

**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, February 4, 2009
1:30 p.m.

1. **Introductions and Determination of a Quorum**
2. **Approval of January meeting minutes**
3. **Public Comment**
4. **Conservation and Open Space Element – Subcommittee Report, for WRAC action**
5. **Resource Management System Annual Summary Report**
6. **Laetitia Ranch Development DEIR - Subcommittee Report**
7. **San Miguel Ranch Draft DEIR - Subcommittee Report**
8. **Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance - Notice on Status of the Proposed Rulemaking**
9. **Chairperson’s report on meetings with Board members**
10. **Ongoing Updates:**
 - a. **IRWM**
 - b. **Paso Robles Basin Groundwater Management Plan**
 - c. **Master Water Plan**
 - d. **Invasive Mussels**
 - e. **Rainfall and Reservoir Update**
11. **Future Agenda Items**

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

Next Regular Meeting: **March 4, 2009 1:30 pm**
 San Luis Obispo City/County Library
 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
January 7, 2009

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

- 1) Introductions of Members and Attendees – Quorum Established
- 2) Elections – Secretary Howard requests nominations for Chair of the WRAC. Chairperson Winn is nominated and approved. Member Luft is nominated and approved as Vice Chair of the WRAC. The director of Public Works appointed Courtney Howard as the secretary to the WRAC.
- 3) Approval of December Meeting Minutes – The December 3, 2008 WRAC meeting minutes were approved with an amendment to the attendance record, revising Member Garfinkel’s December attendance upon a first by Member Buel, second by Member Winholtz, and a unanimous vote with five abstentions.
- 4) Public Comment – (An audio recording of the meeting and materials submitted during public comment are available under the WRAC link at www.slocountywater.org.) Supervisor Patterson presents member Dan O’Grady with certificate of appreciation for service to District 5. John Snyder calls attention to Santa Maria groundwater litigation and the need for clarification of monitoring obligations, status of landowner appeals, appeal process, and relationship between landowners and stipulations. Member Bianchi calls attention to Delta committee background reports which can be found at LA Times on the internet-western/state water issues. Member Greening informs of website (<http://change.gov>) to ask Obama-Biden transition team questions about stimulus bill content. Member Luft addresses the San Miguel Ranch draft EIR calling in to question the existing level of severity in Paso Robles and the impact on water, informs of February 11th deadline for comments, and offers to chair a committee to comment on the document. A subcommittee is formed with plans to bring their findings to the WRAC in February. Gwen Taylor suggests that the community of Los Osos ask the WRAC to review the wastewater project draft EIR with respect to water availability and location and provide comments by the January 30th deadline. Member O’Grady discusses Arroyo Grande water supply issues. Chairperson Winn informs the WRAC he will meet individually with Board members to ascertain their vision for the WRAC. A brief discussion follows.
- 5) Resource Management System Annual Summary Report – James Caruso, County Planning, discusses preliminary draft ideas for addressing water rates and population forecasts. Caruso suggests updating stale plans as an implementation status priority. Caruso requests data discussions be directed to his office. Member Harvey raises the issue of costs and liability for use of reclaimed water. Member Henderson initiates a move to a qualitative water rate discussion. After a lengthy discussion, Chairperson Winn encourages each community to focus on and refine their individual water/wastewater issues for discussion at the February WRAC meeting.

- 6) Integrated Regional Water Management Plan – Secretary Howard informs that State acceptance guidelines for IRWM regions are available and asks agencies represented by the WRAC to consider entering into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) required for Proposition 84 grant funding. Chairperson Winn requests example language for acceptance documents be sent to each involved group for approval.

- 7) Ongoing Updates –
 - a. COSE – James Caruso, County Planning, informs of COSE workshops scheduled for month of January in San Luis Obispo, Arroyo Grande, and Paso Robles.
 - b. Paso Robles Basin Groundwater Management Plan – Secretary Howard informs of Paso Robles Basin Groundwater Management Plan kickoff meeting in Paso Robles on Jan. 15th from 5-7 at the safety center.
 - c. Invasive Mussels – Secretary Howard informs the WRAC that a response plan is being developed.
 - d. Rainfall and reservoir update – Nothing to note.
 - e. Membership updates – Secretary Howard indicates new WRAC appointments are scheduled to go to the Board on February 4, 2009.

- 8) Future Agenda Items – Brief discussion.

Meeting adjourned approximately 3:30 pm.

WATER RESOURCES ADVISORY COMMITTEE 2009

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

M= Member; A= Alternate; NM=New Member NA= New Alternate 0 = No nomination received as of 8/11/08
 *To be confirmed at a future BOS meeting
 • = Notified of Absence/Conflict

TO: Water Resources Advisory Committee

FROM: Syllas Cranor, SLO County Water Resources Engineer

DATE: February 4, 2009

SUBJECT: Agenda Item #4: Conservation and Open Space Element

The County Planning and Building Department has released the Public Review Draft of the Conservation and Open Space Element. It consists of two of the seven mandated elements of the County General Plan. Over the next several months, planned workshops and meetings will give the public an opportunity to hear about the plan and to provide comments. Following these workshops, public hearings will be held at the County Planning Commission beginning in May 2009.

The Conservation and Open Space Element subcommittee met on January 15, 2009. Members are Michael Winn (District 4), Ray Allen (Agriculture At-Large), Betty Winholtz (Morro Bay), and Sue Harvey (Environmental At-Large Alternate). The members reviewed the Water Resources chapter of the Conservation and Open Space Element and associated appendices.

Consensus of the subcommittee was to present the attached comments to the WRAC at the February 4, 2009 meeting for consideration of submittal to the Planning Commission and to the Board of Supervisors.

WRAC Subcommittee meeting on the Water Element of the COSE

January 15, 2009

Present: Michael Winn, Ray Allen, Betty Winholtz, Sue Harvey

Comments follow:

Generally we agreed that the new format and principles articulated are good, but the policies need more detail, especially re implementation.

Introduction on page 1.2

“The discussion of water in the conservation element must be prepared in coordination with water suppliers and include any information on water supply and demand prepared pursuant to §65352.5.”

- Which water suppliers did the County coordinate (incorporated cities, community services districts, PUC-regulated purveyors)? We believe their documentation should be listed in the COSE bibliography.
- The COSE needs precise information on water supply and demand included, with those terms defined as used by the County.

“At the same time, groundwater supplies will need to be protected for agriculture in accordance with Agriculture Element.”

- Emphasize need to protect groundwater for agriculture, whether on land zoned AG or on land zoned RL and RR that is being farmed.

Chapter 10 **WATER RESOURCES**

The introduction needs contextual history here. Issues critical to water policy include long-term semi-arid region, frequency of droughts, cyclical nature of rainfall (with averages), and interrelationship between the long-term trends in rainfall and those in population (both growth rate and total population).

A map of the county is needed here, showing it is not “a region” but several climatic and watershed regions. An overlay showing areas currently experiencing sea water intrusion and a Level of Severity III for water supply would be helpful.

10.1 – “The County of San Luis Obispo is at a critical juncture, as demands on water resources approach sustainable supplies. Some areas of the county are experiencing groundwater quality problems due to seawater intrusion [and/or deterioration of water quality] due in part to a lack of available surface water supplies and consistent recharge. This will have significant effects for people and the environment over time.”

- [Or shorten to “Some areas of the county are experiencing groundwater quality problems.” [Some but not all problems are caused by seawater intrusion.]

10.2 – Report needs a table to show the integration of the COSE and the Water Master Plan.

10.3 – The quote by Zeckster is a poor choice: His definition is incomplete: talks about overdraft but does not address decline in water quality. A better citation would refer to “safe yield”, a far more useful (and legally defensible) standard than “overdraft”.

- Issue of septic systems, water quality and salt-regenerating water softeners needs to be addressed.

Water Quality

Add: "Self-regeneration water softeners using salts of very types pose a serious threat to the quality of the county's groundwater supplies."

Water Conservation

- Conserving the county's limited water supply is one method to reduce the strain on local water sources.
- Water conservation programs in the county vary by community and are difficult to coordinate, as the programs are run by individual water purveyors such as cities, special districts and private companies.
 - There is serious resistance to water conservation in the county. Public commitment to conservation is being compromised by the use of savings to facilitate more population growth.
 - The term "private water purveyors" needs to be more clearly defined as two types:
 - private for-profit PUC-regulated companies
 - mutual water companies
 - Note: Some areas of the county have no water conservation plan at all, neither adopted nor being enforced.
 - Some recognition must be given to the fact that the county's water supplies are limited and either can be supplemented only at great cost (which will be prohibitive in those areas to affordable housing) or simply cannot be supplemented at any cost.
 - Virtually no coordination between County government and that of the Cities. (Morro Bay, for example, has an issue with intensified farming increasing fertilizer etc. runoff which seeps into its groundwater allowed by County-permitted policies.) See the 5-year ag waivers re non-point source pollution.
 - There is a need to reconcile competing interests on AG-zoned land. (The County's "ag cluster" projects facilitate urban growth on AG-zoned land.)
 - Some reference is needed here to conservation-tiered water rates.

p. 10.4

Flood management:

- The flood management section is weak; there is no requirement for site-specific solutions. “An integrated and broad approach” cannot succeed. What is needed is what is endorsed elsewhere in this document—plans based on watersheds. And those need to be entire, particularly when the watershed overlaps county boundaries with neighboring counties. [The Paso Robles watershed studies have done a good job including those portions in Monterey County. The Santa Maria River groundwater studies carried out by the DWR are notably defective in this respect.]
- The challenge for the County to work with other agencies (e.g., cities and CSDs) is how to deal with liability issues, which in unincorporated areas are borne by the County.

