchi	M	X	X										
	Eric Greening	M		X	X									
Heritage Ranch CSD	John D'Ornellas	M												
	Debbie Fransen	A												
Los Osos CSD	George Milanese*	M												
	Bruce Buel*	A												
	Margaret Falkner	Staff		X										
Nipomo CSD	Michael Le Brun	M												
	Ed Eby	A		X	X									
Oceano CSD	Rick Searcy	M												
	Francis Cooney	A			X									
San Luis Coastal RCD	Linda Chipping	M		X	X									
	Kathie Matsuyama	A			X									
Templeton CSD	William Van Orden	M												
	Laurie Ion	A												
Upper Salinas RCD	Tom Mora	M												
	Chuck Pritchard	A												
Agriculture at Large	Ray Allen	M	X	X										
	John Snyder	A												
Public Works Staff	Courtney Howard	Staff	X	X	X									
	Jeff Werst	Staff												
	Mi Kyung Lew	Staff												
	Paavo Ogren	Staff	X	X										
	Mark Hutchinson	Staff		X	X									
	Jill Falcone	Staff												
Planning Staff	John Hand	Staff												
	Jeff Olivares	Staff												
Env. Health Staff	Laurie Salo	Staff	X	X										
	Jenny McCartney	Staff												
<b>OTHER</b>														
Debbie Arnold (Assemblyman Blakeslee's ofc)	Other													
Dennis Gibbs (County of Santa Barbara)	Other													
David Church (LAFCO)	Other													
Jim Patterson (Board of Supervisors)	Other													

M= Member; A= Alternate; 0 = No appointment received as of 4/5/06

**TO: Water Resources Advisory Committee**

**FROM: Courtney Howard, Water Resources Engineer**

**VIA: Paavo Ogren, Deputy Director of Public Works**

**DATE: April 5, 2006**

**SUBJECT: Agenda Item #4.c: IRWM Implementation Grant Plan and Proposal Evaluation**

**A copy of the State's evaluation of the District's IRWM Implementation Grant Proposal is attached.**

**Although the District's proposal was not selected to proceed to Step 2 of the Implementation grant process, our overall ranking was 17<sup>th</sup> (16 individual and consolidated applicants were "called back").**

**Developing plan improvements based on the State's evaluation/feedback, together with educational and other efforts at the state-level, are two high priority strategies that require focused attention in preparing for 2007 Implementation Grant submittals. Additional verbal feedback will be provided at the WRAC meeting.**

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

**PIN:** 3840  
**APPLICANT NAME:** County of San Luis Obispo  
**PROJECT TITLE:** San Luis Obispo County Consolidated Water Project Implementation Proposal

**FUNDS REQUESTED:** \$ 50,000,000  
**COST MATCH:** \$272,472,000  
**TOTAL PROJECT COST:** \$322,472,000

**DESCRIPTION:** The Nacimiento Water Supply Project, with the Lake Nacimiento Watershed Mercury Sediment Reduction Project as a companion project; the Los Osos Wastewater Treatment Facility Project; the Nipomo Supplemental Water Project; and the Lopez Treatment Plant Upgrade Project. This proposal addresses water supply reliability for over 80% of the region's urban residents, including six of the region's seven incorporated cities along with significant portions of the urban population living in unincorporated urban areas. Water quality issues ranging from watershed contamination by mine wastes to protection of a national Estuary would be addressed. Ecosystem benefits range from elimination of alternative projects with significant long-term environmental effects to better growth management by providing adequate supplies to existing urbanized areas.

**Question: Consistency with Minimum IRWM Standards - This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated that the IRWM Plan meets the minimum standards.**

Pass

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption. Weighting factor is 1.** 3

The IRWMP was adopted by the applicant December 6, 2005 by the San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors who govern the applicant. The applicant is the primary agency for regional water planning and the implementation with the county. However, agencies in Water Resources Advisory Committee (WRAC) and other responsible Water Related Agencies (in Exhibits A-1 and A-2) have not adopted the IRWMP.

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Description of Region. Weighting factor is 1.** 4

Regional characteristic discussion is detailed and includes current and future water resources, current water resource quality, quantity, and supply and demand analysis, important ecological process and environmental resources, social and cultural makeup, economic conditions, and important trends. Mapping includes delineation of internal boundaries, major water related infrastructure, major land-use division, geohydrological characteristics, and economic distributions. The regional boundary is the county. The proposal does not adequately account for groundwater basins overlap or clarification of interregional projects relationships. The Salinas River watershed is split between this IRWMP and that of PIN 3816. Coordination between the 2 IRWMPs would help integrate management of that basin.

