

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

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

Wednesday, May 6, 2009  
1:30 p.m.

---

1. **Introductions and Determination of a Quorum**
2. **Approval of April Meeting Minutes**
3. **Public Comment**
4. **Ongoing Updates:**
  - a. **County Resource Management System**
  - b. **Conservation and Open Space Element**
  - c. **Integrated Regional Water Management Program**
  - d. **Water Conservation Plans and Strategies Website Link**
  - e. **Invasive Mussels**
  - f. **Rainfall and Reservoir Update**
5. **County-wide Master Water Plan – Consideration of Mechanism for WRAC Involvement**
6. **WRAC Priorities**
7. **Consideration of the Fiscal Year 2009/10 San Luis Obispo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District Budget**
8. **Los Osos Community Wastewater Project Subcommittee Report**

**Future Agenda Items:**

- a. **County-wide Master Water Plan Goals and Objectives**
- b. **Paso Basin Resource Capacity Study**
- c. **Vineyard Water Conservation Practices**

*--- Adjourn by 3:30 pm ---*

**Next Regular Meeting:**      **June 3, 2009 at 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](http://www.slocountywater.org)**

**Purpose of the Committee:**

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

*Excerpts from WRAC By-Laws dated March, 6, 2007*

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

Meeting Minutes

April 1, 2009

---

An audio recording of the meeting and materials submitted during public comment are available online at [www.SLOCountyWater.org](http://www.SLOCountyWater.org).

Approximately 1:30 p.m., Chairperson Winn called the meeting to order.

- 1) Introductions of Members and Attendees - Quorum Established
- 2) Approval of December Meeting Minutes - The March 4, 2009 minutes were approved upon a first by Member Garfinkel, a second by Member Hyman, and a unanimous vote with one abstention.
- 3) Public Comment - Member Buel reports that the Nipomo CSD has published the Final EIR for the Waterline Intertie Project and the document is available to download at [www.ncsd.ca.gov](http://www.ncsd.ca.gov). Member Bianchi questions how reductions in State Water deliveries affect local State Water Subcontractors. A brief discussion ensues. Los Osos resident, Gwynn Taylor urges individuals and agencies to promote water conservation to reduce the risk of severe water shortages. Member Greening informs the WRAC of the upcoming Water Conservation information session at the Atascadero Lake Pavilion on Wednesday April 1, 2009.
- 4) Ongoing Updates:
  - a. IRWM - Dean Benedix, Utilities Division Manager reports that County staff is currently preparing the Regional Acceptance Process application for submission by the end of April.
  - b. Master Water Plan - Mr. Benedix reports that the MWP is set to go to the Board of Supervisors on April 14, 2009.
  - c. Invasive Mussels - Mr. Benedix reports that there have been no indications of any of monitored reservoirs. The County has asked the Nacimiento Commission to contribute \$25,000 towards developing the County Invasive Mussel Response Plan.
  - d. Rainfall and Reservoir Update - The Rainfall and Reservoir Update is included in the agenda packet.
- 5) Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Resource Capacity Study Update - James Caruso, Department of Planning and Building, discusses the status of the Resource Capacity Study (RCS). Mr. Caruso describes the some of the preliminary findings of the RCS. A brief discussion ensues regarding the difficulty of managing localized issues within the larger groundwater basin.