TABLE WR-1 GOALS FOR WATER RESOURCES

Goal WR-4 needs reworking. The reduction of per capita water use is an implementation strategy. The goal must be to reserve water in good and average rainfall years so that the supply will be adequate in the more frequent years with below-average rainfall.

Also, there is the need for a goal to preserve sustainable aquifers and remediate those in stress. [Implementation will require temporary moratoriums on growth for 10-15 years in some areas, permanent moratoriums in others.]

p. 10.5

Regional Water Supplies – watersheds are the only basis for regional policies.

- Unless the County has a feasible financial plan for interconnecting the water supplies of the cities and water-supplying community services districts, there is a need to abandon the “Regional Water Supply” notion and to develop a Water Master Plan for each watershed (unless some CA

State rubric calls for it, in which case the administrative program could be county-wide, but the implementation would still need to be by watersheds and groundwater basins).

- Change Title from “The County will have a reliable and secure regional water supply (IRWM)” to “The County will have a reliable and secure water supply in each of its watersheds and groundwater basins”
- Refer to the map in Figure WR-1 (p. 10.7) to identify the five major surface water regions in the county. (Note that the Coastal region is much too large to interconnect as one region, but there are subsections that have potential.)

Policy WR 1.1 Protect water supplies

- How will the County have the financial and staff resources to monitor these? E.g.,
 - c. Establish a water demand monitoring program in coordination with the County Planning Department’s Resource Management System to monitor municipal, industrial, agricultural, recreational, and environmental demand on an ongoing basis; ...

All of the Implementation Strategies in WR 1.1.1 involve analysis, studies, and formulating plans; but there are no implementation strategies to actually protect water supplies.

Beyond a Master Water Plan, what can the County do to implement this policy?

Policy WR 1.2 Expand desalination opportunities

[The committee has differing views on this, which reflect the range of views in the public. Some are opposed to desal entirely, because it would remove one significant obstacle to growth. Others are opposed because of the perceived damage to aquatic life by desal operations. Others yet are not opposed to desal but see its very high costs as self-limiting; and they are willing to “balance” some sustainable loss of life with preserving ag

water supplies threatened by increased urban groundwater pumping. Many who strongly support desal have no idea about the costs involved—which could be remedied by education.]

Implementation Strategy WR 1.2.1

Monitor and explore new technologies that lower the cost of desalination.

- This strategy needs to include lowering the use of fossil fuels and reducing the cost of alternative energy sources.
- No qualifiers: We need a BMP statement.
- Major issues are outfall, energy use, and the potential for growth inducement.
- Replace “Monitor and explore new technologies... with “Require new technologies....” [“Monitor and explore” is too passive; not an enforceable implementation strategy.]

Policy WR 1.3 Use reclaimed water

Include the Implementation Strategy of beginning a long-term effort to educate the public about the science, the health safety, and the necessity of recycling treated waste water for human consumption. Use of such water for playgrounds and parks, roadside vegetation, and food crops may be intermediate applications; but we must embrace the long-term necessity of using it for drinking water. [Crops – with the possible exception of some illegal crops – cannot be grown profitably with such water.]

Policy WR 1.4 Interagency projects

“Sponsor discussions”, yes, but where possible let the County mandate that cooperation occur. [The County has more clout than it is sometimes willing to use. Mandates may seem harsh at times, but long-term discussions

cause more trouble in the end. See 30 years of Los Osos waste water treatment discussions for an instructional example.]

Policy WR 1.5 Water-dependent species

Protect water sources for water-dependent species and the continuity of riparian communities.

Policy 1.5 needs to be stronger; County needs to coordinate efforts with RWQCB.

Implementation Strategy WR 1.5.1

Conduct ecosystem analyses and monitoring to better understand the environmental needs for water in each watershed.

1.5.1 – More specifically, monitor and analyze coastal aquifers, major groundwater basins and creeks. [This can, and must, be done in cooperation with others—notably cities, CSDs and other purveyors—and it is essential to responsible planning. Every EIR should be required to help fund a Resource Capacity Study in its area of proposed growth; and where such a RCS has already been conducted within the immediate past, the project should be required to help back-fund the study.]

Policy WR 1.6 Agricultural operations

The subcommittee believes that this section about “priority to ag” is a “feel-good” section without any real content. We recommend two implementation strategies:

- 1) County Planning should eliminate Ag Cluster development as a “planning tool”. Though its original intentions were laudable, its use has resulted in urbanized development on ag land, with Class I impacts on water supplies for agriculture.
- 2) Adopt a policy that no annexations, subdivisions, or (if retained) ag clusters shall be permitted on land zoned AG or zoned RL or RR with a

history of farming, unless they are supplied by supplemental water. (I.e., no residential development outside of Urban or Village Reserve Lines that draw on groundwater.)

Policy WR 1.7 Use of surface water

Surface water will only be used to serve development within urban and village reserve lines and will not be used to serve development in rural areas.

This policy would appear to eliminate ag ponds and retention ponds on ag land, whether for crops, livestock, or homes for farming and ranch families. Please clarify.

Policy WR 1.8 Discourage small systems

Enable expansion of public services to serve contiguous development when water is available. Discourage the formation of small water and sewer systems serving urban development at the fringe and outside of urban reserve lines or urban services lines.

- In the Title, replace “Discourage” with “Limit and Regulate”.
- This section is not specific enough; aquifers are in distress in many regions in the county and the County has an hands-off approach; no oversight and no regulation of small systems.
- Add the word “sustainable”. “Enable expansion of...when sustainable water is available.”
- [“Urban services lines” are not current on many (perhaps most) County planning maps. Consider eliminating USLs and using only URLs.]
- The County needs an Implementation Strategy limiting the expansion of existing mutual water companies, and the formation of new companies, where the groundwater is at an RMS Level of Service II or III.

Policy WR 1.10 Reduce RMS alert levels

The County will work with local agencies to reduce Resource Management System alert levels for water supply and water systems from recommended or certified Levels of Severity II or III to Level of Severity I or better by 2020.

- How? This is meaningless without details.
- The RMS needs to update severity definitions to fit real-world timeframes. [See suggestions in Appendix 8.]

Implementation Strategy WR 1.10.1

Give highest priority to conducting Resource Capacity Studies for groundwater basins with a Level of Severity designation of II and III.

- Needs much more detail. E.g.,
Will the County enter into joint ventures with Cities and/or Community Services Districts to bring in supplemental water?
Will the County sign Joint Powers Agreements with Cities and/or Community Services Districts to secure permits and funding for desalination plants?
Will the County enforce water conservation efforts in the unincorporated areas that match (or closely match) those of adjoining Cities and/or CSDs?

p. 10.9

Policy WR 1.11 Impacts of new development

Accurately assess and mitigate the impacts of new development on water supply. (GM1) At a minimum, comply with the provisions of Senate Bills 610 and 211.

- Add a reference to AB 32. When the County understands how compliance with this law will be measured, such details need to be added to the COSE.

- In general, in this section the County needs to:
 - o devise new term for buildout in water-poor areas that cannot feasibly purchase supplemental water; i.e., where the limit is not a moving target but an absolute number;
 - o add a safe yield statement.

Policy WR 1.12 Density increases in rural areas

Do not approve General Plan amendments or land divisions that increase the density or intensity of non-agricultural uses in rural areas that have a recommended or certified Level of Severity II or III for water supply until a Level of Severity I or better is reached, unless there is an overriding public need.

- Add a period at "...Level of Severity I or better is reached." Remove "unless there is an overriding public need." [Inclusion of that exception would render the policy virtually unenforceable.]
- Add statement re safe yield being the metric the County will use re impacts. (Safe yield and overdraft are not the same.)

p. 10.10

Goal Number 2: The County will manage groundwater resources to ensure sustainable supplies for all beneficial uses.

There is no clarity on how the County will manage groundwater resources. All of the implementation statements avoid the real issues:

- 1) How will the County secure agreements with the incorporated Cities where the Cities are utilizing the same water supply as the adjoining unincorporated areas?
 - a) Will the County help fund incentives like the cities' for water savings?

- b) When reasonable dialogue fails, will the County consider litigating when Cities do not practice sound water policies?
 - c) Will the County honor the Cities' efforts to defend water resources by refusing to permit growth outside of Cities that rejected applications for annexation?
 - d) Will the County deny well permits in the vicinity of City and/or CSD wells?
- 2) How will the County secure agreements with adjoining Counties (notably Monterey and Santa Barbara Counties) for joint management of shared groundwater basins?

Implementation Strategy WR 2.1.2

Adopt a countywide groundwater ordinance to govern groundwater in areas of the county not currently under adjudication.

- Replace with something like: "Adopt a groundwater ordinance per each watershed to govern groundwater in areas of the county not currently under adjudication or under another jurisdiction." [If the State requires a "Regional Water Management" structure that covers the entire county, the County could combine them into a "Regional" composite.]

Add another Implementation Strategy (WR 2.1.3?)

