

**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, March 5, 2008  
1:30 p.m.

---

1. **Introductions and Determination of a Quorum**
2. **Approval of February meeting minutes**
3. **Public Comment**
4. **Member Report – John Kellerman, California Men’s Colony**
5. **Santa Margarita Ranch Revised Draft EIR**
6. **Conservation Element**
7. **Ongoing Updates:**
  - a. **Rainfall and Reservoir Report**
  - b. **State Water**

8. **Future Agenda Items**

*--- Adjourn by 3:00 pm ---*

**Next Meeting:      April 2, 2008 1:30 pm City/County Library Community Room  
                                 995 Palm Street, San Luis Obispo**

**Visit Water Resources on the Web at: [www.slocountywater.org](http://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 March, 6, 2007*

SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL  
AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT  
WATER RESOURCES ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Meeting Minutes  
February 6, 2008

---

Approximately 1:35 pm; Chairman Winn called the meeting to Order

- 1) Introductions of Members and Attendees – Quorum Established
- 2) Approval of January 2008 Meeting Minutes – The January 9, 2008, WRAC meeting minutes were approved upon a first by Member Buel, second by member Garfinkel, no emendations, and a unanimous vote.
- 3) Public Comment – David Blakely provides the WRAC Subcommittee to review the Santa Margarita Ranch Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report (RDEIR) with a list of agencies to involve in its review of the RDEIR and suggests that Planning Department staff also reach out to these agencies. John Snyder provides an update on the Santa Maria Groundwater Basin litigation and the final judgment, and discussion ensues regarding the definition of participants, how the technical group will consider issues and/or analyses and present results and/or decisions, and the Judge’s acknowledgement versus direction regarding those results and/or decisions. Member Sinton offers a copy of the revised Affordable Housing Ordinance to a WRAC member, with Member Winholtz accepting. Chairperson Winn discusses the process for revising the conservation ordinances for Nipomo. Alternate Member Bianchi requests that his input on the Data Enhancement Plan be posted to the WRAC website for review and comment.
- 4) Member Report – Linda Chipping, Coastal San Luis Resource Conservation District (RCD), provides the WRAC with a brief history of the RCD, the extent of its region, and its main goals in helping to control soil erosion, conserve agricultural soils, protect water quality and protect sensitive habitats and ecosystems. Member Chipping provides examples of implemented projects that demonstrate partnerships and best management practices. Discussion ensues regarding responsibility for ongoing maintenance; RCD funding, staffing and budget; terms of cooperation on projects; irrigation products and permitting challenges.
- 5) Assignment of Secretary/Secretary’s Report – Courtney Howard, SLO County Public Works, informs the WRAC that the Public Works Director has assigned her as the WRAC secretary for 2008. A list of agencies that will be contacted regarding their attendance in 2007 is provided and CMC offers to provide the March Member Report.
- 6) 2008 WRAC Goals and Discussion Topics – Discussion ensues regarding the general concurrence with the goals presented in the staff report, moving the Data Enhancement Plan goals next to the Ongoing Data Collection goals, and the need and approach to addressing environmental water demand.

- 7) Conflicting Water Resources-Technical Expert Findings Discussion – Alternate Member David Chipping presents his concerns with the decision of the Board of Supervisors to approve a project and the existence of conflicting testimony from technical experts. Discussion ensues regarding the use of a 3<sup>rd</sup> party to make a recommendation regarding the evidence and/or project, the role of arbitration, and the reliability of consultants. WRAC members express interest in learning about the Planning Department’s environmental review process.
  
- 8) State Water Reliability Contract – Courtney Howard, SLO County Public Works, summarizes the status of executing the State Water Reliability Program Agreements and the State Department of Water Resources’ (DWR) recent indication that an annual program does not comply with Article 56(d)(2) of the State Water Project Contracts, which requires annual transfers of allocation to go through the State’s turnback pool. This assertion conflicts with previous County and CCWA staff discussions with DWR regarding contract language that releases DWR from liability beyond Polonio Pass. The WRAC Subcommittee agrees to meet with County staff to discuss the modification of the Contract to a two-year agreement while County staff concurrently considers an appropriate response to DWR’s comments.
  