- 6) Consideration of Forming a Subcommittee to Review the Revisions to the Resource Management System - A motion to table this item until the May 6, 2009 meeting was moved and seconded with a unanimous vote and no abstentions.
- 7) Consideration of Forming a Subcommittee to Review the Water and Wastewater Impacts of Ag Clusters - Chairperson Winn briefly discusses some of the overlying water-related issues related to the development of Ag Clusters. Discussion ensues. A subcommittee to review the water and wastewater impacts of Ag clusters is formed upon a motion by Member Luft, a second by Member Winholtz and a unanimous vote in favor.
- 8) Consideration of Forming a Subcommittee to Review the Draft “Smart Growth” Revisions to the Framework for Planning General Plan Amendment - Chairperson Winn discusses the “Smart Growth” Revisions to the Framework for Planning and recommends that a subcommittee is formed to assess and comment on the broad impacts of the proposed revisions to the Framework for Planning. Chairperson Winn offers to chair the subcommittee, making it clear that the subcommittee would have to report to the Board before the WRAC met to approve their comments. The subcommittee was formed upon a motion by Member Winholtz, a second by Member Kelly and a vote with all but 1 in favor.
- 9) Review Pump Test Requirements - Syllas Cranor, Public Works Department Staff, discusses current pump test requirements for the County. Tim Cleath speaks to County ordinances requiring pump tests, pump test specifics, and offers other pump recommendations. Mr. Cleath provides Staff with a two-page memo that reviews pump test regulations. This memo is available online at [www.SLOCountyWater.org](http://www.SLOCountyWater.org). Discussion ensues.
- 10) Future Agenda Items - Brief Discussion

Meeting adjourned approximately 3:15 p.m.

---

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

Meeting Minutes

April 4, 2009

---

An audio and video recording of the meeting and materials submitted during public comment are available online at [www.SLOCountyWater.org](http://www.SLOCountyWater.org).

At approximately 8:30 a.m., Chairperson Winn called the meeting to order.

- 1) Introduction of Members - Quorum Established.
- 2) Staff Report - Paavo Ogren, Director of Public Works, introduces the project and project team to the WRAC. John Diodati, Department Administrator for Public Works, speaks to addressing project affordability. Mr. Ogren speaks to the project approach under Assembly Bill 2701 (Blakeslee, 2006). John Waddell, project engineer for the Los Osos Wastewater Project, speaks to the project description, including treated effluent management, water conservation, water purveyor responsibilities, treatment facility sites, treatment and collection system technologies, and other related topics. Mark Hutchinson, Environmental Division Manager of Public Works, speaks to the environmental review process, the environmental impact report, and the coastal development permit.
- 3) Member Questions of Staff - WRAC Members and Alternates ask questions of Staff. Discussion ensues regarding project timing, risk of nitrates and seawater intrusion, feasibility of an Ag exchange program, funding opportunities, site selection and hydrogeology, project review, water conservation, discharge vs. recharge, and tertiary treatment.
- 4) Public Comment - Members of the public ask questions of Staff.

Member Winholtz moves to extend the meeting to 12:30 p.m., with a second by Member Hyman. The motion passes unanimously.

- 5) Member Discussion - Discussion ensues among WRAC Members and Alternates, and Staff regarding the interlocutory stipulated judgment and Assembly Bill 2701. WRAC Members and Alternates identify the following topics for further discussion and/or action; project scope, use of spray fields/effluent disposal, the need for tertiary water treatment and conservation, the implications or removal of agricultural lands, and the inclusion of STEP-STEP design. Member Greening asks questions of some individuals that spoke during public comment. Mr. Ogren indicates that tertiary treatment will be a part of the project. Member Kelly moves to recommend to the Board that the project scope includes tertiary treatment and that the budget for the project scope includes the costs for tertiary treatment, with a second. The vote passes

unanimously. Member Hyman moves to form a subcommittee to look at the Los Osos Wastewater Project, and the ancillary items discussed at the April 4, 2009 meeting, with the intent of bringing their comments to the WRAC in May, with a second. The vote passes 14-0-1. Member Winholtz moves to recommend to the Board that they direct Staff to keep all technologies open, including STEP-STEG, within the design-build process, with a second by Member Fitzhugh for the purpose of discussion. The motion fails 2-13-0. Chairperson Winn moves to encourage the County to start encouraging, as they may, every water purveyor to develop and implement water conservation programs now, with a second by Member Mires. The vote passes unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 12:15 p.m.