Require all residential water suppliers (including mutual water companies serving more than 6 homes) to monitor and report water quality and quantity pumped. [The subcommittee believes this should be monthly, but perhaps quarterly would be adequate.]

p. 10.11

Implementation Strategy WR 2.2.3

Secure right of access to all new key wells together with retaining voluntary access to existing wells having useful histories to ensure that the County's investment in these records is protected. The County should obtain unlimited permission from each of the well owners for releasing or publishing groundwater data. (GM2)

- Strike the word “publish”

Add another implementation policy (WR 2.2.6?):

Require all new residential well permits to include the obligation for owners to monitor and report usage, i.e., water quality and quantity, on a monthly (quarterly?) basis. [This policy would include mutual water companies but not ag wells.]

Policy WR 2.3 Well permits

- Add Implementation Strategy: Permit no new residential wells serving more than one household where groundwater is LOS II or III.

p. 10.13

GOAL 3: EXCELLENT WATER QUALITY WILL BE MAINTAINED FOR THE HEALTH OF PEOPLE AND NATURAL COMMUNITIES.

This section lacks any discussion of soil permeability and surface water pollution.

- Add new Implementation Strategy (WR 3.1.5?) taken from Section WR 3.3:

“Recognize the real impacts of self-regenerating water softeners on the County’s ability to effectively treat and use reclaimed water. Amend ordinance as needed.”

- Add new Implementation Strategy (WR 3.1.6?):

“Greatly reduce and, where possible, eliminate self-regenerating water softeners that use salt unless they are of canister design.”

- Add new Implementation Strategy (WR 3.1.7?):

“The County shall encourage community waste water systems to convert to tertiary treatment, with no permits for new or upgraded community facilities that are not tertiary treated.”

Policy WR 3.2 Protect watersheds

Protect watersheds, groundwater and aquifer recharge areas, and natural drainage systems from potential adverse impacts of development projects.
(GM1)

- This policy should identify the watersheds, groundwater, aquifer recharge areas, and natural drainage systems, possibly with maps.
-
- Add language to end of policy “... adverse impacts of development **and public infrastructure** projects.”

10.14

Implementation Strategy WR 3.3.4

Evaluate the potential impact of self-regenerating water softeners on the county's ability to effectively treat and use reclaimed water. Amend ordinances as needed.

- Remove the Implementation Strategy from this Section (it is not about improving groundwater quality) and move it, as amended, to Section 3.3.

p. 10.15

Policy WR 3.5 Support Resource Conservation Districts

Continue support of and partnerships with resource conservation districts to encourage education and technical assistance regarding erosion and sediment control in agricultural practices.

- Add language including Community Services Districts:
Continue support of and partnerships with Resource Conservation Districts **and Community Services Districts** to encourage education....

GOAL 4: PER CAPITA POTABLE WATER USE IN THE COUNTY WILL DECLINE BY 20 PERCENT BY 2020.

This is not a Goal. It is an Implementation Strategy that should help the County preserve and sustain aquifers in the county, as well as remediating those in distress. [Those that could be remediated by supplemental water via desal – i.e., they are close enough to the ocean and have average community incomes high enough to pay for the higher costs – would still benefit by reduced use, to reduce the amount of expensive water required.]

- Conservation rate and growth rate must result in a net increase in water. Conservation for the purpose of facilitating growth is not an acceptable goal, and it must fail even as an Implementing Strategy. [Community

resistance to water conservation can be overcome by tiered rates – if the community will allow them to be passed in Prop. 218 protest votes – but the resistance becomes very strong when the community believes that conservation is motivated by the desire to increase growth and/or density.]

- Per capita decreases mean no benefit at all if the population continues to rise. What must decrease, or at least hold steady, is the annual demand on the aquifers.
- Emergency measures should be devised as Implementation Strategies that go into effect when certain hydrological “triggers” are reached. These might include a temporary moratorium on growth, no watering of outdoor vegetation beyond the minimum to keep trees alive, no car washing on streets or residential lots, and other measures the County should design.

p. 10.16

Implementation Strategy WR 4.1.3:

Evaluate the feasibility of creating a consortium, Joint Powers Authority, Memorandum of Understanding, or other formal partnership with all water purveyors in the county to provide a comprehensive and consistent countywide water conservation program that includes education, outreach, and financial incentives.

- Delete this Implementation Strategy. This will absolutely not happen with “all water purveyors” in the county, and staff time and money need not be wasted exploring it.
- Replace this Strategy with efforts to secure bilateral agreements with such Cities and other agencies that would be willing to form partnerships with the County. “One size does not fit all.” And some agencies would be much more reluctant to partner with the County than others. (It may be unfortunate but is certain that some Cities incorporated primarily to go a different direction from County government.) But other agencies, some Cities and some CSDs, possibly some PUC-regulated water companies, would just as certainly explore agreements that were either bilateral or extended to more than two agencies that shared a common aquifer.

- Add another Implementation Strategy:
“All Implementation Strategies shall be quantified for amount of water saved per dollar spent (e.g., City of SLO and Nipomo CSD). Little or no money or staff time will continue to be devoted to strategies that cannot demonstrate significant quantifiable water savings.”

Policy WR 4.2 Water pricing structures

Support water-pricing structures to encourage conservation by individual water users (WRM8) and will seek to expand the use of conservation rate structures in areas with Levels of Severity II and III for water supply.

- Replace the word “individual” with “...ALL water users...” (Institutional water users must be included.)
- Add new Implementation Strategy (WR 4.2.2?):
Government and school agencies shall also report annually on success of their conservation efforts.

Implementation Strategy WR 4.3.1

Invite University and community collaboration on water conservation demonstration projects at County facilities such as the replacement of the lawn at the County Courthouse with a native landscape and expansion of water conservation landscaping at regional park facilities.

- Delete this Implementation Strategy. County facilities should be treated even-handedly with other county-wide efforts, not treated specially. Other similar sites are schools, libraries, military bases, parks of all sorts, and golf courses. [Public safety concerns should exempt fire stations from some water use restrictions, though they have an exemplary history of careful water use. The same might apply to military bases.]

- “Native plants” should not be favored over other resilient plant species that are drought resistant and have low water requirements. [The issue in this section is water; not philosophy.]

10.17

Implementation Strategy WR 4.3.2

Reduce exterior and interior use of water in County-owned, -operated, or -financed facilities through efficient technologies, design and management practices, and other conservation efforts.

- Replace the words “exterior” and “interior” with “outdoor” and “indoor”; and add at the end: “For example, parks and golf courses.”

Policy WR 4.4 Reuse water

- Add Implementation Strategy:
Encourage and, where possible, mandate tertiary treatment of all wastewater.
- Add Implementation Strategy:
Begin and sustain a long-term effort to educate the public about the science, the health safety, and the necessity of recycling treated waste water for human consumption. Use of such water for playgrounds and parks, landscape vegetation, and food crops may be intermediate applications; but we must embrace the long-term necessity of using it for drinking water.

Policy WR 4.6 Graywater

Graywater use is problematic. Though some graywater enthusiasts champion the cause uncritically, there are serious health concerns that cannot be ignored if this use is to be adopted by the County.

- Some uses of “graywater” are justified, and no water should be wasted if it can be avoided.
- However, the County must require the most stringent public health policies regarding the use of graywater.
 - Will the County help fund the legal defense of contractors and developers who are sued by persons who suffer from health impacts from graywater contact?
 - Is County Counsel prepared to defend the Planning Department and the County in general in similar litigation?
- Implementation should include a long-term education effort to build support for the limited uses that are consistent with the State and Federal Health Codes.

p. 10.18

Policy WR 4.7 Low Impact Development

Require Low Impact Development (LID) practices in all discretionary and land division projects to reduce, treat, infiltrate, and manage urban runoff.

Some question exists as to whether the County is earnest about this requirement. As is, this policy lacks all essential detail.

- For example, how will County define and implement LID standards?
 - 1) For example, is the County prepared to approve residential subdivisions with curbs and gutters on only one side of the street?
 - 2) Will the County mandate the requirement for retention and detention ponds on residential parcels, to be mapped and recorded on title, and inspected annually?
 - 3) Will the County mandate along residential streets the replacement of clays and other soils with low porosity with other soils as a condition of subdivision all subdivision approvals?
 - 4) Will the County monitor riparian habitats and stream flows, and use them to deny building elsewhere in the watershed?

LID is a powerful planning tool, but its use is complex and will require a major paradigm shift of planning standards wherever used. If the County is serious about adopting these practices (and the subcommittee would support that), the details will need to be fleshed out and the standards must be adopted as mandatory for all discretionary land use decisions.

Policy WR 4.8 Efficient irrigation

- Fluff. {Fluff is OK sometimes, and this bit of cotton candy would not spoil the document.)

Policy WR 5.1 Watershed approach

The County will consider watersheds and groundwater basins in its approach to managing water resources in order to include ecological values and economic factors in water resources development. (WRM1 revised)

- Add the word “entire” and phrase “including across county lines”:

“The county will consider **entire** watersheds and groundwater basins, **including those that extend across county lines** in its approach....”

Implementation Strategy WR 5.1.1

Support development and implementation of watershed management plans for all key watersheds in the county in collaboration with resource conservation districts, water purveyors, cities, and landowners. Watershed management plans should incorporate the information contained in the County’s Source Water Assessments (SWAs) and Watershed Sanitary Surveys (WSSs), and should also include:

- Add language: "... for all key watersheds in the county, **including across county lines**, in collaboration with..."