- 9) Ongoing Updates
  - a. Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) – Courtney Howard, SLO County Public Works, mentions that the County successfully submitted the Step 2 application on January 28, 2008. Staff will be requesting participation in updating the IRWM Plan when Proposition 84 guidelines are available, and will continue coordinating with other regions on the central coast.
  - b. State Water – Central Coast Water Authority Liaison Report - Courtney Howard, County Public Works, attended the January CCWA meeting in Member Buel's absence, and informs the WRAC that CCWA’s Board authorized their General Manager to execute the Water Supply Reliability Agreement. Central Coast Water Supply Reliability Agreements – This item was discussed under Agenda Item #8.
  - c. Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Resource Capacity Study – Brief discussion.
  - d. Conservation Ordinances for Los Osos and Nipomo – At the January 15, 2008, Board of Supervisors meeting, Board members decided to continue discussion on these items during a hearing to be scheduled for the March 18, 2008, Board of Supervisors meeting.
  - e. 2007 Annual Resource Summary Report – The Board of Supervisors approved the Report at their January 15, 2008, meeting.
  
- 10) Future Agenda Items – Transfer of Development Credit update, Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems (OWTS) update, Conservation Element

Meeting adjourned approximately 3:30 pm

**WATER RESOURCES ADVISORY COMMITTEE 2008**

Organization	Representative		Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Cambria CSD	Bryan Bode	M											
	Jim Adams	A											
	Bob Gresens	Staff	X										
Heritage Ranch CSD	John D'Ornellas	M	X										
	Debbie Fransen	A											
Los Osos CSD	Steve Senet*	M/NA	X	X									
	John Schempf*	NM	X										
	George Milanes	Staff	X										
	Margret Falkner	Staff											
Nipomo CSD	Bruce Buel	M	X	X									
	Ed Eby	A	X	X									
Oceano CSD	Patrick O'Reilly	NM	X										
	Phil Davis	NA											
Templeton CSD	William Van Orden	M											
	Laurie Ion	A											
City of Arroyo Grande	Chuck Fellows	M		X									
	Jim Guthrie	A											
City of Atascadero	George Luna	M											
	Wade McKinney	A											
City of Grover Beach	Chuck Ashton	M		X									
	Bill Nicolls	A											
City of Morro Bay	Betty Winholtz	M	X	X									
	Bill Boucher	A											
City of Paso Robles	Douglas Monn	M											
	0	A											
City of Pismo Beach	Kris Vardas	M											
	Dennis Delzeit	A	X	X									
City of San Luis Obispo	Christine Mulholland	M	X	X									
	Alan Settle*	A											
	Ron Munds	Staff											
	Gary Henderson	Staff	X	X									
District 1	Steve Sinton	M	X	X									
District 2	Bill Garfinkel	M	X	X									
District 3	Marilee Hyman	M	X	X									
District 4	Michael Winn	M	X	X									
District 5	Dan O'Grady	M	X	X									
Ca Mens Colony	John Kellerman	M	X	X									
	Gerald Elwood	A											
Camp SLO	Chris Long	M											
	0	A											
Cuesta College	Edralin Maduli	M											
	Terry Reece	A											
Atascadero Mutual	Ken Weathers	M											
	John Neil	A											
	Jaime Lien	Staff											
Golden State Water	Henric Szopinski	M											
	Warren Morgan	A											
Agriculture at Large	Ray Allen	M	X	X									
	Mike Broadhurst	A	X										
County Farm Bureau	Joy Fitzhugh	M	X	X									
	Jackie Crabb	A											
Environmental at Large	Sue Luft	M	X	X									
	Eric Greening	M	X	X									
	David Chipping	A	X	X									
	Sue Harvey	A											
Coastal San Luis RCD	Linda Chipping	M	X	X									
	Kathie Matsuyama	A											
Upper Salinas RCD	Tom Mora	M											
	Bill Bianchi	A	X	X									
Public Works Staff	Courtney Howard	Staff	X	X									
	Paavo Ogren	Staff		X									
	Mark Hutchinson	Staff											
	Sylas Cranor	Staff	X	X									
Planning Staff	James Caruso	Staff											
	Jeff Oliveria	Staff											
Env. Health Staff	Laurie Salo	Staff											
	Leslie Terry	Staff	X										
	Megan Lillich	Staff	X										
Ag. Com. Staff	Michael Isensee	Staff	X	X									