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Objectives. Weighting factor is 1.** 5

The objectives of the planning are well articulated. Specific means of achieving the goals were also identified. IRWMP goals and objectives were initially developed in water supply, water quality, ecosystem preservation and restoration, groundwater monitoring and management, and flood management. The WRAC oversaw development of the draft IRWMP goals and objectives. The draft IRWMP will receive further public review and input prior to the final version being adopted in December 2005. The objectives in the draft IRWMP are very numerous and detailed and fully address regional needs and conflicts.

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Water Management Strategies and Integration. Weighting factor is 1.** 4

Discussion on the water management strategies the IRWMP will employ and how they will work together to provide reliable water supply, protect and improve water quality, and achieve other IRWMP objectives is detailed and well described. The strategies are cross-linked to each other and many of the IRWM goals and objectives overlap to benefit multiple areas of water management. The 20 water management strategies in the Guidelines are linked to specific relevant IRWM goals and objectives and compared to strategies in existing local water plans (e.g., County Master Water Plan). A few other minor improvements are: 1) a matrix identifying links between strategies is provided, but how or why the strategies work together is not explained and 2) 13 benefits to integrating water management strategies were listed, but how or why they would occur is not explained.

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Priorities and Schedule. Weighting factor is 1

3

The IRWMP identified a suite of projects the IRWMP will implement and prioritized them according to short- and long-term implementation. The IRWMP would be reviewed and revised on a five-year schedule with a mid-cycle review also provided after initial IRWMP adoption in December 2005. The process for modifying priorities in response to regional changes and response to implementation of projects was identified. However, the methodology for reassessment and prioritization during the IRWMP implementation was too general. An adaptive management approach may be employed to evaluate IRWMP performance, but the draft IRWMP does not discuss how projects would be assessed, whether there would be any ability to alter project sequencing, or make other mid-implementation changes

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Implementation. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The IRWMP has well defined actions, projects, and studies, ongoing or planned, for implementation. However, the discussion was very general. 69 projects were identified. Scheduling for 5 of the projects and for the development and update of the final IRWMP itself were provided; however, scheduling for the remaining 64 action items was not discussed. The IRWMP identifies that existing institutional structures will be used to implement the IRWMP and possible "alternative institutional structures" will be considered in the future. Interdependence between projects was identified, although not fully articulated. Detailed project linkages are shown for 4 projects. Feasibility of the projects was determined based on the prioritization score ranking criteria; however, supporting rationale was missing. The feasibility of 4 projects was discussed, but absent for the other 65 projects. The implementation status of the Los Osos project is currently in question.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Impacts and Regional Benefits. Weighting factor is 1.

3

Impacts and benefits to DACs are attributed to the region as a whole. Interregional benefits based on the hydrologic linkages to the counties to the south and north were discussed as well as other resources (e.g., air, cultural, biological, and utilities). Advantages of the IRWMP include increased regional understanding, economics of scale, and fostering support within the region. Interregional impact and benefits was addressed in general terms. A general analysis of the IRWMP and project implementation impacts and benefits was provided in the proposal; however, methods used to determine them were not discussed. For example, protection of high value habitat is stated, but no explanation is provided on how this benefit would come from implementing the IRWMP. Potential impacts were cited, but it is unclear that they would result from IRWMP implementation (e.g., increase in urban water demand, demands on parks and open space, and more stringent wastewater treatment requirements).

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Technical Analysis and Plan Performance. Weighting factor is 1.

3

Discussion of data, technical methods, and analyses used in the selection of the strategies is missing; however, current data collection systems were discussed. Data gaps were identified, but a means to supplementing the gaps was not discussed. The IRWMP identified measures that will be employed to monitor project/IRWMP performance. However, the mechanism to be used was non-specific. For example, many action items only list "compliance monitoring and reporting" without explaining what this is or how it is done. The highest priority action item is the Nacimiento Water Project which pipes water from the lake to three towns. Performance monitoring for this includes a "Groundwater level monitoring program," but it is unclear if it is to monitor the effect of this diversion in and near Nacimiento Reservoir or at the points of delivery in the Nipomo Mesa Area.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Data Management. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The proposal details existing data collection activities, assessment, and means of disseminating the information to stakeholders and the public. The applicant has an existing Resource Management System that monitors land use and water supply patterns. The applicant's current data is available to the public, but only via a written request and groundwater data from private wells is not available to the public. The state of existing monitoring efforts was discussed and several data gaps were identified including how to measure IRWMP performance. The only mention of supporting statewide data needs was a commitment to collect water quality monitoring data according to SWAMP and GAMA guidelines.