---

WATER RESOURCES ADVISORY COMMITTEE 2009

Organization	Representative		Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	Apr**	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Cambria CSD	Jim Adams	M													
	Robert Reason	A	X												
	Bob Gresens	Staff		X											
Heritage Ranch CSD	John D'Ornellas	M	X			X									
	Debbie Fransen	A													
Los Osos CSD	Maria Kelly	M		X	X	X	X								
	Marshall Ochylski	A		X	X	X	X								
	George Milanese	Staff			X										
	Margret Falkner	Staff	X												
Nipomo CSD	Bruce Buel	M	X	X	*	X									
	Ed Eby	A	X	X	X	X									
	Jim Harrison	Staff			X										
Oceano CSD	Kevin Walsh	M		X	X	X									
	Barbara Mann	NM*				X									
	Phil Davis	A													
Templeton CSD	Paul Sorensen	M	X		X										
	Laurie Ion	A													
San Simeon CSD	John Russell	M	X	X	X	X	X								
	Charles Grace	A													
San Miguel CSD	Mike Ellison	M	X	X	X										
	Dale Hamblin	A													
City of Arroyo Grande	Chuck Fellows	M													
	Jim Guthrie	A					X								
City of Atascadero	Steve Kahn	M													
	Russ Thompson	NM*													
	David Athey	A													
City of Grover Beach	Robert Mires	M	X	X	X	X	X								
	Debbie Peterson	A													
City of Morro Bay	Betty Winholtz	M	X	X	X	X	X								
	Dylan Wade	A	X		X										
City of Paso Robles	Christopher Alakel	M		X											
	Doug Monn	A													
City of Pismo Beach	Ted Ehring	M		X	X	X	X								
	Ed Waage	A													
	Dwayne Chisam	Staff	X		X										
	Greg Ray	Staff				X									
City of San Luis Obispo	Allen Settle	M													
	Andrew Carter	A													
	Gary Henderson	Staff	X	X		X									
District 1	Steve Sinton	M	X	X	X	X									
	Unappointed	A													
District 2	Bill Garfinkel	M	X	X	X	X	X								
	Unappointed	A													
District 3	Marilee Hyman	M	X	X	X	X	X								
	Unappointed	A													
District 4	Michael Winn	M	X	X	*	X	X								
	Unappointed	A													
District 5	Dan O'Grady	M	X	X	X	X	X								
	Unappointed	A													
California Men's Colony	John Kellerman	M	X		X	X									
	Mike Mintey	A	X												
Camp SLO	John Reid	M	X	X	X	*	*								
	Nicole Balliet	A													
Cuesta College	Edralin Maduli	M													
	Terry Reece	A													
	Scott Demello	Staff			X										
Atascadero Mutual	John Neil	M													
	Jaime Lien	A	X												
	Dan Scalas	Staff				X									
Golden State Water	Mark Zimmer	M		X	X	X	X								
	Patrick Vowell	A	X	X		X	X								
Agriculture at Large	Ray Allen	M	X	X	X	*									
	Mike Broadhurst	A	X	X	X										
County Farm Bureau	Joy Fitzhugh	M		X	X	X	X								
	Jackie Crabb	A	X												
Environmental at Large	Sue Luft	M	X	X	X	X	X								
	Eric Greening	M	X	X	X	X	X								
	David Chipping	A	X	X	X	X									
	Sue Harvey	A	X	X	X		X								
Coastal San Luis RCD	Linda Chipping	M	X	X	X	X	X								
	Kathie Matsuyama	A				X									
Upper Salinas RCD	Tom Mora	M													
	Bill Bianchi	A	X	X		X									
Public Works	Courtney Howard	Staff	X	*	*	*	*								
	Paavo Ogren	Staff			X		X								
	Dean Benedix	Staff	X	X	X	X									
	Sylas Cranor	Staff	X	*	X	X	X								
	Mark Hutchinson	Staff					X								
	John Waddell	Staff						X							
	John Diodati	Staff						X							
Planning and Building	Genaro Diaz	Staff					X								
	James Caruso	Staff	X	X		X									
Public Health Services	Brian Pedrotti	Staff		X											
	Leslie Terry	Staff		X	X	X									
	Megan Lillich	Staff		X	X	X									
	Brad Prior	Staff				X									
Agricultural Commission	Kalub Emmons	Staff					X								
	Michael Isensee	Staff	X	X	X	X									

M= Member; A= Alternate; NM=New Member NA= New Alternate 0 = No nomination received as of 03/04/09