M= Member; A= Alternate; NM=New Member NA= New Alternate 0 = No nomination received as of 1/30/08

\* New Membership to be confirmed at BOS Meeting

\*\*No Meeting Scheduled



March 5, 2008

Ms. Martha Miller, Project Manager  
County of San Luis Obispo  
Planning and Building Department  
976 Osos Street, Rm. 300  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408-2040

Subject:

Water Resources Advisory Committee Comments on the Water Sections of the Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report for Santa Margarita Ranch Agricultural Residential Cluster Subdivision Project and Future Development Program

Dear Ms. Miller,

The San Luis Obispo County Water Resources Advisory Committee (WRAC) formed an ad hoc subcommittee to review and comment on the Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report (RDEIR) for Santa Margarita Ranch Agricultural Residential Cluster Subdivision Project and Future Development Program. At its March 5, 2008 meeting, the WRAC voted to submit the attached comments.

It is apparent from these comments that the WRAC has serious concerns about the impacts of the subject project on the water issues under our purview. The WRAC also believes the attached comments demonstrate that the RDEIR is seriously deficient because it contains numerous, serious, and substantial errors, omissions, and inconsistencies that hamper meaningful public comment. Accordingly, the WRAC believes CEQA requires recirculation of another updated RDEIR for public comment.

Note that the RDEIR does not address comments made on the DEIR including those comments made by the WRAC in our April 4, 2007 letter to Mr. Caruso (EIR Manager at the time). Therefore, that letter and attached comments remain pertinent and valid and must be addressed.

While it is not yet the appropriate time for the WRAC to advise County Supervisors of our opinions and recommendations with respect to the Final EIR, the WRAC believes it is important to communicate the WRAC's responses to the RDEIR to you and to the Supervisors.

The WRAC hopes its comments will prove helpful to all parties involved in the environmental review process on this project.

Respectfully,

Michael Winn  
Chairman, Water Resources Advisory Committee

Cc: County Supervisors, w/attachments

Attachment: Comments on RDEIR from WRAC ad hoc Subcommittee

## COMMENTS ON REVISED DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

By  
WATER RESOURCES ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE FOR SANTA MARGARITA RANCH

March 5, 2008

**1. SCOPE OF RDEIR:** P. 1-2 of the RDEIR states that CEQA requires recirculation of an EIR whenever significant new information is added before certification.

“Information” can include changes in the project or environmental setting as well as additional data or other information. The RDEIR addresses new information submitted by the applicant, but does not respond to any comments submitted on the DEIR including the WRAC’s comments. This approach seems arbitrary, seems designed to limit the scope of the recirculation, and creates a perception of bias. The RDEIR should have addressed those comments that provided significant new information as required by CEQA.

**2. NECESSITY FOR RESOURCE CAPACITY STUDY:** County Supervisors have approved the preparation of a Resource Capacity Study for the Santa Margarita area. Such a study will yield reliable baseline information about water usage, well levels, stream conditions, and biological conditions in the area. This baseline documentation is particularly important to determining the severity of the Class I, significant and unavoidable environmental impacts of the proposed project. In fact, another RDEIR must be recirculated for comment when the Resource Capacity Study is completed and before a final EIR is prepared.

