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, January 10, 2007
1:30 p.m.

1. **Introductions and determination of a quorum**

2. **Approval of December meeting minutes**

3. **Public Comment**

4. **Member Reports**

5. **Ongoing Updates:**

   a. Groundwater Banking Sub-Committee - Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Feasibility Study: The consulting team addressed comments on the Preliminary Engineering Technical Memorandum at the January 4, 2007 meeting. The next meeting is scheduled for March 1, 2007, 5:00 to 6:30 pm, Templeton CSD, 420 Crocker Street – discuss the initial alternatives and screening criteria.

   b. Membership and By-Laws Update – **Membership Applications/Agency Nominations Due 1/5/07**

   c. SLO County Ocean Disposal Alternative/Central Valley Selenium Project Update

   d. Santa Margarita Ranch EIR – To be released for public comment on January 11, 2007

6. **Central Coast Water Authority Executive Board Membership Evaluation Subcommittee – Identify Participants**

7. **Consider recommending that the Board of Supervisors recommend to the State Water Resources Control Board that videotaping of the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board meetings be included in its annual budget**

8. **Appointment of WRAC Liaison(s) to the Transferable Development Credit (TDC) Blue Ribbon Committee**

9. **Los Osos Resource Capacity Study**

10. **Countywide Master Water Plan Discussion Topic – Outline and Identification of Resources**

11. **Election of 2007 WRAC Officers**

12. **Future Agenda Items**

--- Adjourn by 3:00 PM; 3:30PM at the latest ---

Next Meeting: **February 7, 2007 1:30 pm County Government Center Rooms 161/162**
1055 Monterey Street, San Luis Obispo

Visit Water Resources on the Web at*:* ***www.slocountywater.org***

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
December 6, 2006

Approximately 1:32 pm; Chairman Winn called the meeting to Order.

1) Introductions of Members and Attendees – Quorum Established

2) Approval of November 2006 Meeting Minutes – Upon motion by Member Mulholland, second by Member Allen, and vocal vote, minutes of the November 1, 2006, meeting of the Water Resource Advisory Committee (WRAC) were approved as submitted.

3) Public Comment – Members Bianchi and Allen inform the WRAC that best management practices to control coliform discharges from ranching and grazing operations are being considered by the State Water Resources Control Board and discuss the role of the packaging process as a source for contamination. Member Greening points out that the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) meetings are not videotaped and suggests agendizing the topic at a WRAC meeting to make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. Member Eby speaks to the Santa Maria/Nipomo Supplemental Water Pipeline Project and its increased project cost estimate, and plans to reassess all options for supplemental water projects for Nipomo. Discussion ensues regarding the San Luis Obispo County Coastal Disposal Option for the Central Valley drainage problem, including continued concern whether the County will be ready to act if the alternative is selected, the validity of the EIR cost estimate, an article in the Sacramento Bee on November 30th, closed-door litigation meetings versus possible public meetings, and the court-ordered deadline of February 17th for the Bureau of Reclamation to implement a solution. Chairman Winn informs the WRAC of a December 12, 2006, scoping meeting for the Oso Flaco Lake EIR for improving its water quality and the availability of information on the RWQCB website. Chairman Winn announces that the Nipomo CSD has hired SAIC to hydraulically monitor the Nipomo Mesa, speaks to the progress of developing the Nipomo Mesa Management Authority, and encourages budgeting additional monitoring locations on the Mesa as part of the County program.

4) Ongoing Updates

    a. Groundwater Banking Subcommittee: Courtney Howard, SLO County Public Works, informs the WRAC that the Preliminary Engineering Technical Memorandum has been distributed to the Subcommittee for review and comment, the next Subcommittee meeting is scheduled for December 7, 2006, from 5:00 to 6:30 pm at the Templeton Community Services District, comments are due to her on December 15, 2006, and the consultant will address the comments at the January 4, 2007, Subcommittee meeting. The deliverables, public comment form and other project information are available on the internet under the Integrated Regional Water Management Plan icon at

www.slocountywater.org for those not able to participate at the Subcommittee meetings.