10.19

Policy WR 5.2 Climate change

The County will consider ongoing research on long-term changes in climate and precipitation patterns in the county and region in its approach to managing water resources.

- Change to: "The County will consider ongoing research on long-term changes in climate and precipitation patterns in the county and region **consistent with State law.**"

Policy WR 5.6 Cumulative impacts to watersheds

Identify mitigation strategies or programs at the watershed, groundwater basin level, or a portion thereof that address cumulative impacts within watersheds, groundwater basins or in portions of watersheds or groundwater basins in coordination with cities and watershed managers.

- Delete "or in portions of watersheds," and insert "or" to read: "...at the watershed or groundwater basin level that address cumulative impacts..."
- Delete the comma after watersheds in line 3 and "or in portions of watersheds or groundwater basins" and add language to read: "...cumulative impacts within watersheds or groundwater basins in coordination with cities, watershed managers **and, where applicable, adjoining counties.**"

p. 10.20

Policy WR 5.7

- Errata: Replace “affects” with “effects” in subsections 2) and 4); renumber duplicate 5) to 6).

10.22

Table WR 2

- Planning Areas need to be replaced by Watersheds.
- Adelaida: The watersheds need to be correctly delineated. Some “Site Names” belong in other watersheds. Adelaida is in two watersheds.
- Huasna-Lopez incorrectly includes Twitchell Dam and the Cuyama River.
- Erratum: “Las Pilitas” is the correct spelling.
- North Coast designation does not respect separate watersheds. Each creek named is a separate watershed.
- South County Coastal and South County Inland are in the same groundwater basin and same watershed, but Nipomo Creek and its tributaries are only in the Inland portion.

p. 10.25

- Add new Implementation Strategy (6.5.3?):

Map, require their recording on titles, and monitor retention detention basins every 3 years. [By all means avoid 4- or 5-year intervals, which could be undermined by prescription.]

Appendix 8

Appendix 8.1 Setting

- This section lacks information about historic rainfall and renders the section fairly useless. The information given is more political and legislative—interesting but not helpful for assessing the physical context.

- This section would benefit from a graph of 30 years of rainfall and population figures for each watershed.

Appendix 8 WPA Table A8.-2 [pages 8.11-12]

- This table left out “Riparian Demand”, which is an essential inclusion, as in the County’s Water Planning Area (WPA) reports. Also, a map that delineated the boundaries of Water Planning Areas would be important. The Water Planning Areas should coincide with the underlying aquifer. Also, the table should add population numbers so per capita usage can be compared and information on the number ag acres the ag use represents.

Riparian Demands may not be completed for this update, but the WRAC suggests a three-step plan for bring the COSE into compliance by the next update:

- 1) Report as much data from all stream gauges countywide that have records.
- 2) Make a list of all significant areas that do not have stream gauges or data collected and that should.
- 3) Formulate and commit to a 5-year schedule for placing stream gauges in streams that should have them. [Critical stream data can take years to accumulate and data become really useful after 5-10 years, so we must begin as soon as possible.]

p. Appendix 8.10

- Level of Severity projections in years need to be extended in response to real timetables that current projects require. Suggested changes:
 - o Level of Severity I: When projected demand over 9 [change to 15] years equals or exceeds the estimated dependable supply.
 - o Level of Severity II: When projected water demand over the next 7 [change to 10] years equals or exceeds the estimated dependable supply.
 - o Level of Severity III: When projected water demand equals or exceeds the estimated dependable supply [and can be supplemented in less than 10 years].

TO: Water Resources Advisory Committee
FROM: James Caruso, SLO County Planning
DATE: February 4, 2009
SUBJECT: Agenda Item #5: Resource Management System Annual Summary Report

Recommendation

Review the Annual Summary Report of the Resource Management System and approve formal comments to the Board of Supervisors during the February WRAC meeting.

Discussion

The Annual Summary Report (ASR) of the Resource Management System (RMS) will be distributed to WRAC members and will be available to the general public on Monday, January 2, 2009. The WRAC will have January and February meetings to discuss the ASR's content, format and analysis and to make recommendations to the Board. The Board of Supervisors will consider the ASR and the WRAC recommendations later in February 2009.

ASR format changes were started last year. The 2007 ASR was published in a color booklet format that focused on problems and issues. The services that did not have a recommended level of severity were summarized in the appendix. Continued changes have been made to the 2008 report. The ASR is organized by sub-region (South County, North County Inland and North Coast) and by communities within each sub-region. Each incorporated city and unincorporated community has its own section that includes all the services tracked by the RMS: water, sewer, roads, schools and air quality. The more regional services such as schools and air quality are found at the end of the sub-regional section.

The population forecast portion of the report has been expanded. Each city and community has population data and a population forecast from the years 2000 to 2020.

Comments Received

The following comments have been received by Public Works Department staff since January, 7, 2009.

Dylan Wade, Morro Bay

On page 41 paragraph 1 it reads:

The city consists of ten square miles... Please change to "The City consists of six square miles..."

On page 41 paragraph 2 it reads:

A major wastewater treatment level upgrade is needed to bring the treatment plant up to tertiary treatment level. This level of treatment will allow the effluent to be part of the City's water sources.

Please revise to "A major wastewater treatment level upgrade is being pursued to bring the treatment plant up to the tertiary treatment level. This level of treatment will facilitate the use of effluent as part of the City's water sources."

On page 42 Water Supply it reads:

The City receives water from a variety of sources: groundwater from El Chorro Creek, State water via the Morro Bay pipeline and desalinated sea water.

Please change to "The City receives water from a variety of sources: groundwater from Morro and El Chorro Creek underflows, State water via the Chorro Valley pipeline and desalinated sea water."

On page 42 Water Supply Morro Bay Total Water Use Table

The data for 2008 is incorrect and leads to incorrect projections. Usage from July 07 to June 08 was 1419.5 af not 1236.4 as shown. Please revise the table and projections accordingly.

On page 43 Sewage Section it reads:

The wastewater effluent can be used as part of the City's water supply at that treatment level.

Please change to "The wastewater effluent can potentially be used as part of the City's water supply at that treatment level."

Bruce Buel, NCSD

I presume that you will revised the Table of Contents (page 2) and the Charts on Pages 4 and 5.

Following are comments on the Nipomo Mesa Section of the Rough Draft Annual Report:

Page 16 – The two charts do not agree with each other and neither chart agrees with the number set forth in the text.

Page 17 – The chart in the lower left side appears to represent Purveyor Production. TOTAL water use on the Mesa exceeded 10,500af in 2007.

- The Cost of Water 2008 chart in the lower right hand site appears to be an averaging of the four major purveyor's rates. This should be footnoted or explained.

Sue Luft

I have some comments regarding the 2008 Annual Report.

I like the new format better, although the general discussion needs to be added back in. (This was mentioned at the WRAC meeting.) The discussion of water quality and water levels needs to be included. A number of the smaller communities (Creston, Garden Farms, etc.) also need to be discussed.

Tables I and II are missing data, which I imagine you are aware of.

The introduction to North County (page 48) should include some discussion of water as a regional resource.

In the discussion on Paso Robles (page 53), you might mention the groundwater management plan which is in progress (this is mentioned in the Shandon section). Also, a discussion of the overall groundwater basin capacity and the annual withdrawals would be helpful.

Templeton's population is low compared to TCSD numbers. On page 2-8 of the November 2005 Water Master Plan, TCSD states that the current population (in 2005) was 6,417 persons. The LAFCO Municipal Service Review for TCSD (February 2006), on page 3-1, lists the population at

5,298 in 2003 and a growth rate of 5% for the years 1990 through 2001. The LAFCO report (on page 3-9) states that Templeton's population is 6,417 in February, 2006. I understand that Templeton's population is currently around 6,900. TCSD would be the best source for this information. The graph on page 67 should be adjusted to reflect the population numbers.

On page 65, in the discussion on Shandon, there is a statement regarding groundwater banking. The study has been completed and groundwater banking is not currently being pursued. There is also a typo on this page, re: Highway 46.

Broader, future changes in the RMS:

The criteria for Level of Severity for water supply are not appropriate for the current realities. The jump from a LOS II to III (from 7 to zero years) does not allow adequate warning for planning and construction of water delivery facilities. An even bigger issue is that water supply cannot be provided within the longer 9 year period (LOS I) if such supply does not exist. These criteria conflict with the definitions. For example, a Level I "occurs when sufficient lead time exists either to expand the capacity of the resource, or to decrease the rate at which the resource is being depleted".

Rural areas outside of CSDs are not addressed very well by the RMS. For example, we live in the rural El Pomar area. Most of the area is served by individual wells which draw water from the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin. We are located in a watershed that discharges to the Salinas River, however, we are not in the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin. Wells in our area are drilled into fractured shale which is not well mapped. Well levels in our area have been dropping in recent time. Areas west of Paso Robles are similarly not well mapped.

I look forward to discussing revisions to the RMS system in the near future.

TO: Water Resources Advisory Committee

FROM: Syllas Cranor, SLO County Water Resources Engineer

DATE: February 4, 2009

SUBJECT: Agenda Item #6: Laetitia Ranch Development DEIR

The Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Laetitia Agricultural Cluster Subdivision is complete and available for public review and comment. The DEIR addresses the environmental impacts that may be associated with the request to subdivide twenty-one parcels (approximately 1,910 acres) into 106 lots, including 102 residential lots and four open space lots.