\*To be confirmed at a future BOS meeting

\*\*Special Meeting

\* = Notified of Absence/Conflict

WATER RESOURCES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

2009 GUEST LIST

NAME	AFFILIATION (if any)	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
Ausilio, Frank				X									
Barrett, Della	Public			X									
Bianchi, Mary	UC Coop. Extension	X											
Bianchi, Shirley					X								
Cleath, Timothy					X								
Edwards, Jeff	Private Planner		X	X									
Rafferty, Morgan	ECOSLO			X									
Schauler, Lawson	Lso Osos			X									
Senet, Steve	Los Osos			X									
Snyder, John		X	X										
Tanaka, Steven	Wallace Group			X									
Taylor, George			X	X	X								
Taylor, Gwynn		X	X	X	X								
Williams, Dawn	League of Women Voters			X									

**TO: Water Resources Advisory Committee**  
**FROM: James Caruso, County Department of Planning and Building**  
**DATE: April 1, 2009**  
**SUBJECT: Agenda Item #4.a: County Resource Management System**

### **Recommendation**

Consider forming a subcommittee to review the revisions to the Resource Management System and the Growth Management Ordinance in roughly six (6) months.

### **Discussion**

The Board of Supervisors authorized the Department to begin the process to revise the Resource Management System (RMS) and the Growth Management Ordinance (GMO). The Department has been directed to investigate the following changes to the RMS and GMO:

1. Infrastructure strategies
2. Recalculate lead times
3. Institute mandatory actions in RMS
4. Include highway interchanges in RMS
5. Create incentives for water conservation
6. Redefine growth management areas as groundwater basins or portions of basins
7. Set growth limits for areas at LOS I-III
8. Consider adding parks into RMS
9. Streamline the RMS process

The process will take 12-18 months to complete with initial results to the Board in approximately nine (9) months. At this time, there does not appear to be a need for a WRAC subcommittee. However, we should reconsider that in about six (6) months or so.

**TO: Water Resources Advisory Committee**  
**FROM: James Caruso, County Department of Planning and Building**  
**DATE: April 1, 2009**  
**SUBJECT: Agenda Item #4.b: Conservation and Open Space Element**

The Public Hearing Draft of the Conservation and Open Space Element (COSE) and the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) are now available for public review. The documents can be found under "What's New" at the Department of Planning and Building's website: [www.SLOPlanning.org](http://www.SLOPlanning.org). The Public Hearing draft and draft EIR will be considered by the Planning Commission at several upcoming public hearings:

- Study Session: May 28, 2009
  - The Commission will discuss a schedule of chapters to be reviewed at each public hearing.
- Public Hearing #1: June 25, 2009
- Public Hearing #2: July 9, 2009
- Public Hearing #3: July 23, 2009

Additional hearings will be scheduled as the need arises. All comments received by the Department will be forwarded to the Planning Commission.

**TO: Water Resources Advisory Committee**

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

**DATE: May 6, 2009**

**SUBJECT: Agenda Item #4.c: Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Program**

The Region Acceptance Process submittal for our region was successfully submitted by the District on behalf of the Regional Water Management Group. The submittal is available for review at [www.SLOCountyWater.org](http://www.SLOCountyWater.org). Any comments and/or corrections for future IRWM efforts are appreciated.

Please find attached a copy of the final Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for joining the Regional Water Management Group (RWMG) for your agency's use. The RWMG currently consists of the District, County, Nipomo CSD and Los Osos CSD. Please consider having your agency's governing body execute the MOU and join the RWMG. **Only programs and projects for entities that execute the MOU are eligible for submittal in future IRWM grant opportunities.**

Special thanks to District staff Jill Ogren, John Diodati, and Diana Haines for their efforts to address State guidelines and submit the application on time.

**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 Local Projects or Programs.** Cooperative agreements between specific RWMG members for implementation of specific projects or programs that are approved by the RWMG are included in the definition of Regional Projects or Programs.

**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.

5.13 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 IRWMP 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.