**3. BASELINE DATA:** The RDEIR does not contain reliable baseline data as required by CEQA. The RDEIR (Table 4.14-1), for example, **estimates** existing water demands instead of providing actual **measured** water usage. The RDEIR does not provide necessary information about the existing extensive installed water distribution system on the ranch which would yield more reliable data on how much water is extracted, where it is extracted from, and where it goes. Specifically, detailed drawings showing existing water distribution system piping, routing, pipe sizes, all connections to wells and pumps, rated pump gallons per minute, head, motor horsepower, electricity consumption, propane consumption, and irrigated areas served are requested. Also complete records for all wells including dry season well depths, observed changes in stream flows, and pumping and recharge rates during drought periods are requested. Installation of flow meters and other monitoring devices by the applicant may well be required in order to obtain baseline data (this was previously requested by the WRAC). Understanding the impacts of **existing** ranch operations on the water environment is a necessary first step to determining the impacts of the proposed project. This is a major omission by the RDEIR. There is also concern that the ranch may be extracting water from the underflow of creeks and already impacting the riparian environment. The potential for underflow extraction by the proposed project must be quantitatively addressed.

**4. FUTURE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM:** Table 4.14-1 is not consistent with the narrative in either terminology or numbers. The narrative refers to “Future Development Program” but this does not appear in the Table. The table lists “Planned Orchards and Planned Vineyards” but this language does not appear in the narrative. The numbers for vineyard acreage in the Table do not match the narrative. For example, on p. 2-110 of the RDEIR, a 2000 acre vineyard expansion is mentioned, but the Table indicates planned vineyards of 1026.1 acres; p. 2-110 indicates some water usage for the Residential Cluster and the Future Development Program, but the Table does not indicate any. Several major components of Tract 2586 are missing from the Table including two wineries, a farm/ranch headquarters, a bed and breakfast, and farm worker housing. The Table also omits some of the components of the Future Development Program described on p.1-1. The Table does not show the 1466.17 ac-ft of water demand from Table 4.14-2 in the DEIR for the Future Development Program. Where are the “Planned Orchards” to be located, what type of orchards are they, and how does this correlate with the indicated water demand? This information is required by CEQA. Since there is no commitment to retire “the 402 lots allowable under the Salinas River Plan,” the potential water demands of these lots, the golf course, etc. must be addressed as part of the cumulative impacts indicated in Table 4.14-2 of the original DEIR.

**5. TRACT 2586 SCOPE OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** P. 1-1 states that Tentative Tract 2586 is the Ag Residential Cluster Subdivision which includes 111 clustered homesites and one ranch headquarters. However, p. 2-33 of the DEIR states that Vesting Tract 2586 includes two wineries, two ranch/farm headquarters and several farm support buildings. Which is correct? How can the public be expected to comment sensibly on the RDEIR when there are conflicts in the descriptions of the basic scope of the project?

**6. ADDITIONAL RESIDENTIAL LOTS:** CEQA requires all possible project alternatives to be analyzed. However, the RDEIR omits analysis of 402 residential lots potentially allowable under the Salinas River Plan. The development rights to these lots must either be retired or potential project alternatives involving these lots must be analyzed in a recirculated RDEIR.

**7. NEW ALTERNATIVES:** The three new alternatives proposed for the Agricultural Residential Cluster Subdivision are not developed in sufficient detail to determine interrelationships with other proposed ranch development with respect to water and wastewater, or to make a reasonable comparison with other alternatives that are more fully developed. Table 3-1 purports to compare alternatives, but + and – signs are no substitute for hard data which is required by CEQA.

**8. COUNTY POLICIES:** P. 2-112 proposes an imported water supply to serve the Agricultural Residential Cluster Subdivision. P. 2-116 indicates that untreated imported water from Nacimiento or from the State Water Project would be used for agriculture to offset groundwater use for the Cluster. So, imported water really would not serve the Cluster. As correctly pointed out in the RDEIR, this violates both Ag Policy 11 and its provision that groundwater be used for agriculture not housing, and the County’s

Framework for Planning and its goal of maintaining a distinction between urban and rural development by not providing for rural uses from urban and village areas. The WRAC does not recommend deviating from these established county policies and is concerned that doing so would set an unfortunate precedent throughout the county.