The Laetitia Ranch Development DEIR subcommittee initially reviewed and commented on the DEIR documents and Cleath water studies via email. On January 12, 2009 the committee visited the project site on the Laetitia Ranch conducted by Allison Donatello, project designer RRM; Vic Montgomery RRM; and Spencer Harris, hydrologist Cleath & Assoc. The comments and concerns expressed in the attached report are the result of a follow up subcommittee meeting and correspondence via email.

Consensus of the subcommittee was to present the attached comments to the WRAC at the February 4, 2009 meeting for consideration, possible changes, and adoption.

WRAC Subcommittee Report on Laetitia Ranch Development DEIR

The Laetitia Ranch Project subcommittee initially reviewed and commented on the DEIR documents and Cleath water studies via email. On January 12, 2009 the committee visited the project site on the Laetitia Ranch conducted by Allison Donatello, project designer RRM; Vic Montgomery RRM; and Spencer Harris, hydrologist Cleath & Assoc. The comments and concerns expressed in this report are the result of a follow up subcommittee meeting and correspondence via email.

A. CONCERNS OVER THE PROJECT DESCRIPTION IN THE EIR

The currently published DEIR does not include important changes that were submitted by the developer.

During the site tour the subcommittee members learned that several parts of the project had been altered.

(1) Two well sites had been relocated on the project maps so as to remove possible water impact on Los Berros Creek.

(2) The horse facilities had been removed from the project to avoid any pollution or water contamination of creeks.

We need to have a SEIR or addendum published that includes all of the changes before we can submit our final comments.

B. CONCERN OVER CALCULATIONS THAT DETERMINE WATER NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The number of proposed homes appears to be excessive and it seems the DEIR cannot find justification for the 100+ units. The number of residences entitled depends on how intensively the land is being farmed and if the Ag wells failed, their entitlements would decrease (unless the wells failed after homes were built).

We have a concern that in developing their water calculations there has been a commingling of Ag use and home use. In an Ag cluster the homes must not diminish the water available for Ag during drought conditions. Conservation measures listed by the applicant include reduction or periodic cessation of agricultural irrigation (V-52). We need an analysis of the impacts of the proposed residences on Laetitia's own Ag water supply.

C. CONCERNS FOR SUSTAINABLE WATER

The greatest single weakness in the Laetitia project is that the water supply is uncertain. Even though the Cleath water studies show an adequate supply for the project is available now, the difficult question is whether there will be water to sustain it for 20 years.

It is known that wells in fractured shale often go dry suddenly. The subcommittee does not share the confidence that there is sufficient protection for the homeowners for a

sustainable water supply if left on their own without the continuity of stable water management.

While agriculture can more easily survive and adjust as necessary to water availability, water to homes is an absolute necessity. A resident-owned mutual water company would have little recourse, great liability, and great expense providing water; therefore, the property owner (Laetitia Ranch/Winery) should retain ownership and the responsibility to provide adequate water to the properties for at least a twenty-year period. If the water supply proved to be sustainable after sufficient time, Laetitia would be free to divest themselves of it without charge to the homeowners.

D. CONCERNS FOR CREEKS AND ENVIRONMENT

The developer stated that the two new wells located just above Los Berros Creek would not be used for this project. The EIR should clearly state that any new well in that area should not be used unless it can be proven that they are not affecting flows in Los Berros Creek to the detriment of wildlife.

Although Adobe Creek was dry when we visited the site, the presence of vegetation indicates that there is underground water available at all times. This is a likely habitat area for species that needs to remain viable. Pumping from the proposed upstream wells should not alter that balance.

E. CONCERNS FOR WASTEWATER TREATMENT OPERATION

There is evidence in the South County that small package wastewater plants of this sort are most expensive to operate - and carry greater regulatory liability - than 100 homes could operate economically. Laetitia should be required to retain ownership of the facility for the same period that they own the water company charging the residents no more than a price to be contracted for.

F. OTHER CONCERNS EXPRESSED BY INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS

Have the possible consequences of the development's water use on other neighboring properties to the South been fully studied and shown to have no significant impact?

Respectfully submitted,

Members of the Subcommittee:

Bill Garfinkel, Chair

Michael Winn

Dave Chipping

Marilee Hyman

Submitted: January 25, 2009

TO: Water Resources Advisory Committee
FROM: San Miguel Ranch DEIR Subcommittee
DATE: February 4, 2009
SUBJECT: Agenda Item #7: San Miguel Ranch DEIR

The San Miguel Ranch Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) is for a General Plan Amendment to rezone 550 acres of agricultural land to residential and commercial uses. Comments on the DEIR need to be submitted by February 11, 2009.

San Miguel Ranch DEIR review subcommittee met on January 15, 2009. Members are Steve Sinton (District 1), Ray Allen (Ag at large), Mike Ellison (San Miguel CSD), Dan O'Grady (District 5), and subcommittee chair Sue Luft (Environmental at large).

The members reviewed the Water and Wastewater section of the DEIR and the associated documents. This project is within the scope of the WRAC's mission since it involves some water policy issues.

Consensus of the subcommittee was to present the attached comments to the WRAC at the February 4, 2009 meeting for consideration for submittal to the Board of Supervisors with a copy to the Planning Department.

DRAFT – for review by WRAC

February 4, 2009

Honorable Bruce Gibson
Chairman, Board of Supervisors
County of San Luis Obispo
976 Osos Street
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408-2040

Subject: Water Resources Advisory Committee Comments on Water
Sections of Draft Environmental Impact Report for San Miguel
Ranch

Dear Chairman Gibson:

The San Luis Obispo County Water Resources Advisory Committee (WRAC) formed an ad hoc subcommittee to review and comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the San Miguel Ranch. At its February 4, 2009 meeting, the WRAC voted to submit this letter and the attached detailed comments.

The San Miguel Ranch DEIR indicates that the project will result in a decrease in aquifer storage of between 5,393 and 5,554 acre-ft, however, the potential impacts to groundwater are listed as less than significant. The subcommittee has a number of concerns with this conclusion as discussed below.

The project violates Ag Policy 11, GM9 of the Conservation Element, and Policy WR 1.6 of Draft Conservation and Open Space Element since groundwater which should be reserved for agriculture is impacted. These policies are listed at the end of this document for convenience.

The Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Study shows the basin to be in decline at “buildout”. Since the applicant is requesting a General Plan Amendment, the impacts of this project on the basin were not included in the “buildout” numbers. This project will add further to the decline in an already impacted groundwater basin.

The threshold for groundwater impacts was evaluated based on drawdown in existing wells within 0.25 mile from the project site. This short distance seems arbitrary and may not be adequate to evaluate the impact on the basin. Further, this evaluation does not determine whether the threshold of “substantially deplete groundwater supplies” is exceeded.

Water use by residences appears to be underestimated when compared to other agency documents.

Detailed page-by-page comments are attached.

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

Respectfully,

Michael Winn
Chairman, Water Resources Advisory Committee

cc: SLO County Board of Supervisors w/attachments
Steve McMasters, SLO County Planning w/attachments

Attachment: Detailed Comments on DEIR from WRAC ad hoc Subcommittee

San Miguel Ranch DEIR – Detailed Comments from WRAC Subcommittee

Comments on Section 4.14 – Water and Wastewater

4.14-1. “In general, groundwater recharge in the Paso Robles Formation comes primarily from subsurface flows through the Salinas River alluvium.”

This statement is incorrect and should be revised since the Paso Robles Formation is recharged by numerous streams and watersheds, including the Estrella River and Huer Huero Creek.

The existing environmental setting should be expanded to include the entire Paso Robles Groundwater Basin, including the northern portion of the basin within Monterey County. Impacts should be evaluated within this larger area.

4.14-8. The draft 2008 Annual Resource Summary Report lists a Level of Severity II for the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin, due to growth of the pumping depression. We understand that a Resource Capacity Study is being performed for the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin. The data and results of this study should be reviewed and incorporated into the DEIR.

4.14-10, 11, and 12. The impacts from the construction of the proposed water treatment or distribution facilities do not appear to have been analyzed. Therefore, the conclusion of a Class III impact is not justified.

4.14-10 and Table 4.14A. An existing on-site well, the North Well, is proposed to be improved to provide a minimum capacity of 500 gpm to the project. However, this well will not satisfy the 540 gpm peak hour demand that is listed in the table.

Water use appears to be underestimated, and should be reviewed. The residential usage numbers are substantially less than those used in other analyses. The WRAC subcommittee reviewed a readily available document for comparison. Listed in the table below are project water demand numbers from the Templeton CSD’s Water Master Plan, dated November 2005, compared to the San Miguel DEIR water demand values, as an example.

Projected Water Demand Based on Land Use (in acre-ft/yr per unit)

Land Use Category	San Miguel DEIR	Templeton CSD
RR	$2.0/4=0.50$	1.04
RS	$11.6/23=0.50$	1.08
RSF	$124.7/318=0.39$	0.64
RMF	$14.8/44=0.34$	0.24
Total AFY for units in San Miguel DEIR	153.1	243.1

Page 4.14-14. "The landowner of the Development project site already has rights to the water supply from the North Well, which would be transferred to the San Miguel CSD if San Miguel CSD were to accept the North Well into its water supply system." However, no evidence of a contract or memorandum of agreement or other legally enforceable document with San Miguel CSD is provided.