**TO: Water Resources Advisory Committee**

**FROM: Sylas Cranor, SLO County Water Resources Engineer**

**DATE: April 1, 2009**

**SUBJECT: Agenda Item #4.d: Water Conservation Plans and Strategies  
Website Link**

### **Recommendation**

Submit Water Conservation Plans to District staff to post online, at the District's website [www.SLOCountyWater.org](http://www.SLOCountyWater.org).

### **Discussion**

The County of San Luis Obispo is faced with increased water demands due to population growth and economic development at a time when the stresses on the available water supplies are increasing. Current drought conditions, climate change factors that may adversely affect water supply availability, environmental constraints on surface water delivery systems, and new water quality standards are all impacting the water supply. To address these and other problems, local agencies and water providers are developing and implementing comprehensive Water Conservation Plans.

In an effort to improve public access to all regional Water Conservation Plans, the District will post these documents online at [www.SLOCountyWater.org](http://www.SLOCountyWater.org). If your agency has Water Conservation Plans that may be posted on the District's website, please forward them to Sylas Cranor at [scrantor@co.slo.ca.us](mailto:scrantor@co.slo.ca.us) or 805-781-2552. Additionally, if your city or agency does not have a comprehensive plan, we request that you submit any available information on water conservation programs that offer a range of conservation ideas for interested individuals.

To view a list and links of all submitted Water Conservation Plans in the region, navigate from [www.SLOCountyWater.org](http://www.SLOCountyWater.org) to *Water Resources*, then to *Reports*. Alternatively, you may copy and paste the following URL into your web browser: <http://www.slocountywater.org/site/Water%20Resources/Reports/index.htm>.

**TO: Water Resources Advisory Committee**

**FROM: Syllas Cranor, SLO County Water Resources Engineer**

**DATE: May 6, 2009**

**SUBJECT: Agenda Item #4.e: Invasive Mussels**

The District has changed aspects of the invasive mussel reporting procedure to improve the quality of the reports and to better accommodate the schedules of staff.

The timing of the invasive mussel reporting procedure historically resulted in reports that included the end of one month and beginning of the next month, rather than containing a complete month. In part, this is because the invasive mussel reports are due before the end of each month for inclusion in the WRAC agenda package. Shifting the timing of the reporting process will result in reports that reflect a complete month, rather than parts of two months.

Shifting the timing of the reporting procedure will also help accommodate staff schedules. Monitoring site inspectors occasionally need a bit more time to complete the monitoring. The revised timing will also help ease the end of the month scramble to get the reports together, and will offer staff better flexibility during this time.

District staff has shifted the timing of the invasive mussel reporting in the following manner, effective immediately:

- Vessel inspection reports will be due to staff at the Water Quality Lab by the 7<sup>th</sup> of each month for previous month.
- Staff at the Water Quality Lab will package the vessel inspection and the monitoring site inspection reports, and send them to staff in the Water Resources Unit by 10<sup>th</sup> of each month.
- Staff in the Water Resources Unit will post the vessel inspection and the monitoring site inspection reports online and email the reports to the invasive mussel notification list by the 15<sup>th</sup> of each month.

*Please note: There are no new changes to the vehicle inspections, monitoring site inspections, or actions taken in response to the inspections.*

It is also proposed that the invasive mussel reports are no longer included in the WRAC agenda package. At the time WRAC agenda packages are distributed, invasive mussel reports are almost one (1) month old. In an effort to distribute timely information, District staff are offering individuals and agencies the following options:

- **Download the Invasive Mussel Reports Online:** Monthly reports will be available on the District's website [www.SLOCountyWater.org](http://www.SLOCountyWater.org). The reports will be posted by the 15<sup>th</sup> of each month for the previous month.
- **Join the Invasive Mussel Notification email List:** Individuals on the invasive mussel notification email list receive the reports and other mussel-related information on a monthly basis. Please contact Syllas Cranor at [scrantor@co.slo.ca.us](mailto:scrantor@co.slo.ca.us) or 805-781-2552 to have your email address added to the distribution list.