5) Membership and By-Laws Update – Chairman Winn speaks to the need to update the official membership list and Courtney Howard, SLO County Public Works, summarizes the approach to updating the membership list, including advertising for vacancies for San Luis Obispo City Alternate Member, Arroyo Grande Member and Alternate, Agriculture-at-Large Alternate, and Environmental-at-Large and Group Alternate Members. Chairman Winn speaks to the proposed updates to the WRAC By-Laws, including updating the name of Golden State Water Company, replacing "should" with "shall" in Article II.4, changing "chairman" to "chairperson", assignment of the secretary by the Public Works Director, and the addition of a provision requiring annual member reports. Discussion ensues on how to ensure that the assigned County Staff person wouldn't be a different person each meeting. **Member Greening moves to recommend that the Board of Supervisors approve the revised By-Laws as recommended, adding that the Public Works Director "annually" assign the secretary, and the motion is seconded by Member Mulholland. The motion passes unanimously.** Discussion ensues regarding the method for incorporating annual member reports into the WRAC meetings, with consensus to keep the reports short and informal.

6) Resource Management System – Review of Draft 2006 Annual Resource Summary Report (ARSR) – James Caruso, SLO County Planning Department, speaks to the schedule for completing the RMS and that it will be presented to the Board of Supervisors on January 23rd, 2007. Discussion ensues on the Water Systems section with the following highlights:
   - Continuing Level of Severity (LOS) III recommendation for Cambria CSD.
   - Impact of Santa Margarita Ranch development and its EIR on Santa Margarita's and Garden Farms' systems is discussed; Member Greening requests that the EIR be made available to the WRAC and agendized in February 2007 for discussion.
   - The reason for not including the Black Lake Standpipe Project in the Nipomo section is discussed.
   - Continuing LOS III in San Simeon.
   - Discussion on water system management strategies being applied in Los Osos and their inclusion in the Water Supply section. The Los Osos Resource Capacity Study is scheduled to go to the Board of Supervisors in March 2007, and will be agendized for the January WRAC meeting.
   - Annual growth rate and population numbers in the LAFCO Sphere of Influence Report and quoted at recent community meetings are not consistent with numbers in the Templeton section; conservation in rural areas and the impact of solar power on water use needs to be addressed.

   Discussion ensues on the Water Supply section with the following highlights:
   - Potential to apply levels of severity to specific areas in a groundwater basin is questioned, i.e. recommending a LOS III in the Highway 46 East portion of the basin as identified in Figure 34 of the 2002 Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Study. Discussion ensues on the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin's status and current cooperative efforts.

- **Member Allen moves that the area east of Paso Robles identified in the 2002 Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Study by Fugro as having declining groundwater levels be recommended for a LOS III, and the motion is seconded by Member Mulholland.** Discussion ensues on how specifically the area can be defined and whether or not to include water quality in the motion. **The motion is approved as stated, by a vote of 11-0, with one abstention.**
- Water quality deterioration in the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin is discussed, including the need for a map and additional data for determining the location and LOS of deteriorated water quality. Member Greening moves to indicate a concern raised by the water quality statements indicating problems and the lack of information to support a recommendation of no LOS, but upon further discussion the motion is not seconded. **Member O'Grady moves to recommend amending the first recommended action for the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin by adding that a map be developed with sufficient water quality data to make a recommendation on the LOS for water quality in the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin. The motion is seconded by Member Greening, and passes unanimously by vocal vote.**
- Gary Henderson, SLO City staff, points out that Morro Bay is not participating in the Nacimiento Water Project.
- The current certified LOS for the Nipomo Mesa portion of the Santa Maria Groundwater Basin is questioned; County Planning staff will clarify the LOS with the Board of Supervisors when the 2006 ARSR goes for approval in January. Member Eby provides specific language regarding supplemental water supply for the Nipomo Mesa to County staff for incorporation into the Santa Maria Groundwater Basin section.
- Including a discussion of the water quality in the Los Osos Valley Groundwater Basin is discussed including which water quality parameters to include, and possibly waiting to incorporate language next year, after the Resource Capacity Study is completed.
- Cleath Reports on the Los Osos Valley Groundwater Basin will be quoted and referenced rather than the Department of Water Resources and US Geological Study reports with regard to seawater intrusion.
- Member Mulholland clarifies language regarding the San Luis Obispo City Council and its decision to set the reliability reserve level to zero, as well as other grammatical changes, in the San Luis Obispo Creek Groundwater Basin section.

Member Mulholland moves to recommend that the Board of Supervisors adopt the 2006 ARSR with WRAC comments and recommendations incorporated as discussed. The motion is seconded by Member Allen and approved unanimously.

7) Countywide Master Water Plan Discussion Topic – Outline and Identification of Resources – Item deferred.