**9. IMPORTED WATER PROPOSED AS MITIGATION:** The RDEIR does not prove the feasibility of proposed mitigation W-1(c) Imported Water as required by CEQA. So imported water cannot be considered a mitigation at this time. Monitoring has also been added as a proposed mitigation. However, while monitoring of the environment and related water usage is certainly critical and must be a condition of development, monitoring by itself cannot be considered a mitigation unless it is tied to specific thresholds where mitigating actions are initiated that increase water supply and/or decrease consumption and prevent environmental degradation.

**10. IMPACTS OF IMPORTED WATER PIPELINES:** Pp. 2-114 thru 2-118 cover alternative SWP and NWP connections and routing of piping to service the proposed project. The RDEIR just describes pipe routing and connection alternatives but does not analyze the environmental impacts in sufficient detail to determine the feasibility of the proposed alternatives as required by CEQA. Instead, the RDEIR states that separate EIR's would be done for the connections. This does not conform to CEQA which requires the feasibility of all possible project alternatives to be included in one project EIR. P. 2-112 attempts to incorporate EIR's and MND's from other projects associated with State water and Nacimiento water into the RDEIR for this proposed project. We question the validity of using old EIR's and MND's on later projects because environmental conditions and criteria change over time. Additionally, the Final EIR for the Nacimiento Pipeline, on p. 7-18, warns of the negative consequences of allowing the use of pipeline water to drive speculative development. Growth inducing impacts from the NWP on the rural Santa Margarita area could be significant because the potential availability of large amounts of imported water would make development much easier and more financially attractive while increasing pressure on governmental agencies to allow it.

**11. IMPORTED WATER PIPELINE CONSTRUCTION:** P. 2-117 states that pipelines require an 8-foot wide trench. Is this a construction excavation? Does this width include vegetative clearances and right-of-way easements?

**12. MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR IMPORTED WATER:** The RDEIR indicates ranch owners would be responsible for construction, operation, maintenance and monitoring of any service connection to SWP or NWP. Who are ranch owners? The original developers? Cluster home owners? Vineyard owners? Both? CEQA requires the EIR to demonstrate the feasibility of the proposed management and administration of mitigations and having in place this structure prior to construction. For example, how will the capital and operational needs be funded? This demonstration is missing from the RDEIR.

**13. FEASIBILITY OF IMPORTED WATER:** There is no discussion of the known difficulties or feasibility of obtaining the necessary quantities of State water and Nacimiento water and the reliability of those sources during periods of drought . This information is required by CEQA. Furthermore, the underground storage capacity and ability of the aquifer to meet water demands during prolonged drought conditions is unknown and not analyzed in the RDEIR. The Resource Capacity Study is needed to ascertain this information for analysis in a recirculated RDEIR.

**14. CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACTS:** P. 2-110 states that **average** annual rainfall and evaporation rates were used for the water demand calculations. P. 2-35 lists impacts on water from Global Climate Change. The core principles of CEQA require public agencies to address climate change, the impacts of which will clearly reduce water availability. Accordingly, the use of **worst-case** rates instead of **average** rates would more nearly account for the impacts of GCC.

**15. IMPACTS OF AQUIFER DRAWDOWN ON THE COMMUNITY:** P. 2-111 states that Margarita Farms is the only non-agricultural development **on the Ranch property** that draws from the same aquifer as the proposed project. This statement is misleading and beside the point because the community of Santa Margarita and other residences in the area draw water from the same aquifer. What are the impacts of the proposed project on users outside of the project boundaries like these users? This information is required by CEQA.

**16. CONSUMPTIVE USE AND RECHARGE:** The narrative about consumptive use on p. 2-112 fails to address the effect of the area's clay soil which reduces recharge to the aquifer. It also fails to account for the portion of the water use that flows to the Salinas and does not recharge the aquifer. A water balance calculation should be provided to show the whole picture and should include all of the possible uses described in the EIR. This information is required by CEQA.

