

**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, June 4, 2008

1:30 p.m.

1. **Introductions and Determination of a Quorum**
 2. **Approval of May meeting minutes**
 3. **Public Comment**
 4. **Member Report – City of Pismo Beach**
 5. **Integrated Regional Water Management Program/Master Water Plan**
 6. **Consideration of a special July or August meeting**
 7. **Ongoing Updates:**
 - a. **Invasive Mussel Species**
 - b. **AB 303 Local Groundwater Assistance Grant Program**
 - c. **Proposed Basin Plan Revisions**
 - d. **State Water - Schedule for Reviewing Options for Shandon's Allocation**
 - e. **Budget Hearings**
 8. **Future Agenda Items**
- Adjourn by 3:00 pm ---*

Next Regular Meeting: **September 3, 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

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
May 7, 2008

Approximately 1:30 pm; Chairperson Winn called the meeting to order

- 1) Introductions of Members and Attendees – Quorum Established.
- 2) Approval of April 2008 Meeting Minutes – The April 2, 2008, WRAC meeting minutes were approved upon a first by Member Mulholland, second by Member Buel, and a unanimous vote.
- 3) Public Comment – Member Buel speaks to the April 30th Nipomo CSD Board’s selection of the water intertie project with the City of Santa Maria, selection of an environmental consultant and authorization of soliciting design proposals. Member Buel provides information on the quantity of water being delivered, schedule for completion, and suspension of issuing intent to serve letters until April groundwater level measurements are analyzed. John Snyder speaks to the Santa Maria Groundwater Basin litigation, including Santa Barbara County’s actions regarding removal of supplemental water requirements (materials submitted are available at www.slocountywater.org), the hearing on overdraft, a letter that was sent to opponents to the Land Owner Group, including SLO County, requesting each to submit their stipulation regarding overdraft, and a pending hearing on June 13, 2008. Discussion ensues regarding what may happen if the opponents do not make a stipulation on overdraft. Mr. Snyder also speaks to Golden State Water Company actions with the Public Utilities Commission. Discussion ensues regarding the Board of Supervisors considerations of actions based on the resource management system. Alternate Member Bianchi suggests the Chair write a letter thanking the Public Works staff for their efforts in time for the Budget Hearings. Member Winn speaks to the Regional Water Board’s hearing on the Basin Plan amendments regarding onsite wastewater treatment systems scheduled for May 9, 2008; Board of Supervisors consideration of the Framework for Planning on July 15, 2008; and issues with the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, the Affordable Housing Ordinance and the associated EIR, and the associated SLO County Planning Commission hearing on June 22, 2008. Mary Michael informs the WRAC that she is campaigning for California’s seat in the US Senate, is a low-income housing resident of Pismo Beach, and is interested in talking to WRAC members about their ideas for addressing the State water and environmental crisis.
- 4) Member Report – Upper Salinas-Las Tablas Resource Conservation District (US/LT RCD) – Gidi Pullen, Associate Director of the US/LT RCD, explains how and why the RCD was formed; describes the Soil Conservation Act, the relationship between local landowners and federal government, how projects are generally a 50% cost share with partnering entities, technical information is free, and that funding is not received from State or Federal agencies but rather through grant applications. Ms. Pullen describes a variety of water quality and quantity focused projects/programs, including programs with the County such as the Mobile Water Lab for irrigation

audits, Alternative Review Program, and the Erosion Control Assistance Program; and projects such as the removal of a cement swimming pool in San Miguel on the Salinas River, drainage mitigation in south Paso Robles near Wal-Mart, and technical assistance with the development of the Nacimiento/San Antonio Watershed Management Plan. Discussion ensues regarding the RCD's boundaries, staffing and purview.

- 5) Proposed 2008/09 Fiscal Year Budget for the San Luis Obispo Flood Control and Water Conservation District – Paavo Ogren, Director of Public Works, highlights the budget process and potential impacts of the State budget process, use of reserves to cover Master Water Plan efforts, and a loan to Flood Control Zone 1/1A from the Flood Control General budget until tax revenue comes in. Discussion ensues regarding the increased allocation to WRAC coordination and drainage studies. Member Buel relays the Nipomo CSD Board's request to add the activation of water level and quality monitoring at sentinel wells in the County's Budget and that the Nipomo CSD would match those funds. Discussion ensues regarding the Board's previous direction to work with the Nipomo CSD on appropriate cost sharing, the process for making a Budget adjustment based on the anticipated cost, other regional cost-sharing examples, the relationship to the Data Enhancement Plan, potential for grant funding through USGS's GAMA program, and monitoring of land subsidence. Member Hyman asks how the property tax income is calculated, why the Budget reflects programs versus individual equipment and labor, about the reduction of countywide overhead, about the designated reserves, what is not in the Budget that would be good to have in the Budget, about trends in funds available over time and assistance for new WRAC members. Discussion ensues regarding website development and data management. Member Buel moves to support adoption of the proposed Budget, with the addition of a footnote or mention in the narrative that captures the intent of the Public Works staff to activate the two sentinel wells on the coast per Nipomo CSD's request, with a second by Member Winholtz. Member Mulholland suggests that the motion refer only to a mention in the narrative and not a footnote, which the motioner and seconder accept. The motion passes by a vote of 19-0.