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Financing. Weighting factor is 1.

2

Potential funding/financing for IRWMP implementation depends on securing grant funding. Beneficiaries of the identified projects are generally described as the entire region and its constituents. Funding sources for the 4 IRWMP implementation grant projects are described as SWB State Revolving Fund Loans, the IRWMP grant, "contractual commitments", and "settlement provisions of litigation." The last 2 sources are not explained. For most of the 69 projects, fund sources are not specified beyond the agency responsible for the item. If these items encounter "inadequate funding" the IRWMP adaptive management approach would be used to identify "how to solve these obstacles." The applicant indicates the O&M funding for the 4 implementation grant projects will come from local sources. There is no indication regarding the funding sources for long-term projects. The financing plan and funding for implementation are generally questionable and are of particular note for the Los Osos project.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Relation to Local Planning & Sustainability. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The local planning documents are not listed by name, but were identified as general, land use, or operational plans developed by local agencies that were named. The IRWMP is described as being a foundation for the local planning documents by providing the perspective of regional water resource needs and constraints. Since the IRWMP is not final, this foundation may relate to future revisions to local planning documents. None of the 69 projects are related to specific local planning documents except for the Nacimiento Water Pipeline Project. The draft IRWMP was developed with assistance from the WRAC. Most of the local land use decision makers are represented on the WRAC. There is a general discussion of linkages between water management strategies and local planning documents, and most of the local documents are said to be based in large part on water availability concerns.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Stakeholder Involvement & Coordination. Weighting factor is 1.

4

The WRAC represents the major stakeholders in the region. Three public workshops were held in early 2005 to begin IRWMP development. DAC involvement appears to be at the governmental level; inclusion of community group or other forum was lacking. Plan outreach consists of various subcommittees and WRAC itself. DAC and environmental justice issues will be determined and refined during development of the final IRWMP. A mechanism for including additional stakeholders in the WRAC for is not apparent. Coordination with State and federal agencies within the current regional management structure exists. Possible obstacles to IRWMP implement was discussed in general terms.

### Question: Funding Match. This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated the ability to meet the minimum funding match or has requested a waiver or reduction in the funding match. Pass or Fail.

Pass

### Question: Description of Proposal. Weighting factor is 3.

9

A general discussion of the work scope, goals, objectives, scientific basis, beneficial use, and water quality and quantity are summarized. Each project is prioritized and ranked. Consistency with the IRWMP is identified and a matrix depicting how the projects will meet IRWMP objectives is provided. Although supporting documentation is cited, the scientific basis of each project is general. Several water management elements were identified to be addressed by the four projects, but rationales are missing. Integration of the 4 projects has regional benefits but documentation was general in nature and missing supporting documentation. Integration was not apparent for the other 64 IRWMP projects. Technical analysis of how the projects will track and measure water quality and quantity improvements is not included. Discussion on environmental compliance is missing.

### Question: Project Prioritization. Weighting factor is 2.

8

Projects are prioritized within the region and within the proposal. Both short-and long-term projects are identified within the IRWMP and ranking of short-term projects are identified. The proposal consists of 4 projects, which are identified in the draft IRWMP as being in the top 13 high priority IRWMP action items. It is not clear why the 4 projects were included in the proposal over the other 9 equally highly ranked IRWMP action items.

### Question: Cost Estimate. Weighting factor is 1.

3

A number of tables depict cost estimates. Construction/Implementation contingency ranges from 17 to 35% and appear high. One of the projects has higher planning, design, engineering, and environmental documentation than construction cost. Supporting documentation was not provided making it hard to determine if the costs are reasonable. The Nacimiento Mercury project is part of the larger Nacimiento Water Supply Project but has a separate budget sheet. The largest single item is \$26,400,000 for the Nacimiento Water Supply Project, but a cost breakdown was not provided making it difficult to determine the reasonableness of the estimate.

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

**Question: Schedule. Weighting factor is 1.**

5

The schedule provided was in greater detail than the cost estimate and the work scope. One of the projects would require a Stream Bed Alteration permit. No other related IRWMP elements were identified except those proposed for funding. The schedule for the Los Osos project may need significant reevaluation.

**Question: Need. Weighting factor is 2.**

8

Discussion on the current water supply systems and expected long-term regional water needs is succinct and includes how each project will help meet that need. However, long-term supply needs are not quantified. Discussion also includes regional economic, environmental, and fiscal need for the projects. Negative impacts that would result from not completing the project are briefly described. Local and regional economic, environmental, and fiscal impacts related to the four projects are briefly described.