**17. IMPACTS ON STREAM FLOWS AND TROUT:** The discussion of mitigations of impacts on steelhead trout on Pp. 2-74 thru 76 omits analysis of impacts on stream flows from the project's increased water usage. Also, there is no analysis of impacts from existing operations, and baseline data is missing. This information is required by CEQA. We note that NOAA recommends no decrease in stream flows. A possible mitigation could be the plugging of all existing wells that likely extract water from the underflows of streams that historically have supported steelhead populations.

**18. IMPACTS ON SEASONAL POOLS:** The existence and importance of Seasonal Pools are acknowledged on p. 2-50, but no mitigations of impacts are mentioned. This information is required by CEQA.

**19. IMPACTS ON OAKS:** The impacts of falling water tables on oak stands should be analyzed. This information is required by CEQA.

**20. AGENCY DOCUMENTATION:** Members of the public have asked the WRAC to request from the various water-related governing agencies any and all correspondence and documentation involving Santa Margarita Ranch water and water related environmental issues in order to help analyze proposed project impacts. Such documentation in the possession of or controlled by the applicant must be included and evaluated in a recirculated RDEIR.

**21. RECIRCULATE ANOTHER RDEIR:** In summary, the WRAC believes the above comments demonstrate that the RDEIR is seriously deficient because it contains numerous, serious and substantial errors, omissions, and inconsistencies that hamper meaningful public comment. Accordingly, the WRAC believes CEQA requires the recirculation of another updated RDEIR for public comment.

**TO: Water Resource Advisory Committee**

**FROM: James Caruso, Senior Planner**

**DATE: March 5, 2008**

**SUBJECT: Agenda Item #6: Conservation and Open Space Element (COSE)**

The four following water policy areas form the basis of the Water Conservation chapter of the COSE. Please review the policy statements that are provided for:

- Water Supply                      Water Quality
- Water Conservation              Water Management

The WRAC is requested to identify any “policy gaps” in these lists of proposed policy statements. Implementation programs will be developed for these policy areas. Implementation programs can also be suggested.

The Department will hold two open houses to get public input into the COSE. The Open Houses are scheduled for:

**Thursday, March 6, 2008, at Paso Robles City Council Chambers (3:00 – 8:00 p.m.)**  
**Thursday, March 13, 2008, at the South County Regional Center (3:00 – 8:00 p.m.)**

**1. Water Supply**

- a. Enhance water infiltration and encourage groundwater recharge.
- b. Designate watersheds, groundwater and aquifer recharge areas and natural drainage systems to protect when making land use decisions.
- c. Limit development on ridgelines and hillsides to minimize erosion and sedimentation of waterways.
- d. Mitigate water demand in new development through accurate assessments of impacts of new development on water.
- e. Protect water sources for water-dependant species and the continuity of riparian communities.
- f. Collect and assess groundwater condition data for all groundwater basins.
- m. Require groundwater studies prior to any land use change.
- n. The county shall not approve land use designation changes that result in the intensification of land uses in areas with severe water shortages until sustainable water supply solutions are identified.
- o. Encourage new groundwater recharge opportunities.

- p. Develop residential/domestic well permit standards that improve the data obtained from well permit applications on location, depth, yield, use, flow direction and water levels.
- q. Ensure sufficient groundwater quantity and quality for existing and proposed uses of subject wells during the well application process through standards for pump tests, well yields, pollutant levels and water storage.
- r. In areas with approved groundwater management plans, require all well permits to be consistent with the adopted plan.

## 2. **Water Quality**

- a. Encourage water pollution prevention programs.
- b. Reduce urban runoff from such sources as homes, golf courses, swimming pools and roadway maintenance.
- c. Identify and secure funding for development of groundwater quality assessments, monitoring, management and education in all groundwater basins.
- d. Encourage programs which provide education and technical assistance for agriculture in prevention of soil erosion and sediment control, including on-site retention of stormwater and conservation of natural drainage courses.
- e. Partner with CC RWQCB, CDFG, RCDs and local agencies to implement water quality restoration and remediation programs or projects in areas where water quality is impaired.
- f. Actively pursue the abatement of failing septic systems that are a health and safety hazard. Prohibit septic systems in areas where impairment of groundwater quality would take place.
- g. Assess risk of seawater intrusion in all groundwater management plans.