- 6) Options for Shandon's Allocation of State Water - Consideration of Process and Criteria – Paavo Ogren, Director of Public Works, states that no action is recommended at this time as the consideration of Shandon's State Water allocation will go through a number of steps with a number of agencies, and summarizes the parties interested in Shandon's allocation, the history of considering Shandon's allocation. Mr. Ogren also points to the Criteria for using State Water, WRAC's review of the criteria, and excess capacity in the Coastal Branch. Member Mulholland suggests considering editing language to be clearer. Discussion ensues regarding annexations, mitigation of environmental impacts and the anticipated schedule for considering the criteria.

- 7) Ongoing Updates
 - a. Conservation Ordinances – James Caruso, Planning Department, informs that the Board of Supervisors adopted two conservation ordinances for Los Osos. Chairperson Winn speaks to the development of a conservation information link for the WRAC that will have links to conservation plans, urban water

management plans and salt management plans; www.cuwcc.org is an existing conservation information link.

- b. Proposed Basin Plan Revisions – Dean Benedix, Public Works Department, speaks to the Regional Water Board’s hearing on May 9, 2008, and the potential impact to County operations.
 - c. Invasive Mussel Species – Chairperson Winn speaks to recent newspaper articles and actions at local lakes. Discussion ensues regarding communications with Monterey County, design changes to address invasive mussel concerns for the Nacimiento Water Project, planning a response to an infestation, and the State’s response.
 - d. IRWM – Paavo Ogren, Director of Public Works, informs the WRAC that the County has not been recommended for Proposition 50 Round 2 Step 2 funding.
 - e. State Water – No report.
 - f. Rainfall and Reservoir Update – No discussion.
- 8) Future Agenda Items – Pismo Beach Member Report in June; Conservation Element in September.

Meeting adjourned approximately 3:35 pm.

WATER RESOURCES ADVISORY COMMITTEE 2008

Organization	Representative		Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Cambria CSD	Jim Adams	M			X	X	X						
	Robert Reasons	A											
	Bob Gresens	Staff	X										
Heritage Ranch CSD	John D'Ornellas	M	X			X							
	Debbie Fransen	A											
Los Osos CSD	John Schempf	M	X			X							
	Steve Senet	A	X	X		X	X						
	George Milanese	Staff	X										
	Margret Falkner	Staff											
Nipomo CSD	Bruce Buel	M	X	X	•	X	X						
	Ed Eby	A	X	X	X		X						
Oceano CSD	Patrick O'Reilly	m	X										
	Phil Davis	A											
Templeton CSD	Paul Sorensen	M					X						
	Laurie Ion	A											
City of Arroyo Grande	Chuck Fellows	M		X	•	X	X						
	Jim Guthrie	A											
City of Atascadero	Steve Kahn	M											
	David Athey	A											
City of Grover Beach	Chuck Ashton	M		X	X	X	X						
	Bill Nicolls	A											
City of Morro Bay	Betty Winholtz	M	X	X	X	X	X						
	Bill Boucher	A											
City of Paso Robles	Christopher Alakel	M			•		X						
	Doug Monn	A											
	Iris Prieststaff	Staff			X								
City of Pismo Beach	Kris Vardas	M											
	Dennis Delzeit	A	X	X		X	X						
City of San Luis Obispo	Christine Mulholland	M	X	X	X	X	X						
	Alan Settle	A											
	Ron Munds	Staff											
	Gary Henderson	Staff	X	X	X	X							
District 1	Steve Sinton	M	X	X	X	X	X						
District 2	Bill Garfinkel	M	X	X	X	X	X						
District 3	Marilee Hyman	M	X	X	X	X	X						
District 4	Michael Winn	M	X	X	•	X	X						
District 5	Dan O'Grady	M	X	X	X	X	X						
Ca Mens Colony	John Kellerman	M	X	X	X	X							
	Gerald Elwood	A											
Camp SLO	Chris Long	M			X	•							
	Nicole Balliet	A				•							
Cuesta College	Edralin Maduli	M											
	Terry Reece	A			X								
Atascadero Mutual	John Neil	NM				X							
	Jaime Lien	NA			X								
Golden State Water	Mark Zimmer	NM			X		X						
	Dan Durlack	NA											
Agriculture at Large	Ray Allen	M	X	X	X	X							
	Mike Broadhurst	A	X		X	•	X						
County Farm Bureau	Joy Fitzhugh	M	X	X	X	X	X						
	Jackie Crabb	A											
Environmental at Large	Sue Luft	M	X	X	X	X	X						
	Eric Greening	M	X	X	X	X	X						
	David Chipping	A	X	X	X	X							
	Sue Harvey	A			X								
Coastal San Luis RCD	Linda Chipping	M	X	X	X	X							
	Kathie Matsuyama	A											
Upper Salinas RCD	Tom Mora	M											
	Bill Bianchi	A	X	X	X	X	X						
	Gidi Pullen	Staff					X						
Public Works Staff	Courtney Howard	Staff	X	X	X	X							
	Paavo Ogren	Staff		X			X						
	Dean Benedix	Staff			X	X	X						
	Sylas Cranor	Staff	X	X	X	X							
	Glen Priddy	Staff					X						
	Mark Hutchinson	Staff					X						
Planning Staff	James Caruso	Staff			X		X						
	Martha Miller	Staff			X								
Parks Staff	Don Melin	Staff					X						
Env. Health Staff	Laurie Salo	Staff											
	Leslie Terry	Staff	X		X	X	X						
	Megan Lillich	Staff	X		X	X							
Ag. Com. Staff	Michael Isensee	Staff	X	X	X	X							