**Question: Disadvantaged Communities. Weighting factor is 2.**

6

The proposal identified the DACs make-up. Benefits derived from project implementation will indirectly benefit DACs. However, direct benefits to DACs were not adequately described, and each of the 4 projects claims to provide possible benefit to DACs. The applicant claims that 18% of the region's population has household incomes below the 80% standard. The applicant is not requesting a match reduction or waiver. No projects are designed specifically to benefit DACs or their specific needs.

**Question: Program Preferences. Weighting factor is 1.**

4

Discussion on how the IRWMP and project implementation meets the program preference is succinct. Most of the proposal is directed to improving water supplies. 2 projects expand distribution of potable water supplies, 1 project improves a drinking water supply, and 1 project improves a wastewater treatment facility. Improvements in meeting water quality standards in the region will be minor and will be focused mainly in the Los Osos area. Some reduction of pollution that impairs habitat will occur as a result of the Los Osos project. However, the implementation status of the Los Osos project is in question. The Lopez project will improve drinking water quality that benefits Oceano, a DAC.

**TOTAL SCORE: 83**

Step 1 Proposal Evaluation Results

PIN	Applicant Name	Overall Statewide Priorities Ranking	Score Ranking	Score	Consolidated Score
4676	San Luis and Delta Mendota Water Authority	High-Med	A	89	
5976	Mojave Water Agency	Med	A	110	
6584	Humboldt County	Med	A	109	
5636	Pajaro Valley Water Management Agency	Med	A	106	
4698	Plumas County	Med	A	106	
3998	Community Foundation of Santa Cruz County	Med	A	98	
5756	Yucaipa Valley Water District	Med	A	99	94
6986	Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority			94	
6398	Tahoe Resource Conservation District	Med	A	93	
3816	Monterey County Water Resources Agency	Med	A	89	
6984	Calleguas Municipal Water District	Med-Low	A	94	94
6462	Ventura Countywide Integrated Regional Water Management			87	
6504	Orange County	Med-Low	A	94	
6964	Contra Costa Water District	Med-Low	A	91	
6884	Freeport Regional Water Authority	Med-Low	A	90	90
6336	Regional Water Authority			80	
5796	Northern California Joint Exercise of Powers	High	B	71	71
5816	Butte County Dept of Water & Resource Conservation			56	
7084	Santa Monica Bay Restoration Authority	High-Med	B	81	81
7036	West Basin Municipal Water District			78	
5956	Watershed Conservation Authority			76	
7068	Los Angeles, City of			76	
6456	Alameda County Water District	High-Med	B	88	78
7092	Santa Clara Valley Water District			78	
6770	Bay Area Clean Water Agencies			75	
6624	Montara Water and Sanitary District			56	
3840	San Luis Obispo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	Med	B	83	
6136	Salton Sea Authority	Med	B	77	
5996	Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	Med-Low	B	80	
6438	Santa Barbara County	Med-Low	B	76	
5880	Upland, City of	Med-Low	B	73	
6416	Solano County Water Agency	Low	B	83	
6766	Kaweah Delta Water Conservation District	Low	B	82	
6178	Madera Irrigation District	Low	B	79	
4076	San Bernardino County	Low	B	74	
7024	Monterey Peninsula Water Management District	High-Med	C	60	
4136	San Diego County Water Authority	Med-Low	C	68	
6016	Stockton, City of	Med-Low	C	67	
7246	Pleasant Valley Water District	Med-Low	C	60	
5316	Lake County Watershed Protection District	Med-Low	C	59	
6156	Kings River Conservation District	Low	C	61	
6646	Inyo County Water Department			DQ	
7040	Calexico New River Committee			DQ	
6804	Merced - University of California			DQ	
7034	Nevada Irrigation District			DQ	
7144	County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County			DQ	
6564	Lake County Special Districts			DQ	
6098	Shafter, City of			DQ	
7038	Moreno Valley, City of			DQ	
7042	Downey, City of			DQ	

     Proposal invited to submit Step 2 proposal  
 High-Proposal with a high degree of benefit to this Statewide Priority.  
 Med-Proposal with a moderate degree of benefit to this Statewide Priority.  
 Low-Proposal with a low degree of benefit to this Statewide Priority.  
 NA-Statewide Priority not addressed by applicant in Attachment 12

Consolidated Score based on either highest score or the highest score that represents the consolidated region  
 A = Score of 89 & above. Highest scoring proposals on evaluation criteria. Call back all.  
 B = Scores of 83-71. Call back proposals scoring High or High-Med on Statewide Priorities.  
 C = Score < 70 points. No proposals called back.