8) Consideration of Forming a Subcommittee to Evaluate District's Membership on the Central Coast Water Authority Executive Board – Chairman Winn speaks to forming a subcommittee and a brief discussion ensues regarding balancing participation on the

subcommittee between North and South County members and current State Water Subcontractors. Member Mulholland moves to form a subcommittee and meet to evaluate the District's membership on the Central Coast Water Authority Executive Board. The motion is seconded by Member Allen and approved unanimously.

9) Date of Next WRAC Meeting – Consensus is reached to move the WRAC meeting from January 3rd, 2007 to January 10th, 2007.

10) Future Agenda Items – No discussion.

Meeting adjourned approx. 3:30 pm

WATER RESOURCES ADVISORY COMMITTEE 2006

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

M= Member; A= Alternate; 0 = No appointment received as of 10/13/06

* Arroyo Grande membership changes have not yet been approved by the Board of Supervisors

** Indicates special workshop

TO: **Water Resources Advisory Committee**

FROM: **James Caruso, Senior Planner**

DATE: **January 10, 2007**

SUBJECT: **Agenda Item #9: Los Osos Resource Capacity Study**

1. Introduction

A Resource Capacity Study (RCS) for Los Osos water supply was ordered by the Board of Supervisors in December 2005. The Board unanimously set a Level of Severity III for water supply and directed that a Resource Capacity Study be prepared.

The county's Resource Management System (RMS) is a mechanism for ensuring a balance between land development and the resources necessary to sustain such development. When a resource deficiency becomes apparent, efforts are made to determine how the resource capacity might be expanded, whether conservation measures could be introduced to extend the availability of unused capacity, or whether development should be limited or redirected to areas with remaining resource capacity. The RMS is designed to avoid adverse impacts from depletion of a resource.

The RMS describes a resource in terms of its "level of severity", based on the rate of depletion and an estimate of the remaining capacity, if any. In response to a staff recommended level of severity, the Board of Supervisors may direct that a Resource Capacity Study (RCS) be conducted to provide additional details which would allow the Board to certify a level of severity and adopt whatever measures are needed to eliminate or reduce the potential for undesirable consequences.

This RCS is based chiefly on two studies conducted for the Los Osos Community Services District (LOCSD). These two studies are:

> Water Management Plan for the Los Osos Valley Ground Water Basin, Cleath; July 2005; and
>
> Sea Water Intrusion Assessment and Lower Aquifer Source Investigation, Cleath and Associates; October 2005.

2. Safe Yield

Safe yield is the amount of naturally occurring ground water that can be withdrawn from an aquifer on a sustained basis, economically and legally, without impairing the native ground-water quality or creating an undesirable effect such as environmental damage (C. W. Fetter, Applied Hydrogeology, Third Edition, 1994). "Undesirable effects" frequently cited as consequences of exceeding safe yield include:

> Reductions in streamflow; reductions in lake levels
> Drying of wetlands
> Subsidence of the land surface

Degradation of water quality
In coastal locations, seawater intrusion into the aquifer's fresh water in storage
Lowering water levels leading to increase in pumping cost.

3. Past and Recent Studies

There have been several studies focused on Los Osos Valley ground water issues such as safe yield and sea water intrusion:

1. Brown and Caldwell (1974): Safe yield at 1300-1800 acre feet year (AFY). This is questioned in Cleath; July 2005 where the 1800 AFY is said to be consumptive use and not gross water production. The correct number, according to Cleath, should be closer to 3750 AFY.

2. Dept of Water Resources (1989): The DWR report determined a safe yield of 2200 AFY thru the use of a USGS model. Cleath adjusts this number to 3140 AFY.

3. URS Corporation (2000): Uses 3150 AFY as safe yield. URS used an updated USGS model.

4. Cleath and Associates (2002): Cleath used multiple methods to estimate safe yield at 3560 AFY in the LOCSD Master Water Plan.

5. Cleath and Associates (2005): This newer Cleath report includes a discussion of sea water intrusion. This issue has caused Cleath to reduce safe yield estimates to 3250 AFY to keep sea water intrusion at bay.

The studies have established a safe yield from each of the sub-groundwater sources. The safe yield (3250 AFY) used in the latest report for the CSD (Cleath and Associates July 2005) will be used in this RCS.

Table 1
Safe Yield Estimate

Storage Area	**Current Conditions**	
	LOCSD Master Plan	2005 Water Management Plan
Upper Aquifer	**1150**	**1150**
Lower Aquifer	**1610**	**1300**
Creek Valley	**800**	**800**
TOTALS	**3560**	**3250**

As noted in the table, the safe yield from the lower aquifer was reduced from 1610 AFY to 1300 AFY as a result of the sea water intrusion assessment. The reduction of 310 AFY is needed to address sea water intrusion in the lower aquifer.