M= Member; A= Alternate; NM=New Member NA= New Alternate 0 = No nomination received as of 5/21/08
 **No Meeting Scheduled
 • = Notified of Absence/Conflict

TO: Water Resource Advisory Committee

FROM: Courtney Howard, SLO County Water Resources Engineer

DATE: June 4, 2008

SUBJECT: Agenda Item #5: Integrated Regional Water Management Program/Master Water Plan

Recommendation

Review the anticipated changes to the IRWM Plan guidelines and provide documents/data for IRWM Plan and Master Water Planning efforts

Discussion

A draft outline of the changes proposed for the guidelines for an IRWM Plan was recently issued by DWR and is attached for your review. Significant changes include the following:

IRWM Plan Governance

DWR may be requiring that regions be governed by a Regional Water Management Group rather than a single Regional Agency with stakeholder participation and input. In essence, all of the participating agencies and groups within the County would need to enter into some form of agreement, such as a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), outlining roles and responsibilities for participating in and maintaining the IRWM Plan. If an agency/group does not enter into the agreement, then the agency's/group's projects would not be included in the IRWM Plan.

Region Approval Process

DWR, after local consultations, will be approving IRWM Region boundaries. In order to ensure approval of our Region as the County boundary, DWR may advise the District during the consultation to better explain in the IRWM Plan which agency is responsible for specific water resource management activities in the area of overlap and/or how the two regions will coordinate overlaps. It is possible that DWR may advise the District to develop agreements with our bordering regions.

Areas of overlap with Monterey County include:

- Nacitone Watershed Management Plan
- Upper Salinas-Las Tablas RCD
- Salinas River
- Paso Robles Groundwater Basin
- Big Sur Land Trust/Monterey Bay Marine Sanctuary (coordination of stewardship of the ocean and coastal streams)

Areas of overlap with Santa Barbara County include:

- Cuyama Groundwater Basin Study
- Santa Maria Valley Water Management Area (Santa Maria GW Litigation)
- State Water/CCWA.

The closest IRWM Region to the Kern County/San Luis Obispo County boundary is the Poso Creek region managed by Semitropic Water Storage District.

Since the work efforts to complete the County-wide Master Water Plan are integral to the update of the IRWM Plan, the development of both documents will be closely coordinated with the Proposition 84 IRWM Program schedule. The final guidelines for the IRWM Plan for Proposition 84 are anticipated to be released at the end of this year, with grant solicitation and award for monies to update/develop IRWM Plans expected early through mid-2009.

The four main components of the Master Water Plan are:

- Description of water resources management in the County
- Analysis of water supply and demand now and in the future
- Identification of measures to address any deficiencies in supply versus projected demand
- Description of how the Master Water Plan relates to other regional and local water management plans

All of these components are required in the IRWM Plan as well.

In order to complete the description of water resources management in the County and the analysis of water supply and demand now and in the future between now and mid-2009, water management plans, such as Urban Water Management Plans, from all agencies and groups are being collected. Attached is preliminary list of major purveyors and an inventory of what has been collected so far. If the spaces next to your agency are blank, **please provide a copy (preferably electronic) of your most recent water management plan and/or related documents as soon as possible.**

In order to develop the environmental water demand component, **copies of Waste Discharge Requirements are also being requested.**

Previous staff reports to the WRAC regarding the development of the Master Water Plan are listed below and are available for review at www.slocountywater.org.