## Proposal Evaluation Ranking Independent from State-Wide Priorities

PIN	Applicant	Grant Request	Score	North or South	Call Back	Comment
6584	County of Humboldt	\$50,000,000	109	N	Y	
5636	Pajaro Valley Water Management Agency	\$27,954,600	106	N	Y	
4698	County of Plumas	\$9,999,438	106	N	Y	
3998	Community Foundation of Santa Cruz County	\$32,209,283	98	N	Y	
6398	Tahoe Resource Conservation District	\$29,341,641	93	N	Y	
6964	Contra Costa Water District	\$49,480,000	91	N	Y	
6884	Freeport Regional Water Authority	\$50,000,000	90	N	Y	Sac County Consolidated
4676	San Luis & Delta Mendota Water Authority	\$25,000,000	89	N	Y	
3816	Monterey County Water Resources Agency Project	\$22,811,000	89	N	Y	
6456	Alameda County Water District	\$10,620,000	88	N	Y	Bay Area Consolidated
6416	Solano County Water Agency	\$3,191,900	83	N	N	
3840	County of San Luis Obispo	\$50,000,000	83	N	N	
6766	Kaweah Delta Water Conservation District	\$14,695,600	82	N	N	
6336	Regional Water Authority	\$29,946,808	80	N	Y	Sac County Consolidated
5996	Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	\$49,975,000	80	N	N	
6178	Madera Irrigation District	\$20,140,000	79	N	N	
7092	Santa Clara Valley Water District	\$10,721,000	78	N	Y	Bay Area Consolidated
6770	Bay Area Clean Water Agencies	\$39,380,000	75	N	Y	Bay Area Consolidated
5796	Northern California Joint Exercise of Powers	\$39,365,000	71	N	Y	Sac Valley Consolidated
6016	City of Stockton	\$50,000,000	67	N	N	
6156	Kings River Conservation District	\$49,571,784	61	N	N	
7246	Pleasant Valley Water District	\$14,495,310	60	N	N	
7024	Monterey Peninsula Water Management District	\$27,260,150	60	N	N	
5316	Lake County Watershed Protection District	\$1,945,481	59	N	N	
6624	Montara Water and Sanitary District	\$48,017,000	56	N	Y	Bay Area Consolidated
5816	Butte County Dept of Water & Resource Conservation	\$25,232,618	56	N	Y	Sac Valley Consolidated
7034	Nevada Irrigation District	\$15,840,232	0	N	N	
6804	University of California, Merced	\$4,730,400	0	N	N	
6646	Inyo County Water Department	\$20,075,430	0	N	N	
6564	Lake County Special Districts	\$1,599,849	0	N	N	
6098	City of Shafter	\$693,388	0	N	N	
5976	Mojave Water Agency	\$50,000,000	110	S	Y	
5756	Yucaipa Valley Water District	\$15,062,000	99	S	Y	Santa Ana Consolidated
6986	Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority	\$50,000,000	94	S	Y	Santa Ana Consolidated
6984	Calleguas Municipal Water District	\$49,458,750	94	S	Y	Ventura County Consolidated
6504	County of Orange	\$50,000,000	94	S	Y	
6462	Ventura Countywide Integrated Regional Water Management	\$25,338,199	87	S	Y	Ventura County Consolidated
7084	Santa Monica Bay Restoration Authority	\$27,423,246	81	S	Y	LA Metro Consolidated
7036	West Basin Municipal Water District	\$49,889,000	78	S	Y	LA Metro Consolidated
6136	Salton Sea Authority	\$20,080,000	77	S	N	
7068	City of Los Angeles	\$49,995,950	76	S	Y	LA Metro Consolidated
6438	Santa Barbara County	\$35,742,000	76	S	N	
5956	Watershed Conservation Authority	\$47,685,717	76	S	Y	LA Metro Consolidated
4076	County of San Bernardino	\$10,000,000	74	S	N	
5880	City of Upland	\$10,000,000	73	S	N	
4136	San Diego County Water Authority	\$49,859,617	68	S	N	
7144	County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County	\$7,303,512	0	S	N	
7042	City of Downey	\$4,326,000	0	S	N	
7040	Calexico New River Committee	\$15,678,454	0	S	N	
7038	City of Moreno Valley	\$4,000,000	0	S	N	