The July 2005 Cleath and Associates Water Management Plan determined that the basin is already in an overdraft situation. The safe yield is reported at 3250 AFY and the current production is estimated at 3400 AFY.

4. Estimate of Projected Growth

Projected growth rates in the Los Osos Valley have been derived in the Estero Area Plan. There are similar figures used in the LOCSD's Water Management Plan. The figures are 19,713 persons (Estero update) and 19,692 persons (LOCSD Water Management Plan). The numbers are not dissimilar enough to make a difference in the current analysis.

However, these build out figures are from the recently prepared Estero Area Plan update. The update for the Los Osos area has now been taken off the table by the County and the previous plan is being put back into place. The build out for the previous plan, now back in operation, is 28,000 persons. This 9000 person increase will exacerbate the overdraft and sea water intrusion problems in the basin.

5. Overdraft

According to Table 1 the current safe yield of the basin is 3250 AFY. According to Cleath (October 2005) total pumpage from the basin is approximately 3400 AFY. This figure means that the basin is in overdraft at least 150 AFY. Table 2 shows purveyor pumping from 1985 to 2001:

Table 2
Ground Water Production
1985-2001

Aquifer Zone	Purveyors			Private Domestic	Agricultural Irrigation*	1985-2001 average	2001 prod.
	Golden State	LOCSD	S&T				
A, B	0	0	0	40	0	40	40
C, alluvium	250	230	50	120	330	980	810
D	820	630	60	40	400	1950	2170
E	0	280	0	0	220	500	380
Total	1070	1140	110	200	950	3470	3400

The sea water intrusion assessment (October 2005) reached the following conclusions:

1. The upper aquifer fresh water / sea water interface is relatively stable beneath the Morro Bay sand spit, with a potential for active intrusion during extended drought periods.

2. Sea water intrusion in lower aquifer Zone D has advanced at an average rate of 60 feet per year between 1985 and 2005, and is currently between Pecho Road and Doris Avenue.

3. Sea water intrusion in lower aquifer Zone E has advanced at an average rate of 54 feet per year between 1977 and 2005, and is currently between Broderson Avenue and Palisades Avenue.

Conclusions of the lower aquifer source investigation are as follows:

1. Lower aquifer production west of the Los Osos Creek valley is currently close to 600 acre-feet per year more than the average fresh water inflow. This is confirmed by the evidence of sea water intrusion. The Los Osos Valley ground water basin is currently in an overdraft condition.

2. The upper aquifer is the primary source of fresh water recharge to the lower aquifer, particularly on the west side of the basin. Plans originally developed during the 1980's for treated effluent disposal at higher elevations on the west side of the basin provide a reasonable potential for incidental recharge to the lower aquifer. Nitrates and other conservative constituents of basin return flows present in the upper aquifer will ultimately reach the lower aquifer.

3. Lower aquifer recharge from the southern end of the Los Osos Creek valley into the main basin area where community purveyors operate is restricted by faulting. Artificial recharge projects in the uppermost creek valley would not directly benefit the main basin area, and would require careful positioning of recovery wells with respect to local faulting.

6. Study Recommendations

The recommendations from the October 2005 Cleath Study state:

> "The information gained through this project provides a better understanding of the dynamics of sea water intrusion and lower aquifer recharge in the Los Osos Valley ground water basin. These two issues are critical to the future management of water resources. Sea water intrusion is threatening the lower aquifer, which is the primary water supply for the community. Based on the findings and conclusions of this project, it is recommended that:
>
> 1. Lower aquifer ground water production be reduced to a level which does not exceed the average annual fresh water recharge to the aquifer. Reductions should be focused primarily on the west side of the basin, where active intrusion is occurring.
>
> 2. A basin ground water management plan be configured to mitigate sea water intrusion as a top priority, such as outlined in the July 2005 Draft Water Management Plan for the Los Osos Valley Ground Water Basin (Cleath & Associates). This plan contains a phased approach to basin management, whereby increased utilization of the upper aquifer for ground water supply allows lower aquifer recovery from the excessive draft currently being placed upon it.
>
> 3. A sea water intrusion monitoring program be implemented to provide information on the future movement of sea water and the success of mitigation measures. The recommended monitoring program is included in Part 2 of this document.