February 2006	Relationship to IRWM Plan, Conservation Element Update and the RMS
March 2006	Review of open recommendations from the 1998 Master Water Plan
September 2006	Agricultural Water Demand
October 2006	Environmental Water Demand
November 2006	State Water
December 2006	Draft Outline of Master Water Plan

Changes made to IRWM Plan Standards from P50 through the P84 process

Standard	Prop 50	Prop 84 – Draft of Language	Comment
Regional Agency or Regional Water Management Group	Describe the regional water management group or regional agency responsible for development and implementation of the Plan. Include the member agencies and organizations and their management responsibilities related to water. Demonstrate that all agencies and organizations, including but not limited to, public agencies, not-for-profit organizations, and privately owned water utilities regulated by the Public Utilities Commission, that were necessary to address the objectives and water management strategies of the Plan were involved in the planning process.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Included as part of the Governance Standard
Governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not part of Prop 50 Plan Standards 	<p>The IRWM plan must document Governance that ensures the IRWM plan will be updated and implemented beyond existing grant programs. The IRWM plan must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Name a regional water management group responsible for development and implementation of the Plan. A Regional Water Management Group must, at a minimum, meet the definition of California Water Code §10537. The IRWM plan must include a description of the Regional Water Management Group and explain how the make up of the group meets the definition of California Water Code §10537, and is sufficient in breath of membership and participation to develop and implement the IRWM Plan. The IRWM Plan must be adopted by the Regional Water Management Group and individual project proponents. Contain a description of the IRWM governance structure. Contain a description of how the chosen form of governance addresses/ensures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision making, Equal access and participation, Communication within the IRWM structure and outside that structure, Interim changes and formal changes to the IRWM plan, Long term implementation of the IRWM plan, and Coordination with neighboring IRWM efforts and state and federal agencies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Added based on Prop 50 experience.

Changes made to IRWM Plan Standards from P50 through the P84 process

Standard	Prop 50	Prop 84 – Draft of Language	Comment
<p>Region Description</p>	<p>Explain why the region is an appropriate area for integrated regional water management. Describe internal boundaries within the region (boundaries of municipalities; service areas of individual water, wastewater, and land use agencies, including those not involved in the Plan; groundwater basin boundaries, watershed boundaries, county boundaries, etc.), major water related infrastructure, and major land-use divisions. Describe the quality and quantity of water resources within the region, including surface waters, groundwater, reclaimed water, imported water, and desalted water. Describe water supplies and demand for a minimum 20-year planning horizon. Describe important ecological processes and environmental resources within the regional boundaries and the associated water demands to support environmental needs. Describe the social and cultural makeup of the regional community; identify important cultural or social values. Describe economic conditions and important economic trends within the region.</p> <p>In certain cases, individual agencies or organizations may participate in different regional efforts depending on geography, Plan objectives, or other relevant factors. For such cases, the application should include an explanation of why participation in various regional efforts is appropriate.</p>	<p>The IRWM Plan must include a description of the management region. Each IRWM effort is responsible for defining its management region. The region description must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A description of the watersheds and the water system, natural and manmade, which are being managed. Provide a description of the quality and quantity of water resources within the region, including but not limited to surface waters, groundwater, reclaimed water, imported water, and desalted water. • A description of internal boundaries within the region, including but not limited to boundaries of municipalities; service areas of individual water, wastewater, and land use agencies, including those not involved in the Plan; groundwater basin boundaries, watershed boundaries, county boundaries, etc. • A description of major water related infrastructure and major land-use divisions. • A description of water supplies and demand for a minimum 20-year planning horizon. Including a discussion of important ecological processes and environmental resources within the regional boundaries and the associated water demands to support environmental needs. • A description of the social and cultural makeup of the regional community. Identify important cultural or social values. Identify disadvantaged communities in the management area. Describe economic conditions and important economic trends within the region. • A description of major water related issues, including the effects of climate change, and conflicts in the defined management region. Include a description of water issues of identified DAC communities. • An explanation of how the boundaries of the management region were determined and why the region is an appropriate area for integrated regional water management. • Identification of any neighboring IRWM efforts, overlapping IRWM efforts, and how the water management issues of the subject management region differ from adjacent or overlapping regions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Added the description of major water related issues and conflicts to make this a section that contains the problem statement. • Arranged bullets so they may be steps to arrive at regional boundaries.

Changes made to IRWM Plan Standards from P50 through the P84 process

Standard	Prop 50	Prop 84 – Draft of Language	Comment
Objectives	Identify Plan objectives and the manner in which they were determined. The Plan must address major water related objectives and conflicts within the region, including at a minimum, water supply, groundwater management, ecosystem restoration, and water quality.	<p>The IRWM plan must clearly present IRWM objectives, and a description of the process used to develop those objectives. IRWM objectives must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address major water related issues and conflicts of the region, • Be measurable by some practical means so achievement of objectives can be monitored. <p>The IRWM plan may prioritize objectives for the region and contain an explanation of the prioritization.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Added prioritization here to replace regional objectives. • Clarifications based on comments from Prop 50.