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

**Monitoring Site Inspections**

<b>Reservoir</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>No. of sites</b>	<b>Were all sites inspected?</b>	<b>Any confirmed positives?</b>
<b>Lopez Lake</b>	CDFG	1	Yes	No
<b>Lopez Lake</b>	SLO Co. PWD	3	Yes	No
<b>Lopez Terminal</b>	SLO Co. PWD	1	Yes	No
<b>Salinas</b>	CDFG	1	No	---
<b>Salinas</b>	SLO Co. PWD	2	Yes	No
<b>Cayucos</b>	Whale Rock Reservoir	1	Yes	No
<b>Nacimiento</b>	CDFG/Mo. Co. Parks	1	Yes	No
<b>Nacimiento</b>	SLO Co. PWD/OSCA	1	Yes	No
<b>Nacimiento</b>	HRCSD/SLO Co. PWD	1	Yes	No
<b>Nacimiento</b>	Mo. Co. Parks/SLO Co. PWD	1	Yes	No
<b>Nacimiento</b>	Mo. Co. Parks/MCWRA	2	No	---
<b>San Antonio</b>	Mo. Co. Parks	3	Yes	No
<b>Lake Cachuma</b>	SB Co. Parks	10	Yes	No
Information compiled on 4/29/09				

**Notes from April 2009**

1. At Lake San Antonio, Monterey County Parks discontinued inspection of the CDFG site due to accessibility issues, but added two new sites, increasing the total number of sites at Lake San Antonio from 2 to 3.
2. Fewer non-local vessels expected at Nacimiento this summer compared to other years due to low lake level.

**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.

**TO: Water Resources Advisory Committee**

**FROM: Syllas Cranor, SLO County Water Resources Engineer**

**DATE: May 6, 2009**

**SUBJECT: Agenda Item #4.f: Rainfall and Reservoir Update**

Region	ALERT Precipitation Station	2007-08 Water Year Annual Total (July '07 - June '08)	2008-09 Water Year Cumulative Total (July '08 - Current)	Average Annual Rainfall (in)	% of Annual Average
<b>Santa Margarita</b>	Santa Margarita (#723)	22.1	14.0	24	58%
<b>San Luis Obispo</b>	SLO Reservoir Gauge (#749)	20.2	11.7	24	49%
<b>Lopez</b>	Lopez Rec. Area (#707)	17.3	11.5	23	50%
<b>Atascadero</b>	Atascadero (#711)	13.2	7.6	17	44%
<b>Cambria</b>	Santa Rosa at Main St. ( # 717)	*11.0	10.0	22	45%

\* Due to equipment malfunction, not all rainfall was recorded during this water year.  
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 (%)
<b>Nacimiento</b>	<b>April 29, 2009</b> April 29, 2008	<b>745.2</b> 767.9	<b>800.0</b>	<b>135,115</b> 218,530	<b>40%</b> 65%
<b>Lopez</b>	<b>April 25, 2009</b> April 25, 2008	<b>496.9</b> 507.8	<b>523.0</b>	<b>29,222</b> 36,927	<b>59%</b> 75%
<b>Salinas</b> (Santa Margarita Lake)	<b>April 29, 2009</b> April 29, 2008	<b>1289.3</b> 1300.4	<b>1300.7</b>	<b>16,436</b> 23,592	<b>69%</b> 99%
<b>Whale Rock</b>	<b>April 29, 2009</b> April 29, 2008	<b>185.8</b> 198.2	<b>216.0</b>	<b>24,944</b> 30,836	<b>61%</b> 76%
<b>Twitchell</b>	<b>April 28, 2009</b>	<b>529.6</b>	<b>651.5</b>	<b>715</b>	<b>0.3%</b>

Tables updated 4/29/09

**TO: Water Resources Advisory Committee**

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

**DATE: May 6, 2009**

**SUBJECT: Agenda Item #5: County-wide Master Water Plan –  
Consideration of Mechanism for WRAC Involvement**

### **Recommendation**

Consider method (i.e. subcommittee[s], special meetings, etc.) by which WRAC shall participate in the development of the Master Water Plan (MWP).