Green = Called Back

## Rainfall and Reservoir Update

Alert Precipitation Station	05/06 Water Year July 05 to June 06	05/06 Water Year Cumulative Totals	Average	% of Avg
		3/20/2006		
Santa Margarita (#723)	37.17	16.18	22.00	74%
SLO Reservoir Gage (#749)	38.70	18.82	24.00	78%
Lopez Rec Area (#707)	32.68	18.86	24.00	79%
Atascadero (Rocky Canyon # 711) <sup>1</sup>	24.41	5.92	19.00	31%
Atascadero (Upper Torro # 702)		17.44		
Santa Rosa Creek at Main St ( # 717)	31.69	12.99	18.00	72%

<sup>1</sup> Found material interfering with measurements; Upper Torro reading provided for alternate reference

Reservoir Status	Date	Level (Feet)	Spillway Elev	Storage (Acre-Feet)	Percent Capacity
Nacimiento Reservoir	14-Mar-06	785.85	800.00	301,650	80%
Lopez Reservoir	19-Dec-05	502.77	522.60	33,212	67%
	19-Jan-06	505.92	522.60	35,507	72%
	21-Feb-06	506.09	522.60	35,634	72%
	14-Mar-06	507.03	522.60	36,341	74%
Salinas Reservoir	19-Dec-05	1,294.42	1,300.74	19,515	82%
	19-Jan-06	1,300.84	1,300.74	23,917	100%
	21-Feb-06	1,300.82	1,300.74	23,902	100%
	14-Mar-06	1,301.00	1,300.74	24,116	101%
Whalerock Reservoir	19-Dec-05	208.80	216.00	36,510	90%
	19-Jan-06	211.10	216.00	37,809	93%
	21-Feb-06	210.70	216.00	37,582	92%
	10-Mar-06	210.70	216.00	37,582	92%

**TO: Water Resources Advisory Committee**

**FROM: Courtney Howard, Water Resources Engineer**

**VIA: Paavo Ogren, Deputy Director of Public Works**

**DATE: April 5, 2006**

**SUBJECT: Agenda Item #5: Presentation by Ron Munds from the City of San Luis Obispo regarding Assembly Bill 2717 – Landscape Task Force**

**In September 2004, Governor Schwarzenegger signed into law a bill requesting the California Urban Water Conservation Council (CUWCC) convene a stakeholder's task force to evaluate and recommend proposals, to the Governor and legislature by December 31, 2005, for improving the efficiency of water use in new and existing urban landscapes in California. Based on this charge, the Task Force adopted a comprehensive set of 43 recommendations and over 70 specific actions.**

**Ron Munds, the City of San Luis Obispo's Utilities Conservation Coordinator, was the chairman and facilitator of the Task Force. Ron will present a summary of the Task Force's process and recommendations to the WRAC and the potential implications to the region.**

**TO: Water Resources Advisory Committee**

**FROM: Courtney Howard, Water Resources Engineer**

**VIA: Paavo Ogren, Deputy Director of Public Works**

**DATE: April 5, 2006**

**SUBJECT: Agenda Item #6: Summary of 1998 Master Water Plan Recommendations, Status and New Master Water Plan Approach**

Please find included in the agenda package a table outlining the recommendations from the 1998 Master Water Plan, the status of the County's response to each recommendation, and a suggested approach to addressing outstanding recommendations for review and discussion during the April 5<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Many of the recommendations have been addressed, either by completion of projects or studies, or incorporation into the Integrated Regional Water Management plan. For example, mercury manometer stream gauges have been replaced, CIMIS stations are being utilized, and additional gauges have been installed. Additionally, grant money was recently approved for the District to complete studies on how to further improve the data collection program and to investigate the feasibility of groundwater banking as a method of increasing reliability of water supplies. Implementation of the Nacimiento Projects is underway, a Paso Robles Basin Monitoring Agreement has been executed, the IRWM Plan is promoting sub-regional efforts, and strategies to coordinate with land use planning issues are improving.

Nevertheless, more work is ahead of us. There are still outstanding recommendations to be discussed with WRAC during the development of the new Master Water Plan. In particular, the method of estimating water needs for rural areas and the environment, the District's policy on private well information disclosure, and the incorporation of watershed management plans and policies. These items are suggested for the topical discussions planned for upcoming WRAC meetings.

Other recommendations for subsequent phases of the 1998 Master Water Plan included prioritizing the WPAs, identifying and activating stakeholder groups, and having each WPA "develop watershed management plans and implementation procedures". These specific efforts need to be reconsidered in light of IRWM efforts and the decision to develop a "New" Master Water Plan instead of proceeding with "Phase II" of the 1998 Master Water Plan. District Resolution 68-223 (attached) may also help provide guidance in discussing the approach to regional versus sub-regional water management efforts.