For Discussion Purposes

Changes made to IRWM Plan Standards from P50 through the P84 process

Standard	Prop 50	Prop 84 – Draft of Language	Comment
<p>Water Management Strategies</p>	<p>Document the range of water management strategies considered to meet the objectives. Strategies to be considered include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecosystem Restoration* Environmental and habitat protection and improvement* Water Supply Reliability* Flood management* Groundwater management* Recreation and public access* Storm water capture and management* Water conservation* Water quality protection and improvement* Water recycling* Wetlands enhancement and creation* Conjunctive use Desalination Imported water Land use planning NPS pollution control Surface storage Watershed planning Water and wastewater treatment Water transfers <p><small>*Pursuant to CWC §§79562.5 and 79564, these water management strategies must be considered to meet the minimum Plan Standards.</small></p>	<p>The IRWM plan must document the range of resource management strategies considered to meet the IRWM objectives and identify which resources management strategies were incorporated into the IRWM plan. The effects of climate change on the IRWM management area must factor into the consideration of resources management strategies. Resources management strategies to be considered must include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce Water Demand <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agricultural Water Use Efficiency Urban Water Use Efficiency Improve Operational Efficiency and Transfers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conveyance System Reoperation Water Transfers Increase Water Supply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conjunctive Management & Groundwater Storage Desalination - Brackish and Seawater Precipitation Enhancement Recycled Municipal Water Surface Storage—CALFED Surface Storage—Regional/Local Improve Flood Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Modify Flooding</i> <i>Modify Impacts of Flooding</i> <i>Modify Susceptibility to Flooding</i> <i>Preserve and Restore Natural Resource</i> <p><small>Note: Resources Management Strategies shown in <i>italics</i> are being considered for California Water Plan 2009.</small></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To be renamed “Resources Management Strategies”; terminology consistent with Prop 84 and the California Water Plan • Additional Strategies per PRC §75026(a)

Changes made to IRWM Plan Standards from P50 through the P84 process

Standard	Prop 50	Prop 84 – Draft of Language	Comment
Integration	Present the mix of water management strategies selected for inclusion in the Plan and discuss how these strategies work together to provide reliable water supply, protect or improve water quality, and achieve other objectives. Include a discussion of the added benefits of integration of multiple water management strategies, as compared to stand alone alternatives.	<p>The IRWM plan must provide opportunities, structures, and processes that develop, foster, and demonstrate integration. Integration may occur on many levels. IRWM plans must contain structures, processes, and procedures that foster one or more of the following types of integration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder/Institutional Integration • Resource Integration • Watershed Integration • Data/Information Integration • Planning Decision Integration 	
Regional Priorities	Include short-term and long-term priorities for implementation of the Plan. Discuss the process used to determine the regional priorities and the process for modifying priorities in response to regional changes.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add prioritization to Objectives standard. • This clarification was made based on comment on Prop 50.
Implementation	Identify specific actions, projects, and studies, ongoing or planned, by which the Plan will be implemented. Identify the agency(ies) responsible for project implementation and clearly identify linkages or interdependence between projects. Demonstrate economic and technical feasibility on a programmatic level. Identify the current status of each element of the Plan, such as existing infrastructure, feasibility, pilot or demonstration project, design completed, etc. Include timelines for all active or planned projects and identify the institutional structure that will ensure Plan implementation.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation was replaced by Governance and Project Review Process. • Implementation language was weaker than and partially redundant with Governance and Project Review Process.

Changes made to IRWM Plan Standards from P50 through the P84 process

Standard	Prop 50	Prop 84 – Draft of Language	Comment
Project Review Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not part of Prop 50 standards 	<p>The IRWM plan must contain a process(es) employed by the IRWM effort to identify implementation projects for inclusion in the IRWM plan. This review process must include the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How the project contributes to the IRWM objectives; How the project is related to selected resource management strategies; Technical feasibility of the project; Project benefits; Specific benefits to disadvantaged communities’ water issues; Environmental Justice considerations; Project costs and financing; Project Economic Analysis, including water quality and water supply benefits and other expected benefits; Project status; Potential for integration; Potential for meeting the project goals with an alternative project/modified project; Strategic considerations for IRWM plan implementation, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Purposefully integrating projects, Purposefully implementing a project as is, Purposefully meeting project goals with an alternative project/modified project, and IRWM objective priorities; and Contribution of the project in combating climate change (energy efficiency, reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, reduction of carbon foot print, or reduction in water demand) as opposed to alternative projects. <p>The IRWM plan must also specify the process for submitting projects for inclusion into the IRWM plan. The IRWM plan must include an implementation list of projects or a link to where a list of implementation projects exists.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Prioritization. Added based on PRC §75028(a)