### **Discussion**

Please find attached the current schedule for completing the MWP. Note that there are many agenda items or workshops scheduled with the WRAC through next year, including:

- Goals and Objectives – June 2009
- Water Demand Methodology and Supply Inventory – October 2009
- Demand Analysis Results – November 2009
- Analysis Criteria – January 2010
- Recommendations – March 2010
- Draft MWP – July 2010

In order to optimize stakeholder participation and keep the project on schedule, please consider forming subcommittees and/or holding special meetings if the WRAC wishes to continue efforts on other water resource policy issues during its regularly scheduled meetings. The Board of Supervisors has directed staff to make completion of the MWP on time a high priority. Consequently, review time of consultant deliverables will be expedited.

ID	Task Name	Duration	Start	Finish
1	Notice To Proceed	0 days	Thu 4/23/09	Thu 4/23/09
2	Data Collection	100 days	Thu 4/23/09	Mon 9/14/09
3	A. Refine Scope, Goals, Objectives	10 days	Mon 4/20/09	Fri 5/1/09
4	B. Describe Water Resources Management	30 days	Thu 5/21/09	Thu 7/2/09
5	C. Water Resources Analysis	230 days	Mon 5/4/09	Wed 3/31/10
6	C-1) Develop Objectives of Resources Analysis	15 days	Mon 5/4/09	Fri 5/22/09
7	C-2) Describe Available Data	20 days	Fri 6/19/09	Fri 7/17/09
8	Submit Description of Available Data	0 days	Fri 7/17/09	Fri 7/17/09
9	District Review Available Data	7 days	Mon 7/20/09	Tue 7/28/09
10	C-3) Water Supply Inventory/Assessment	35 days	Mon 7/20/09	Fri 9/4/09
11	Submit Water Supply Inventory and Assessment	0 days	Fri 9/4/09	Fri 9/4/09
12	District Review Supply Inventory	7 days	Tue 9/8/09	Wed 9/16/09
13	C-4) Develop Demand Analysis Methodology	25 days	Mon 7/20/09	Fri 8/21/09
14	Submit Analysis Methodology	0 days	Fri 8/21/09	Fri 8/21/09
15	District Review Methodology	7 days	Mon 8/24/09	Tue 9/1/09
16	C-4) Water Demand Analysis	35 days	Wed 9/2/09	Wed 10/21/09
17	Submit Demand Analysis Results	0 days	Wed 10/21/09	Wed 10/21/09
18	District Review Demands	7 days	Thu 10/22/09	Fri 10/30/09
19	C-5) Identify Analysis Criteria	15 days	Mon 11/2/09	Fri 11/20/09
20	Submit Analysis Criteria	0 days	Fri 11/20/09	Fri 11/20/09
21	District Review Analysis Criteria	7 days	Mon 11/23/09	Thu 12/3/09
22	C-6) Sub-Regional Analysis, Conc., Recomm.	35 days	Fri 12/4/09	Mon 1/25/10
23	Submit Conclusions and Recommendations	0 days	Mon 1/25/10	Mon 1/25/10
24	District Review Recommendations	10 days	Tue 1/26/10	Mon 2/8/10
25	C-6) Revise Conclusions and Recommendations	20 days	Thu 3/4/10	Wed 3/31/10
26	D. Document Relationship of MWP	20 days	Thu 3/4/10	Wed 3/31/10
27	E. MWP Report Preparation	148 days	Thu 4/1/10	Thu 10/28/10
28	Administrative Draft MWP	40 days	Thu 4/1/10	Wed 5/26/10
29	Submit Administrative Draft MWP	0 days	Wed 5/26/10	Wed 5/26/10
30	District/County Planning Review	10 days	Thu 5/27/10	Thu 6/10/10
31	Public Draft MWP	18 days	Fri 6/11/10	Wed 7/7/10
32	Submit Public Draft MWP	0 days	Wed 7/7/10	Wed 7/7/10
33	Public/Stakeholder Review	25 days	Thu 7/8/10	Wed 8/11/10
34	Board of Supervisors Draft MWP	20 days	Thu 8/12/10	Thu 9/9/10
35	Submit Board of Supervisors Draft	0 days	Thu 9/9/10	Thu 9/9/10
36	Board Review	15 days	Fri 9/10/10	Thu 9/30/10
37	Board of Supervisors Presentation	0 days	Fri 9/17/10	Fri 9/17/10
38	Final MWP Report	20 days	Fri 10/1/10	Thu 10/28/10
39	Submit Final Report	0 days	Thu 10/28/10	Thu 10/28/10
40	F. Stakeholder Review/Meetings	296 days	Wed 6/3/09	Wed 8/4/10
41	WRAC Workshop No. 1 (Present Goals, Objectives)	0 days	Wed 6/3/09	Wed 6/3/09
42	WRAC Workshop No. 2 (Present Demand Methodology)	0 days	Wed 10/7/09	Wed 10/7/09
43	WRAC Meeting on Water Supply Inventory	0 days	Wed 10/7/09	Wed 10/7/09
44	WRAC Workshop No. 3 (Present Demand Analysis Results)	0 days	Wed 11/4/09	Wed 11/4/09
45	WRAC Meeting on Analysis Criteria	0 days	Wed 11/6/10	Wed 11/6/10
46	WRAC Workshop No. 4 (Present Recommendations)	0 days	Wed 3/3/10	Wed 3/3/10
47	WRAC Workshop No. 5 (Present Draft MWP)	0 days	Wed 7/7/10	Wed 7/7/10
48	Sub-Regional Meeting 1 (Present Draft MWP)	0 days	Wed 7/21/10	Wed 7/21/10
49	Sub-Regional Meeting 2 (Present Draft MWP)	0 days	Wed 7/28/10	Wed 7/28/10
50	Sub-Regional Meeting 3 (Present Draft MWP)	0 days	Wed 8/4/10	Wed 8/4/10
51	G. Framework for Maintaining MWP	20 days	Thu 4/15/10	Wed 5/12/10
52	H. CEQA Compliance	90 days	Fri 6/11/10	Mon 10/18/10