The DEIR is correct that the land owner already has overlying water rights to the water supply from the North Well. However, when those rights are transferred to the CSD, they become "municipal" in nature and are no longer entitled to be considered overlying. The California Supreme Court has ruled that these municipal rights are appropriative the moment the water enters the public system. Therefore, the land owner's rights become reduced to an appropriative water right that is junior to all surrounding overlying right holders the moment the CSD takes over the well and begins using it for municipal purposes. Only CSD water that is used on CSD land for irrigation would retain the overlying priority. Theoretically, once the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin reaches overdraft, the CSD's use of the North Well is subject to enforced reduction in use to accommodate the prior rights of the overlying landowners' uses.

Page 4.14-15 through 4.14-17. No evidence is provided that construction of wastewater facilities and wastewater transmission lines will not cause significant environmental effects.

Threshold 4.14.4. No analysis of the impacts of construction of the water treatment plant expansion were found in this portion of the DEIR. Therefore, the conclusion of a Class III impact is not justified. Furthermore, the proposed expansion of the plant to 400,000 gpd will not meet the projected demand of 441,523 gpd at buildout.

Threshold 4.14.5. "Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level."
The first part of this threshold – whether the project will substantially deplete groundwater supplies - has not been evaluated. In the case of an aquifer that is in decline, any decrease in aquifer storage is a negative impact that should be mitigated.

Page 4.14-16. Since the water treatment plant expansion is considered part of the project, it must be analyzed in this EIR. However, the DEIR offers scant analysis and instead proposes to defer development of the necessary information about the plant expansion until later and then let the plant owner, San Miguel CSD, determine whether the impacts were fully analyzed in this EIR and whether additional review would be necessary. This approach does not comply with CEQA.

The DEIR dismisses the necessary analysis of the timing of the water treatment plant expansion by saying it is not “anticipated until Phase II or Phase III of the proposed project.” But this statement is not supported by any analysis with numbers and dates that includes the impacts of wastewater generated by other projects that may be built in San Miguel. This is another reason why the expansion of the plant must be fully analyzed in this EIR.

Page 4.14-17 and 18. Under Scenarios A and B, the 4,000 acre-ft difference between pumping and storage is stated as being due to recharge from the Salinas River alluvium. In the case of the Salinas River, any decrease in downstream flow is a negative impact that should be mitigated.

Page 4.14-18. “There are no federal, State, or local thresholds that allow a quantitative evaluation of the project's potential drawdown impacts; therefore the following analysis of drawdown impacts is a qualitative evaluation.”
A threshold for an acceptable drawdown, particularly the impact on neighboring wells and agricultural operations, should be established.

The conclusion that “potential impacts related to groundwater levels and production rates of preexisting wells would be less than significant” may not be accurate and is an unsupported assertion.

Page 4.14-19. Cumulative impacts for water were only reviewed within 0.25 mile of the project site. The impacts on the entire Paso Robles Groundwater Basin and on the surrounding agriculture need to be evaluated. Any cumulative impact on water should be mitigated. Since no single project by itself could ever significantly decrease water levels in the extensive Paso Robles Groundwater Basin, the DEIR conclusion that cumulative impacts due to just this project are less than significant is a logical fallacy..

Page 4.14-20. The statement that cumulative water and wastewater impacts would be less than significant does not appear to be justified since the cumulative impacts of the wastewater facilities have not been analyzed, and the impact on water has only been evaluated for the short distance of 0.25 mile from the project site.

The statement that “all of potential impacts related to water supply, treatment, and distribution facilities would be less than significant prior to mitigation” should be revised for the reasons stated above.

Mitigation measures should include the suggested measures listed in the Water Resources Evaluation, as follows.

- Establishment of a comprehensive groundwater monitoring program in and around San Miguel Ranch.

- Implementation of water conservation and water use efficiency methods to residential, landscape, and crop water uses.
- Importation of surface water supplies.

Mitigation Measure 4.14.1. Recommend clarifying the wording of the measure as follows: Water Treatment capacity. Issuance of construction permits for each phase of development on the San Miguel Ranch Development project site shall be contingent upon the prior submission by the project applicant of a letter plus supporting calculations from the San Miguel Community Services District (CSD) to the County of San Luis Obispo Department of Planning and Building proving that sufficient wastewater treatment capacity is on line as a result of expansion of the CSD Wastewater Treatment Plant and available to serve that phase of the development.

Comment on Section 4.4 - Ag Resources, related to water

Page 4.4-39. To the contrary, the proposed project is inconsistent with Agricultural Policy 11 since groundwater which should be reserved for agriculture is impacted..

Comment on Section 4.15 – Hydrology and Water Quality

Water softeners which recharge onsite are not currently allowed within San Miguel CSD due to the impact on the discharge from the wastewater treatment plant. The EIR must state that this restriction must apply to the project.

Comments on Water Resources Evaluation

Page 11. “As a requirement for annexation of the Ranch into the CSD, at least one water well capable of yielding 750 gpm is needed on the project site . . .” Section 4.14, on page 4.14-10 states that an existing on-site well, the North Well, will be improved to provide a minimum capacity of 500 gpm to the project.

Page 14. “For the future scenario . . . the natural hydrology from 1981 to 1997 was repeated twice to provide a reasonable representation of future fluctuations of climate”. Past climate data may not be representative of future conditions, particularly with the impact of climate change.

Figure 4 in the Update for the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin, dated December 2007, shows annual rainfall at Paso Robles for the years 1957 through 2007. This figure clearly shows that a few years have much higher than average rainfall. Removing these occasional high rainfall years from the total rainfall would result in a much lower average rainfall value. The rainfall data used in the Water Resources Evaluation should be reviewed.

Applicable SLO County Policies – For Information

AGP11 – Agricultural Water Supplies states:

- Maintain water resources for production agriculture, both in quality and quantity, so as to prevent the loss of agriculture due to competition for water with urban and suburban development.
- Do not approve proposed general plan amendments or rezonings that result in increased residential density or urban expansion if the subsequent development would adversely affect: (1) water supplies and quality, or (2) groundwater recharge capability needed for agricultural use.

GM9 of the Conservation Element states:

- Priority should be given in meeting the needs of agricultural operations in water resources management. Agricultural water supplies should be protected from usurpation by incompatible development through land use controls.

Policy WR 1.6 of Draft COSE – Agricultural operations

- Groundwater management strategies will give priority to agricultural operations. Protect agricultural water supplies from competition by incompatible development through land use controls.



Michael Winn
<mwwinn@sbcglobal.net>

01/22/2009 10:12 PM

Please respond to
mwwinn@sbcglobal.net

To "David H. Chipping" <dchippin@calpoly.edu>
cc "Benedix, Dean" <dbenedix@co.slo.ca.us>, "Cranor, Syllas"
<scrantor@co.slo.ca.us>
bcc
Subject Re: Fwd: [CNPS Alllistings] FW: Model Water Efficient
Landscape Ordinance - Notice on Status of the Proposed
Rulemaking

Thank you, David. I will forward it to Public Works to get it included in our staff report for the WRAC meeting February 4.

Mike

David H. Chipping wrote:

> Mike: Thanks for the climate reference. Here is something from me to you that might be worth mentioning at WRAC.
> Dave C
>
> ----- Forwarded Message -----
> From: "Amanda Jorgenson" <ajorgenson@cnps.org>
> To: alllistings@cnps.org
> Sent: Wednesday, January 21, 2009
> Subject: Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance - Notice on Status of the Proposed Rulemaking
>
> FYI-Amanda
>
> From: MWEO [mailto:mweo@water.ca.gov]
> Sent: Wednesday, January 21, 2009 10:12 AM
> To: MWEO
> Subject: Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance - Notice on Status of the Proposed Rulemaking
> Importance: High
>
> Please see PDF attachment for an update on the Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance.
>
> This information is posted on the DWR Model Ordinance website at <http://www.owue.water.ca.gov/landscape/ord/updatedOrd.cfm/#status>
>
> In addition, public comments received during the extended 15-day comment period (November 26, 2008 to December 30, 2008) are also posted on the FTP site at <ftp://ftp.water.ca.gov/Model-Water-Efficient-Landscape-Ordinance/Written-Comments-Extended-15-day-Comment-Period/>
>
> We apologize for any duplicate email messages from mweo@water.ca.gov .
>
>
>
> Thanks.
>
> Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance Team
>
> State of California
>

> Department of Water Resources
>
> Office of Water Use Efficiency & Transfers
>
> P.O. BOX 942836
>
> Sacramento CA 94236-001
>
> Email Address: mweo@water.ca.gov
>
>
>
> Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance website
>
> <http://www.owue.water.ca.gov/landscape/ord/ord.cfm>
>
>

TO: Water Resources Advisory Committee
FROM: John Diodati, Department Administrator
VIA: Paavo Ogren, Director of Public Works
DATE: February 4, 2009
SUBJECT: Agenda Item #10.a: Integrated Regional Water Management

Recommendation

Review and discuss the draft Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) required for Proposition 84 grant funding.

Discussion

The County of San Luis Obispo Public Works Department, through the San Luis Obispo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, has taken the lead on applying for Proposition 84 Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) grant funding. The funding guidelines have still not been released, but the Department of Water Resources (DWR) has announced that an MOU that establishes “governance” (i.e. how the revised IRWM plan will be adopted) will be required in order to apply for Proposition 84 grant funds. All member agencies of the WRAC are parties of San Luis Obispo County’s IRWM, and the more who adopt the MOU, the more competitive our Proposition 84 application will be.