## 1998 Countywide Master Water Plan

Recommendation	Status	Current Goals / New Plan Approach
<b><i>Existing Water Supplies</i></b>		
New hydrologic data should be developed for the Paso Robles Basin. Establish a) whether the basin is approaching safe yield; b) whether areas of the basin are being over-pumped; or c) what actions could be taken to preserve the yield from this important water source.	Phase II of the Paso Robles GW Basin Study (Fugro) was completed in February 2005. The District, the City of Paso Robles, County Service Area No. 16 (Shandon) and numerous landowners overlying the basin executed a groundwater monitoring and management agreement in 2005, articulating that the basin is not in overdraft and that the parties to the agreement will work together to monitor and manage the basin.	<u>Paso Basin Monitoring Agreement (PBMA):</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Review District’s current data gathering program for “gaps” and other improvements</li> <li>▪ Develop a “plan” for ongoing monitoring</li> </ul> <u>Conjunctive Use Programs</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Evaluate the feasibility of Groundwater Banking component of IRWM planning grant.</li> </ul>
<b><i>Watershed Management</i></b>		
Formally investigate small, localized, off-stream areas where ground water recharge may be significant.	No specific action has been taken on this item.	Reconsider the purpose of the investigations under the County-wide Master Plan. Recommendation appears to be more aligned with specific or sub-regional efforts.
The County should develop policies for the areas where specific watershed management practices should be encouraged. Each WPA should develop watershed management plans and implementation procedures.	Consideration of policies for watershed management practices was included in the IRWM.	Develop policies for the Master Water Plan (MWP) from IRWM efforts (Consider a review with WRAC as a “Topical Discussion” in 2006). Reconsider the development of watershed management plans as a component of the MWP; rather, individual specific areas on a case-by-case basis. Several examples already exist – San Luis Creek Watershed; Arroyo Grande Creek watershed. Document in MWP the status and overall findings, or incorporate by reference.

## 1998 Countywide Master Water Plan

<b>Future Water Supply Options</b>		
The County should evaluate the costs and benefits to County users of utilizing excess State Water allocation.	IRWM planning grant was approved to investigate the feasibility of groundwater banking. CCWA has completed a capacity study. Evaluation of alternatives for excess allocation will be considered.	Incorporate results from Groundwater Banking component of IRWM planning grant and evaluation of alternatives.
The County should evaluate the costs and benefits to County users benefits associated with spillway improvements at Nacimiento Dam.	Monterey County is implementing spillway improvement project. District is implementing the Nacimiento project under contracts with the Cities of Paso Robles and San Luis Obispo, the Templeton Community Services District, and the Atascadero Mutual Water Company. Of 15,750 acre feet per year; 9,630 contracted; 6,130 in reserve.	Evaluate alternative uses of Nacimiento Reserve Water within context of Nacimiento Contracts.
<b>Water Needs</b>		
Water use for golf courses in the County should be added to each WPA total, as appropriate.	Data was included for WPA 6, and was addressed in each WPA data update.	Discuss incorporation of golf course water usage into any water needs calculations.
Rural demands were based on population and a more accurate accounting could be developed by assigning assessor parcel information to each of the WPAs.	Assigning assessor parcel info to each of the WPAs is very detailed and costly with questionable benefits in many cases. Nevertheless, incorporating APN's into a GIS system in some cases, such as the PBMA, may be appropriate for estimating rural and agricultural demand.	Discuss the approach for new WMP with WRAC after further efforts of the PBMA have evaluated the cost/benefit of the approach. If APN information is not deemed appropriate, consider alternative approaches for maintaining timely information in a cost effective manner.
The range of future environmental water demands will likely require knowledge on average annual unimpaired runoff. Lacking the availability of consistent stream flow data in a readily usable format, unimpaired runoff estimates should be generated by WPA from rainfall data.	Upgrading stream flow monitoring equipment and evaluation of current data collection program will be included in the IRWM planning grant data enhancement plan component.	Discuss use for this data and appropriateness of this approach for estimating environmental water demand with WRAC after appropriate milestone on IRWM effort.