Changes made to IRWM Plan Standards from P50 through the P84 process

Standard	Prop 50	Prop 84 – Draft of Language	Comment
Impact and Benefit	<p>Discuss at a screening level the impact and benefits from Plan implementation. Include an evaluation of potential impacts within the region and in adjacent areas from Plan implementation. Identify the advantages of the regional plan; including a discussion of the added benefits of the regional plan as opposed to individual local efforts. Identify which objectives necessitate a regional solution. Identify interregional benefits and impacts. Describe the impacts and benefits to environmental justice or disadvantaged communities. Include an evaluation of impacts/benefits to other resources, such as air quality or energy.</p>	<p>The IRWM plan must contain an initial, screening level discussion of potential impacts and benefits of plan implementation. This discussion must include, but is not limited to the following items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential benefits and impacts from the regional plan versus individual local efforts; • Potential benefits and or impacts within the IRWM plan region; • Potential benefits and impacts to other management regions (adjacent or more distant); • Potential interregional impacts and benefits; and • Potential impacts and benefits to resources other than water such as air quality or energy. 	
Technical Analysis and Plan Performance	<p>Include a discussion of data, technical methods, and analyses used in development of the Plan. Include a discussion of measures that will be used to evaluate Project/Plan performance, monitoring systems that will be used to gather performance data, and mechanisms to adapt project operations and Plan implementation based on performance data collected.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Separated technical analysis from Plan performance for clarification. • PRC §75026(a) calls out plan performance.
Plan Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was a combined standard Technical Analysis and Plan Performance under Prop 50 	<p>The IRWM plan must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The metrics that will be used to evaluate project/plan performance, including but not limited to: • Obtaining plan objectives, • Stakeholder outreach and involvement, • Monitoring systems that will be used to gather performance data • Mechanisms to adapt project operations and plan implementation based on performance data collected, and • Process to formally update or amend the IRWM plan. 	

Changes made to IRWM Plan Standards from P50 through the P84 process

Standard	Prop 50	Prop 84 – Draft of Language	Comment
Data Management	<p>Include mechanisms by which data will be managed and disseminated to stakeholders and the public, and include a discussion of how data collection will support statewide data needs. Assess the state of existing monitoring efforts for water quantity and water quality, and identify data gaps for which additional monitoring is needed.</p> <p>If the Plan includes a water quality component, include a discussion of the integration of data into the State Water Board’s SWAMP and Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) Program. Appendix E provides a listing of web links for accessing information on the State Water Board’s statewide data management strategies.</p>	<p>The IRWM plan must include mechanisms and processes by which data will be collected, stored, and disseminated to IRWM participants, stakeholders, the public, and the State. The IRWM plan must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A description of data management process for the IRWM region. • An explanation of how the data collection systems and data management protocols are shared throughout the IRWM region. • An explanation of how the data management system supports local planning efforts with shared data. • An explanation of how data will be shared with State agencies. 	
Financing	<p>Identify beneficiaries and identify potential funding/financing for Plan implementation. Discuss ongoing support and financing for operation and maintenance of implemented projects.</p>	<p>The IRWM plan must identify and explain potential financing for plan implementation, including but not limited to the following items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List possible, as well as known, local efforts and grant opportunities for funding the projects that implement the IRWM plan. • Include explanations of certainty, magnitude, longevity of potential funding and the effects on plan implementation. • Include an explanation of how any operation and maintenance costs would be covered. 	
Statewide Priorities	<p>Identify issues of statewide significance or State agency priorities that will be met or contributed to by implementation of the Plan, Proposal, or specific projects. Describe how the Plan, Proposal, or specific projects were developed to meet issues of statewide significance or State agency priorities.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not included. Prop 84 moves Statewide Priorities to a Program Preference.
Relation to Statewide Water Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not included 	<p><i>Currently under review</i></p>	
Technical Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was a combined standard Technical Analysis and Plan Performance under Prop 50 	<p>The IRWM plan must contain a discussion of data, technical methods, and analyses used to develop the IRWM plan.</p>	

Changes made to IRWM Plan Standards from P50 through the P84 process

Standard	Prop 50	Prop 84 – Draft of Language	Comment
Relation to Local Water Planning	Discuss how the Plan relates to planning documents and programs established by local agencies. Demonstrate coordination with local land-use planning decision-makers. Discuss how local agency planning documents relate to the IRWM strategies and the dynamics between the two planning documents. Discuss the linkages between the Plan and local planning documents.	<p>The IRWM plan must contain references to the local water planning documents on which it is based, including the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A listing of local water plans used in the IRWM plan, • A discussion of how the IRWM plan relates to planning documents and programs established by local agencies, and • A description of the dynamics between the IRWM plan and local planning documents. 	
Relation to Local Land Use Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not included; was part of Relation to Local Planning Standard. 	<p>The IRWM plan must contain a description of the relationship between local land use planning entities and the IRWM effort including, but not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A description of the current relationship between local land use planning entities and IRWM entities. • A description of current and future efforts to establish an interactive relationship between land use planning and IRWM planning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relation to local land use planning modified based on Prop 50 experience and PRC§75026(b)(2) • Separation of the water planning and land use planning to provide more emphasis on relation to land use planning.
Stakeholder Involvement	Identify stakeholders included in developing the Plan. Identify how stakeholders were identified, how they participate in planning and implementation efforts, and how they can influence decisions made regarding water management. Include documentation of stakeholder involvement such as inclusion of signatory status or letters of support from non-agency stakeholders, i.e. those who have not “adopted” the Plan. Include a discussion of mechanisms and processes that have been or will be used to facilitate stakeholder involvement and communication during implementation of the Plan. Discuss watershed or other partnerships developed during the planning process. Discuss disadvantaged communities within the region and their involvement in the planning process. Discuss efforts to identify and address environmental justice needs and issues within the region. Identify possible obstacles to Plan implementation.	<p>The IRWM plan must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify IRWM stakeholders including but not limited to watershed groups, disadvantaged communities, environmental justice communities, and tribal interests and their current level of participation. • Describe or reference the outreach protocols used to identify, inform, invite, and involve stakeholder groups in the IRWM process. • Explain IRWM committees, roles, or positions that stakeholders can occupy including how a stakeholder goes about participating in those committees, roles, or positions. • Discuss mechanisms and processes that have been or will be used to facilitate stakeholder involvement and communication during implementation of the IRWM plan • Demonstrate that all agencies and organizations that were/are necessary to address the objectives and resource management strategies of the Plan were/are involved in the planning process. • A discussion of partnerships developed during the planning process. 	