In order to qualify for grant funding, staff has provided a draft MOU for your consideration. The attached MOU utilizes the WRAC for plan adoption. We anticipate that the County Board of Supervisors will be considering this MOU on February 24, 2009. A final MOU will be brought to the WRAC at your March 4, 2009 meeting, and staff requests you take the MOU to your agencies for adoption. In addition to this master MOU, each agency which applies for Proposition 84 funding is expected to need to develop a project specific MOU, but as previously stated, final guidelines have not been published.

Other Agency Involvement/Impact

The Department of Water Resources has assisted staff in understanding the expedited funding round and the required MOU document.

San Luis Obispo County
Integrated Regional Water Management Plan
Memorandum of Mutual Understandings

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) is to establish the mutual understandings between San Luis Obispo County Region partners with respect to their joint efforts towards developing an Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP) for the San Luis Obispo County Region that will establish a unified vision of the relationships between individual goals of water quality improvement, ecosystem preservation, water supply protection, ground water management, and flood management.

2. DEFINITIONS

2.1 Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP). A comprehensive plan for a defined geographic area, in this case the San Luis Obispo County Region, the specific development, content, and adoption of which shall satisfy requirements of California's IRWM Program and relevant codes. At a minimum, an IRWMP describes the major water-related objectives and conflicts within a region, considers a broad variety of water management strategies, identifies the appropriate mix of water demand and supply management alternatives, water quality protections, and environmental stewardship actions to provide long-term, reliable, and high-quality water supply and protect the environment, and identifies disadvantaged communities in the region and takes the water-related needs of those communities into consideration.

2.2 San Luis Obispo County Region (Region). The geographic area, which is coterminous with the San Luis Obispo County and the San Luis Obispo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District boundary, covered by the IRWMP.

2.3 Local Agency. Any city, county, city and county, special district, joint powers authority, or other political subdivision of the state, a public utility as defined in Section 216 of the Public Utilities Code, or a mutual water company as defined in Section 2725 of the Public Utilities Code.

2.4 Regional Water Management Group (RWMG). A group in which three or more local agencies, at least two of which have statutory authority over water supply or water management, as well as those other persons who may be necessary for the development and implementation of an IRWMP, participate by means of a joint powers agreement, memorandum of understanding, or other written agreement, as appropriate, that is approved by the governing bodies of those local agencies. The Region's RWMG Members are signatories to this MOU and may designate a representative to participate in RWMG activities.

2.5 Regional Projects or Programs. Projects or programs to be implemented by signatories of this MOU identified in an IRWMP that accomplish any of the following:

- (a) Reduce water demand through agricultural and urban water use efficiency.
- (b) Increase water supplies for any beneficial use through the use of any of the following, or other, means:
 - (1) Groundwater storage and conjunctive water management.
 - (2) Desalination.
 - (3) Precipitation enhancement.
 - (4) Water recycling.
 - (5) Regional and local surface storage.
 - (6) Water-use efficiency.
 - (7) Stormwater management.
- (c) Improve operational efficiency and water supply reliability, including conveyance facilities, system reoperation, and water transfers.
- (d) Improve water quality, including drinking water treatment and distribution, groundwater and aquifer remediation, matching water quality to water use, wastewater treatment, water pollution prevention, and management of urban and agricultural runoff.
- (e) Improve resource stewardship, including agricultural lands stewardship, ecosystem restoration, flood plain management, recharge area protection, urban land use management, groundwater management, water-dependent recreation, fishery restoration, including fish passage improvement, and watershed management.
- (f) Improve flood management through structural and nonstructural means, or by any other means.

2.6 Regional Reports or Studies. Reports or studies relating to any of the matters described in 3.5 (a) to (f), that are identified in the IRWMP.

2.7 Service Function. A water-related individual service function provided by an agency, i.e. water supply, water quality, wastewater, recycled water, water conservation, stormwater/flood control, watershed planning, and aquatic habitat protection and restoration.

2.8 Integration. Assembling into one document the water-related management strategies, projects and plans in the Region. The first phase would be to identify water management strategies for the region and the priority projects that demonstrate how these strategies work together to provide reliable water supply, protect or improve water quality, provide watershed protection and planning, and provide environmental restoration protection. Projects and plans would be categorized and opportunities to identify regional benefits of linkages between multiple water management strategies among projects and plans of separate service functions and to see where projects and plans of separate service functions may further interrelate, e.g. wastewater treatment and water recycling or habitat restoration.

2.9 Water Resources Advisory Committee (WRAC). This is the committee comprised of water purveyor, resource conservation district,

environmental and agricultural representatives that was originally established in the 1940's to advise the Board of Supervisors for the San Luis Obispo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (District) on water resource issues. The WRAC meets monthly, with the exception of July and August, and is subject to the Brown Act. The members of the WRAC with the authority to enter into an MOU are the same agencies that would comprise a RWMG to support the region's IRWM planning efforts. Therefore, RWMG Members and other regional stakeholder groups participate in the IRWMP development process by way of presentations to the Water Resources Advisory Committee (WRAC).

3. GOALS OF THE IRWMP

The goals of the IRWMP are to without unfairly burdening communities, neighborhoods, or individuals:

- 3.1** Protect and improve water quality for beneficial uses consistent with regional interests and the Basin Plan in cooperation with local and state agencies and regional stakeholders.
- 3.2** Improve regional water supply reliability and security, reduce dependence on imported water, reduce water rights disputes and protect watershed communities from drought with a focus on interagency conjunctive use of regional water resources.
- 3.3** Protect, enhance and restore the region's natural resources including open spaces; fish, wildlife and migratory bird habitat; special status and native plants; wetlands; estuarine, marine, and coastal ecosystems; streams, lakes, and reservoirs; forests; and agricultural lands.
- 3.4** Monitor, protect, and improve the regions groundwater through a collaborative approach designed to reduce conflicts.
- 3.5** Develop, fund, and implement an integrated, watershed approach to flood management through a collaborative and community supported process.

4. IRWMP PROJECT PARTICIPANTS

Development and implementation of the Region's IRWMP is a collaborative effort undertaken by the RWMG. The RWMG is being led by the District, in partnership with other signatories to this MOU. The IRWMP will be developed in coordination with the WRAC. However, only regional projects and programs to be implemented by signatories to this MOU will be eligible for grant applications. The signatories entering into this MOU are specifying their shared intent to coordinate and collaborate on water management issues as expressed in Section 3. Goals of the IRWMP and in accordance with Section 5. Mutual Understandings. The signatories anticipate the potential need for future agreements on specific projects or programs that may be considered for grant applications.

5. MUTUAL UNDERSTANDINGS

5.1 Need for the Region’s IRWMP

5.1.1 To improve communication and cooperation between public and private agencies and minimize conflict-generated solutions.

5.1.2 To enhance our existing water management efforts by increasing stakeholder awareness of important issues, providing more opportunities for collaborative efforts and improving efficiencies in government and water management.

5.1.3 To qualify for state grants and other funding opportunities only available to those regions which have developed an IRWMP.

5.2 Subject matter scope of the IRWMP. The IRWMP focuses on water supply, water quality protection and improvement, ecosystem preservation and restoration, groundwater monitoring and management, and flood management as these are the most prevalent water resource issues facing the Region.

5.3 Geographical scope of the IRWMP. The Region for this memorandum is coterminous with the boundary of San Luis Obispo County. This is an appropriate geographic region for integrated regional water management planning because it encompasses all aspects of water management generally within the same physical, political, environmental, social, and economic boundaries.

The Salinas Valley Integrated Regional Water Management Plan region borders the Region to the north and the Santa Barbara County IRWMP region border the Region on the South. Coordination with agencies in Kern County developing an IRWMP region at the time of initial execution of this MOU will be important for identifying any water resources issues overlapping with the Region in the future.

Water resources issues that overlap with neighboring regional boundaries are either covered by existing cooperative water management plans (i.e. Nacitone Watershed Management Plan), adjudication (i.e. Santa Maria Groundwater Basin), and operational agreements (i.e. Nacimiento and Salinas Reservoirs), or there is no defining water resource management issue at this time (i.e. Kern County region boundary). All of these items are to be included in the Region’s IRWM Plan consistent with the IRWMPs of neighboring regions. The RWMG will continue to coordinate with neighboring regions to address additional water resources issues in our respective IRWMPs.

5.4 Approach to developing and implementing the IRWMP

5.4.1 Signatories. Signatories to this MOU, including the District, that make up the RWMG are responsible for the development of the IRWMP.

5.4.2 Lead Agency. The District will act as the lead agency, ultimately responsible for the final production of the Region’s IRWMP, presentations to stakeholders, submittal of IRWM grant applications, execution of grant agreements with the State, and execution of agreements with RWMG members responsible for the implementation of projects that are awarded grants.

5.4.3 RWMG Member Responsibilities. All members, in a timely fashion, will provide information sufficient to meet State guidelines for their regional projects and programs to be included in the IRWMP and participate in the review of the IRWMP. All Members will participate in the process to select IRWMP regional projects and programs for grant applications. Members responsible for the implementation of regional projects and programs awarded grant funding will be responsible, through contract with the District, for complying with the provisions of the District's grant agreement with the State. Members will provide the District with their designated representative's contact information. Members will adopt the IRWMP in accordance with 5.5 and 5.6 below.