## 3. **Water Conservation**

- a. Conserve water through use of efficient technologies, design and management practices, and other conservation efforts in new and renovated commercial and residential development projects.
- b. Work with wastewater generators to implement programs for reuse of treated wastewater, particularly in landscaping, irrigation, parks, and public facilities.
- c. Work with domestic water system operators and public water purveyors to implement programs to eliminate water loss due to leakage in pipes, ditches or other conveyance facilities.

- d. Assess water use by County buildings and facilities and reduce water consumption to the maximum extent possible.
- e. Where consistent with water quality regulations, encourage greywater systems, roof catchments of rainwater and other re-use methods in public facilities and private developments.

#### 4. **Water Resource Management**

- a. Encourage the study of long-term changes in climate and precipitation patterns in the county and region, and related impacts to water resources.
- b. Increase institutional capacity within the county to manage groundwater resources.
- c. Assist water suppliers in assuring that proposed water supplies and facilities are consistent with adopted general plans, that all planning jurisdictions are notified of and consider potential water supply deficiencies during the preparation of such plans and that adopted general plans accurately reflect secure water sources.
- d. Support cooperative, interregional water planning efforts.
- e. Coordinate the County's land use decisions and actions to be consistent with the Water Resources chapter of the Conservation Element.
- f. Require a full assessment of the environmental impacts of any proposals to import additional water into the County.
- g. Seek and secure funding to address water resource issues on a watershed basis.
- h. Coordinate water resource management plans with other conservation planning efforts, such as those related to open space, parkland, and agricultural preservation.

Note: The following policies are taken directly from the Air Quality Chapter, but are applicable to Water Resources.

- i. The County of San Luis Obispo shall provide for an orderly outward expansion of new urban development so that it is contiguous with existing development, allows for the incremental expansion of infrastructure and public services, and minimizes impacts on the environment.
- j. The County of San Luis Obispo shall encourage infill of vacant parcels.
- k. The County of San Luis Obispo shall expand public services incrementally to serve contiguous development and will discourage the formation of small sewer and water systems serving fringe urban development.

## Rainfall and Reservoir Update

Region	ALERT Precipitation Station	2006-07 Water Year (July '06 - June '07)	2007-08 Water Year Cumulative Total (July '07 - Current)	Average Rainfall (in)	% of Annual Average
Santa Margairta	Santa Margarita (#723)	8.5	19.7	24	82%
San Luis Obisp	SLO Reservoir Gauge (#749)	11.0	18.1	24	75%
Lopez	Lopez Rec Area (#707)	10.3	19.5	23	85%
Atascadero	Atascadero (#711)	5.6	11.9	17	70%
Cambria	Santa Rosa at Main St. ( # 717) <sup>1</sup>	12.8	11.4	22	52%
	Rocy Butte ( # 703)	21.3	31.5	39	81%
	Hwy 46 W 7 Mi ( # 3113)	10.8	17.3	29	60%

<sup>1</sup> Due to equipment malfunction, not all rainfall was recorded at this site. "Rocky Butte" and "Hwy 46 W 7 Mile" precipitation data provide for alternate reference.

Please note, this table contains provisional data from automated gauges and has not been verified.

Reservoir	Date	Water Elevation (ft)	Spillway Elevation (ft)	Storage (acre-feet)	Capacity (%)
Nacimiento Reservoir	February 20, 2008	764.5	800.0	204,695	54%
Lopez Reservoir	February 20, 2008	508.1	523.0	37,141	75%
	February 1, 2007	512.3		40,474	82%
Salinas Reservoir	February 21, 2008	1300.8	1300.7	23,917	100%
	February 1, 2007	1294.2		19,374	81%
Whale Rock Reservoir	February 13, 2008	198.2	216.0	30,836	76%
	February 1, 2007	208.2		36,176	89%
Twitchell Reservoir	February 22, 2008	559.7	651.5	18,190	7%