Changes made to IRWM Plan Standards from P50 through the P84 process

Standard	Prop 50	Prop 84 – Draft of Language	Comment
Coordination	Identify State or federal agencies involved with strategies, actions, and projects. Identify areas where a State agency or other agencies may be able to assist in communication, cooperation, or implementation of Plan components or processes, or where State or federal regulatory decisions are required for implementation.	<p>The IRWM plan must identify agencies and entities outside the IRWM effort targeted for coordination and cooperation. The IRWM plan must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify State or federal agencies important to the implementation of the IRWM plan and associated projects and the agencies roles. • Identify areas where a State or other agencies may be able to assist in communication, cooperation, or implementation of IRWM plan components or processes. • Identify State or federal regulatory decisions that are required for IRWM plan or project implementation. • Identify any neighboring IRWM efforts and how cooperation or coordination with the other IRWM efforts will be accomplished. 	
Climate Change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not included 	<i>Currently under review</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Added per AB32. • Not certain if this is separate standard or will be built into other standards such as Project Review Process.

For Discussion Purposes

Inventory of References for IRWM Plan and Master Water Plan

Sub-Region	Area	Purveyors	UWMPs		WSMPs		Water Resources Studies		RMS		Bio Studies		WDRs or Releases		Groundwater Reports		Agricultural Reports		Data	
			Received?	Date	Received?	Date	Title	Date	RCS?	Date	Title	Date	Title	Date	Title	Date	Title	Date		
North Coast	San Simeon	San Simeon CSD Overlying Users			Yes	2007														
	Cambria	Cambria CSD	EIR	Feb-2008			Recycled Water	2004												
		Overlying Users																		
	Cayucos	Morro Rock Mutual	Yes	2008													Cayucos GW Study	1988		
		Paso Robles Beach CSA 10A	Yes Yes	2008 2008		Yes	2003										Cayucos GW Study Cayucos GW Study	1988 1988		
	Morro Bay	Overlying Users																		
		Morro Bay Cayucos Sanitation District	Yes	2006																
	Chorro Valley	CMC				Yes	2004													
		County																		
		Cuesta College Camp SLO Overlying Users																		
Los Osos Valley	Overlying Users							Yes	1992											
	Golden State Water							Yes	1992							Water Management Plan for the LO GW Basin	Jul-2005			
Los Osos	S&T Mutual							Yes	1992											
	Los Osos CSD	Yes	?					Yes	1992											
	Overlying Users							Yes	1992											
	Overlying Users							Yes	1992											
South Coast North	San Luis Obispo	City of San Luis Obispo	Yes	2005			Stream Management and Maintenance Program	2002								Pumping Evaluation	2001			
		Water Resources Status Report						2007								SLO/Edna GW Basin Evaluation	1997			
	Edna Valley	Golden State Water Company CSA 18														SLO/Edna GW Basin Evaluation	1997			
		County Airport Overlying Users			Yes	2004	WWTP Audit	2004								SLO/Edna GW Basin Evaluation SLO/Edna GW Basin Evaluation	1997 1997			
	Avila Valley	Overlying Users																		
		San Miguelito MWC San Luis Coastal UCD CSA 12																		
		Avila Valley MWC Overlying Users (?) Avila Beach CSD																		
		City of Pismo Beach	Yes	2006			Water Balance Study	2007								SM GW Basin Litigation	2005			
		City of Arroyo Grande					Water Supply Alternatives Study	2004								SM GW Basin Litigation	2005			
	Northern Cities Management Area	Oceano CSD					Water Balance Study	2007								SM GW Basin Litigation	2005			
City of Grover Beach		Yes	2006			Water Balance Study	2007								SM GW Basin Litigation	2005				
Halcyon															SM GW Basin Litigation	2005				
Overlying Users															SM GW Basin Litigation	2005				
South SLO County Sanitation District															SM GW Basin Litigation	2005				
Pismo Valley		Overlying Users																		
		PXP																		
Lopez		Zone 3	Zone 3 UWMP	2005																
Arroyo Grande Valley		Overlying Users									HCP	2004				Permeability Study	2001			
		Varian Ranch									Habitat Assessment	2000								
Unincorporated South Coast South	Overlying Users					Laetitia EIR	2007								SM GW Basin Litigation	2005				
	Golden State Water Company							Yes	2004						SM GW Basin Litigation	2005				
Nipomo Mesa Management Area	Rural Water Company							Yes	2004						SM GW Basin Litigation	2005				
	Woodlands							Yes	2004						SM GW Basin Litigation	2005				
	Conoco Phillips							Yes	2004						SM GW Basin Litigation	2005				