5.4.4 Stakeholder Participation. RWMG Members and other regional stakeholder groups participate in the IRWMP development process by way of presentations to the Water Resources Advisory Committee (WRAC). Stakeholders that are not WRAC members will be notified of when an IRWMP item will be reviewed by the WRAC. Sub-regional meetings may be required to ensure all stakeholders, including disadvantaged communities, who may not necessarily be able to attend WRAC meetings, can participate in IRWMP development.

5.4.5 IRWMP Development and Implementation. The Region's IRWMP that was adopted by the District, developed in coordination with and approved by stakeholders in 2005, and updated in 2007, will be the basis for the next and subsequent adopted IRWMPs for the Region. The RWMG will propose changes to the previous versions of the IRWMP to comply with new State guidelines and incorporate new information and projects, for review and approval in accordance with 5.5 and 5.6 below. Since a key element of the IRWM Program is integration, the RWMG will work with other WRAC Members to identify water management strategies for the region and the priority projects that demonstrate how these strategies work together to protect and improve water quality; improve regional water supply reliability and security; protect, enhance and restore the region's natural resources; monitor, protect, and improve the region's groundwater; and develop, fund, and implement an integrated, watershed approach to flood management. Regional projects and programs would be categorized and opportunities to identify regional benefits of linkages between multiple water management strategies among projects and programs of separate service functions and to see where projects and programs of separate service functions may further interrelate, e.g. wastewater treatment and water recycling or habitat restoration.

5.5 Decision-making. The WRAC will serve as the main advisor to the RWMG on decisions to be made on the IRWMP. Written consensus will be sought between the representatives of RWMG members in the event the need for a decision arises that cannot be brought forth to the WRAC before a decision needs to be made.

5.6 Adoption of the IRWMP. IRWMP approval and adoption will occur by the governing bodies of RWMG Members. IRWMP updates to meet new State guidelines, add new RWMG Members, add or remove regional

projects and programs, or other updates to information do not require IRWMP re-adoption. Significant changes to the IRWMP, including revised goals and objectives, revised regional boundaries, or other changes deemed significant by the RWMG, will require re-adoption of the IRWMP.

5.7 Non-binding nature. This document and participation in this IRWMP effort are nonbinding, and in no way suggest that a RWMG Member may not continue its own planning and undertake efforts to secure project funding from any source. An agency may withdraw from participation at any time.

5.8 Personnel and financial resources. It is expected that RWMG members will contribute the resources necessary to fulfill the responsibilities in 5.4.3 above.

5.9 Other on-going regional efforts. Development of the IRWMP is separate from efforts of other organizations to develop water-related plans on a regional basis. As the IRWMP is developed, work products can be shared with these separate efforts to provide them with current information. Cooperative agreements between specific RWMG members for implementation of specific projects or programs are included as attachments to this MOU.

5.10 Reports and communications. The WRAC, an IRWM contact list and the District's website will serve as the forum for updates and correspondence relating to the development of the IRWMP.

5.11 Termination. Because the IRWMP will require periodic review and updating for use into the future, it is envisioned that the joint efforts of those involved will be ongoing in maintaining a living document. Thus this MOU will remain as a reflection of the understandings of the RWMG Members. As indicated, individual signatories of this MOU may terminate their involvement at any time.

6. SIGNATORIES TO THE MEMORANDUM OF MUTUAL UNDERSTANDINGS

We, the undersigned representatives of our respective agencies, acknowledge the above as our understanding of how the San Luis Integrated Regional Water Management Plan will be developed.

_____ signature
_____ printed name
_____ agency
_____ date

TO: Water Resources Advisory Committee

FROM: Syllas Cranor, SLO County Water Resources Engineer

DATE: February 4, 2009

SUBJECT: Agenda Item #10.d: Invasive Mussel Species

**San Luis Obispo County Regional Invasive Mussel Monitoring Program
Monthly Summary Report for January 2009**

Monitoring Site Inspections

Reservoir	Agency	No. of sites	Were all sites inspected?	Any confirmed positives?
Lopez Lake	CDFG	1	No	---
Lopez Lake	SLO Co. PWD	3	Yes	No
Lopez Terminal	SLO Co. PWD	1	Yes	No
Salinas	CDFG	1	No	---
Salinas	SLO Co. PWD	2	Yes	No
Cayucos	Whale Rock Reservoir	1	Yes	No
Nacimiento	CDFG/Mo. Co. Parks	1	Yes	No
Nacimiento	SLO Co. PWD/OSCA	1	Yes	No
Nacimiento	HRCSD/SLO Co. PWD	1	Yes	No
Nacimiento	Mo. Co. Parks/SLO Co. PWD	1	Yes	No
Nacimiento	Mo. Co. Parks/MCWRA	2	Yes	No
San Antonio	CDFG/Mo. Co. Parks	1	Yes	No
San Antonio	Mo. Co. Parks	1	Yes	No
Lake Cachuma	SB Co. Parks	10	Yes	No
Information compiled on 1/26/09.				

General notes on monitoring site inspections

1. A site inspection may include inspection of an artificial substrate and/or a surface survey (docks etc). At some sites a fairly extensive inspection is performed, at others it may be more limited.
2. For more information about invasive mussel monitoring at Lake Cachuma, contact Liz Mason-Gaspar, Park Naturalist, Santa Barbara County Parks Department, 805-688-4515, lmason@co.santa-barbara.ca.us.

**SUMMARY OF AQUATIC NUISANCE SPECIES BOAT INSPECTIONS
LOPEZ LAKE RECREATION AREA**

JANUARY 2009 (1/27/09)

Boats Entering Park	425
Total Inspected	127
Decontaminated	127
Returning tag	296
Rejected	2

Returning Tags: Boats with Lopez Lake or Santa Margarita Lake wire clear tag attached to boat and trailer. These boats have not been removed from trailer since last visit to lake and are not subject to inspection or decontamination.

Rejected boats are not permitted to enter the park and are not counted in the "Boats Entering Park" category.

Reasons for rejection:

Water in bilge/hull	1
Water in live well/bait tank	0
Internal ballast system	1
Debris on boat hull	0
Refused inspection	0

As of 1/27/09 no mussel species have been located on any vessel entering Lopez Lake.

Information compiled directly from boat inspection forms.

Prepared by Don Melin, Supervising Ranger- Lopez Lake Recreation Area
January 27, 2009.

INVASIVE MUSSEL PREVENTION REPORT
Santa Margarita Lake Recreation Area
San Luis Obispo County Parks

Period: December 26 through January 25, 2009

Vessel entry	339
Decontaminations	83
Returning tags	256
Rejected (disallowed entry) <i>Table below for breakdown</i>	0
Cabled at time of exit	308

Reasons for rejection:

Water in bilge/hull/ engine	0
Water in live well/bait tank	0
Internal ballast system	0
Debris on boat hull	0
Refused inspection	0

categories defined

Vessel entry: total vessels entering facility, summation of decontaminations and returning tags.

Decontaminations: +140 degree (F) water application to trailer, tow vehicle rear-end, vessel hull and internal vessel areas as required.

Returning tags: vessels with Santa Margarita Lake, Lopez Lake or Cachuma Lake stamped and sealed wire clear tag attached to vessel and trailer (ensures location of prior use). Not subject to decontamination procedure, only thorough inspection.

Rejected: these vessels are not permitted to enter the park due to unacceptable condition, and are not counted in the "Vessel entry" category.

Cabled at time of exit: stamped and sealed wire clear tag attached to vessel and trailer for re-entry at future date.

As of 1/25/09 no mussel species found at Santa Margarita Lake Inspection Station.
 Prepared by Santa Margarita Lake Recreation Area Staff, January 27, 2009.
 Submitted: to Lisa Wallender & Courtney Howard, 1-27-09 via email.

TO: Water Resources Advisory Committee

FROM: Syllas Cranor, SLO County Water Resources Engineer

DATE: February 4, 2009

SUBJECT: Agenda Item #10.e: Rainfall and Reservoir Update

Region	ALERT Precipitation Station	2007-08 Water Year (July '07 - June '08)	2008-09 Water Year Cumulative Total (July '08 - Current)	Average Annual Rainfall (in)	% of Annual Average
Santa Margarita	Santa Margarita (#723)	22.1	5.6	24	23%
San Luis Obispo	SLO Reservoir Gauge (#749)	20.2	4.7	24	20%
Lopez	Lopez Rec Area (#707)	17.3	3.9	23	17%
Atascadero	Atascadero (#711)	13.2	2.8	17	16%
Cambria	Santa Rosa at Main St. (# 717)	*11.0	3.8	22	17%

* Due to equipment malfunction, not all rainfall was recorded at this site.

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	January 28, 2009	733.7	800.0	101,623	30%
	January 28, 2008	758.2			
Lopez Reservoir	January 27, 2009	498.0	523.0	30,358	61%
	January 27, 2008	505.3			
Salinas Reservoir	January 28, 2009	1290.9	1300.7	17,380	73%
	January 28, 2008	1300.9			
Whale Rock Reservoir	January 28, 2009	187.3	216.0	25,612	63%
	January 28, 2008	196.9			
Twitchell Reservoir	January 26, 2009	525.0	651.5	0	0%