## 1998 Countywide Master Water Plan

<b>Water Management Data Collection</b>		
Continue collecting Spring and Fall static water level readings in wells throughout the County.	Data collection continues to occur in April and October.	Other specific recommendations expected as a result of Data Enhancement component of IRWM planning grant.
The County should construct peizometers, within public rights-of-way where practical, to avoid the need to take measurements at private wells.	Funding for additional peizometers has not been available.	Other specific recommendations expected as a result of Data Enhancement component of IRWM planning grant
The County should provide a policy statement on how water level information is made available to the public.	Policy has been written and approved by County Counsel. Water level information is published in a biennial report at <a href="http://www.slocountywater.org">www.slocountywater.org</a> . Next steps are to solicit feedback on format and information provided, and to finish linking of raw data and policy to website.	Discuss inclusion of policy with WRAC.
To keep the MWP current, the WRAC should consider sponsoring a program of voluntary reporting and tabulating of actual water use, by type of use, by source, by water planning area.	Water use data for the Planning Department's RMS is currently collected.	Preparation of the new WMP will include better integration with RMS, as discussed with WRAC at meeting of February 2006.
To assist in keeping the MWP current, and to assist in the confirmation or development of estimates of agricultural water use, the WRAC should consider sponsoring a voluntary "pilot program" to track actual applied water per acre for various crop-types by water planning area.	The Ag commissioner already collects data. Next step is to evaluate data they collect and ability to obtain data regularly as a part the MWP and annual updates to RMS.	Next step is to evaluate data they collect and ability to obtain data regularly as a part the MWP and annual updates to RMS.

## 1998 Countywide Master Water Plan

<p>The County should provide a policy statement on the circumstances under which well logs will be made available to the public.</p>	<p>County Counsel has approved a policy statement.</p>	<p>Review with WRAC and discuss it's incorporation into the MWP. (Consider as a Topical Discussion in 2006).</p>
<p>At least one (1) stream gauge per major stream should be placed in WPA 1. (The definition of the actual location was beyond the scope of this Phase 1 effort.)</p>	<p>Stream gauges are currently located in San Simeon and Santa Rosa Creeks in WPA1.</p>	<p>Incorporate results from Data Enhancement component of IRWM planning grant.</p>
<p>At least two (2) additional stream gauges should be placed in WPA 4: one on the San Luis Obispo Creek and one on the Davenport Creek, at a point upstream of the City of San Luis Obispo. (The definition of the actual locations was beyond the scope of this Phase 1 effort.)</p>	<p>Four stream gauges have been added to WPA 4. Additional evaluations of the relationship between rainfall and creek flows have recently been approved for Zone 9 of the District (i.e., the San Luis Creek Watershed).</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>Mercury manometer stream gauges should be replaced.</p>	<p>Mercury manometer stream gauges have been replaced.</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>Continuous-read rain gauges should be established in WPA 1, along Upper Santa Rosa Creek, in particular.</p>	<p>A continuous read rain gauge has been established on Perry Creek in WPA 1.</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>The County should sponsor additional CIMIS stations in WPAs 6 and 9a.</p>	<p>A CIMIS station has been placed at Chalk Mountain Golf Course in WPA 9a, and another station is being placed at Cypress Ridge Golf Course.</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>The WRAC should continue to promote the use of the Mobile Lab.</p>	<p>County staff regularly reminds the WRAC of the Mobile Lab's availability and the remaining budget.</p>	<p>Continue with current efforts.</p>

## 1998 Countywide Master Water Plan

<p>Data currently maintained by the County should be converted and maintained in a digital format. The data should be made available through the Internet, such that others may retrieve the data and have the capability to run “intelligent queries” and to perform trend analyses.</p>	<p>Data has been digitized and work is currently underway to make it available on the internet at <a href="http://www.slocountywater.org">www.slocountywater.org</a>.</p>	<p>Efficient data reporting is next step.</p>
<p>The County should provide additional staffing to ensure the data are current, consistent in format, to provide assistance in the collection of data, and to document data collection and maintenance procedures.</p>	<p>Stations have been upgraded to collect data electronically. Upgrades to the rain gauges will be completed after the 05/06 water year.</p>	<p>Evaluation of staffing is done on an annual basis as part of budgets.</p>
<p><b><i>MWP Phase 2 Implementation</i></b></p>		
<p>Develop and implement a Public Participation Plan to inform and educate the public about the MWP Phase 1 product, and to solicit comments.</p>	<p>Work continues with the WRAC and other stakeholders in reviewing the MWP.</p>	<p>“Phase 2” is no longer anticipated. Instead, the efforts to prepare the new MWP are underway. Public Participation is ongoing, but formal education and outreach on a sub-regional basis will need to be developed.</p>
<p>Prioritize the WPAs and identify and activate stakeholder groups.</p>	<p>WPAs have not been specifically prioritized, but the IRWM does prioritize specific regional projects and planning needs.</p>	<p>Discuss appropriateness of prioritizing the WPAs with WRAC as part of education and outreach identified above.</p>

L:\UTILITY\APR06\WRAC Master Plan Recommendation table 3-1-06.doc