	Nipomo CSD	Yes	2006					Yes	2004						SM GW Basin Litigation	2005				
	Overlying Users							Yes	2004						SM GW Basin Litigation	2005				
South Coast Inland	Cuyama	Cuyama CSD																		
	Huasna	Overlying Users																		
Inland West	Pozo	Overlying Users																		
	Santa Margarita Ranch	CSA 23			Yes	2003	EIR	2008												
		Garden Farms														GW Resources Tech Memo	2004			
	Atascadero Sub- basin / Santa Margarita Valley	Atascadero Mutual Water Company	Yes	2005												PR GW Basin Studies I&II	2002:2005			
		Overlying Users														PR GW Basin Studies I&II	2002:2005			
	City of San Luis Obispo	Templeton CSD					Sphere of Influence	2006								PR GW Basin Studies I&II	2002:2005			
		Overlying Users														PR GW Basin Studies I&II	2002:2005			
		City of Paso Robles					Sphere of Influence	2006								PR GW Basin Studies I&II	2002:2005			
	San Miguel CSD	Overlying Users														PR GW Basin Studies I&II	2002:2005			
		Bradley Sub-area	Bradley													PR GW Basin Studies I&II	2002:2005			
Nacitone	Oak Shores					Watershed Management Plan	2009													
	Overlying Users					Watershed Management Plan	2009													
	Heritage Ranch CSD					Sphere of Influence	2006													
Inland Central	Monterey County					Watershed Management Plan	2009													
	North Gabilan	Overlying Users													PR GW Basin Studies I&II	2002:2005				
	South Gabilan	Overlying Users													PR GW Basin Studies I&II	2002:2005				
	Creston	Overlying Users													PR GW Basin Studies I&II	2002:2005				
	Shandon	CSA 16			Yes	2005	Community Plan	2009							PR GW Basin Studies I&II	2002:2005				
Inland East	San Juan	Overlying Users													PR GW Basin Studies I&II	2002:2005				
	California Valley/Carrizo Plains	Overlying Users																		
	Cholame	Overlying Users																		
County-wide	Flood Control District																			
	Master Water Plan																			
SLO County	Master Water Plan																			
	Water and Sewage Plan														WW Reclamation/GW Recharge	1976		Ag Commissioner	Multiple	
North/South Coast	Coastal San Luis RCD																			
	Upper Salinas-Las Tablas RCD																			
Inland Regional	CCWA (State Water)																			
	CCWA																			

*Cities include Sphere of Influence
 *Urban Water Management Plans (UWMPs) - 3000 customers or 3000 AFY
 *WSMPs = Water System Master Plans

TO: Water Resource Advisory Committee

FROM: Courtney Howard, SLO County Water Resources Engineer

DATE: May 7, 2008

SUBJECT: Agenda Item #7.a: Invasive Mussel Species

On June 24, 2008, the Parks Department and Public Works Department will be holding a joint hearing with the Board of Supervisors to inform them and the public of the various actions the departments are taking to educate the public, prevent infestation, monitor for infestation, coordinate with other agencies, and prepare for infestation, should it occur.

The attached table provides updated information on invasive mussel prevention and preparation activities locally.

Statewide, the CA Department of Fish and Game is the lead agency informing and advising agencies throughout the State and performing inspections on main routes into California. Several links are available under the Quagga Mussel link at www.slocountywater.org.

Reservoir	Owner	Recreation	Water Supply
Lopez	SLO County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	SLO County Parks Department <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informational flyers • No boats from infected lakes • Inspected to ensure clean and dry • Decontaminated • Tagged upon exit 	SLO County Public Works <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular monitoring • Response Plan • \$50K Budget
Salinas	Army Corp of Engineers	SLO County Parks Department <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informational flyers • No boats from infected lakes • Inspected to ensure clean and dry • Decontaminated • Tagged upon exit 	SLO County Public Works <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular monitoring • Response Plan • \$50K Budget
Nacimiento	Monterey County Water Resources Agency	Monterey County Water Resources Agency <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informational flyers • Training held on May 28, 2008 • Regular monitoring Heritage Ranch CSD <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informational flyers • Regular monitoring (TBD) Oak Shores <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informational flyers 	SLO County Public Works <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular monitoring • Response Plan • Modification of design to support maintenance upon infestation