7. Recent Actions

Water purveyors have responded to this information through changes to lower aquifer utilization. A May 2006 memorandum from Cleath and Associates to Warren Morgan of Golden State Water Co states:

> "Changes in well production by GSWC over the last several years have significantly reduced the amount of sea water intrusion into the lower aquifer Zone D (from 199 AFY to 137 AFY)."

These recent studies were prepared with a particular wastewater collection and disposal system approved. This allowed assumptions to be used that included effluent return flows to the basin. There is no longer an approved project being pursued, so no conclusion can be reached regarding the future wastewater project's effect on water supply.

8. Recommended Actions

As the Los Osos groundwater basin is already in overdraft and sea water intrusion continues, strong action is needed to stabilize the situation. Generally, recommended actions may increase supply, extend capacity or conserve the resource.

The first series of recommendations of this RCS reiterates the recommendations of the Cleath report (October 2005).

1. Lower aquifer ground water production be reduced to a level which does not exceed the average annual fresh water recharge to the aquifer. Reductions should be focused primarily on the west side of the basin, where active intrusion is occurring.

2. A basin ground water management plan be configured to mitigate sea water intrusion as a top priority, such as outlined in the July 2005 Draft Water Management Plan for the Los Osos Valley Ground Water Basin (Cleath & Associates). This plan contains a phased approach to basin management, whereby increased utilization of the upper aquifer for ground water supply allows lower aquifer recovery from the excessive draft currently being placed upon it.

3. A sea water intrusion monitoring program be implemented to provide information on the future movement of sea water and the success of mitigation measures. The recommended monitoring program is included in Part 2 of this document.

The second series of recommendations are meant to address overdraft:

4. The water purveyors utilizing the basin should pursue a supplemental water source. The information presented in the studies cited in this RCS all indicate serious water balance issue. The higher and lower population projections used in recent reports points to the need for supplemental water.

5. A retrofit program should be established for all new construction and interior remodels. As the basin is already in overdraft and sea water intrusion is occurring, strong water conservation measures for new development should be implemented.

6. Strong conservation measures should be implemented by water purveyors for existing customers and new construction including limited use of outdoor water, retrofit programs and tiered billing rates.

7. Prohibit subdivisions that increase the net use of groundwater.

8. Future wastewater treatment systems should consider using effluent to recharge the basin or used to offset groundwater pumping through water reclamation projects.

The staff recommendation to the Board will be to certify the Level of Severity to Level III and to implement these recommendations. Many of the recommended actions would be the responsibility of the water purveyors and others will be the responsibility of the County. The RCS report to the Board will divide those responsibilities.

TO: **Water Resources Advisory Committee**

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

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

DATE: **January 10, 2007**

SUBJECT: **Agenda Item #10: Countywide Master Water Plan Discussion Topic – Outline and Identification of Resources**

Recommendation

Review and discuss the Master Water Plan outline and identified resources.

Discussion

Please find attached an outline of the Master Water Plan (MWP). The MWP will address all of the water resources in the County, including those not directly under County jurisdiction. The intention is to provide a snapshot of the water resources picture in the County now and into the future, cross check for consistency in planning documents and water-related projects, and to recommend regional and/or sub-regional strategies for proper and prudent management of water resources.

Also attached is an inventory of resources necessary for completing the MWP, which includes a description of its relationship to the MWP. A regular and acceptable mechanism for collecting the resources will need to be coordinated with the owners of the resources. Information and documents currently needed are 2005 Urban Water Management Plans, current water system master plans, General Plan updates, water supply cost information and discharge permits.

Consideration of Staff, Consultant, Budget and Schedule Implications

In order to create a functional, usable, and worthwhile MWP, it is important to develop the resources in-house for ownership and upkeep. An in-house process will be developed, and to a certain extent currently exists, for collecting and analyzing the data necessary for upkeep and use of the document. Communication and coordination between County departments will also be facilitated by working on the MWP in-house. In-house staff has been assigned to completing the MWP and there may be opportunities for additional staff from outside departments to participate and provide supportive work efforts in the areas of mapping and regional planning. Therefore, consultants hired will be utilized for specific purposes, such as when insufficient resources and expertise exist in-house. This approach will also allow the County to select consultants individually based on their expertise rather than relying on a lead consultant to select an appropriate team.

The budget needed to complete the MWP is currently being developed, and will be presented to the WRAC at an upcoming meeting. The MWP is a high priority for the Board and the Public Works Department, and our goal is to complete the MWP congruous with the Conservation Element.