**TO: Water Resources Advisory Committee**  
**FROM: Courtney Howard, SLO County Water Resources Engineer**  
**DATE: May 6, 2009**  
**SUBJECT: Agenda Item #6: WRAC Priorities**

### **Recommendation**

Review and endorse attached WRAC Priorities for 2009.

### **Discussion**

The attached chart illustrates recommended priorities for 2009. WRAC's 2008 priorities have been updated with each item's current status and next actions related to:

- The County-wide Master Water Plan
- Integrated Regional Water Management
- The Resource Management System
- Conservation
- Data Collection
- State Water
- Information Systems

New items that have not previously been identified as priorities but that have been topics in recent WRAC meetings include review of development project EIRs and wastewater issues. Monitoring the invasive mussel situation, identifying projects with water resource impacts and reviewing them for consistency with water resource policies, and review of wastewater issues as they relate to water resources policy, are proposed to be included as a part of IRWM Planning.

Currently, District Staff's priorities are to develop and complete the Master Water Plan, monitor the State's IRWM program and plan efforts accordingly, and develop an implementation plan for improvements to the District's data collection and management system.

**WATER RESOURCES ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
DRAFT PRIORITIES FOR 2009**

<b>PRIORITIES</b>	<b>CURRENT STATUS</b>	<b>NEXT ACTION</b>
<b>MASTER WATER PLAN (MWP)</b>		
Develop Public Participation Plan for the MWP	Identifying stakeholders, regional workshops planned	Encourage full participation by WRAC member agencies and other stakeholders in MWP development
Improve accuracy of all water demands, especially rural and environmental	MWP Scope of Work includes water demand analysis	Develop approach for reviewing analysis
Add golf course water usage to total needs	MWP Scope of Work includes water demand analysis	Review demand analysis at appropriate milestone in MWP development
Evaluate costs/benefits future water supply options, including off-stream storage and recharge areas	MWP Scope of Work includes water supply analysis	Review supply analysis at appropriate milestone in MWP development
Evaluate the costs and benefits associated with use of excess State Water entitlements	Optimization of Coastal Branch included in MWP Scope of Work; County, State Water Subcontractors and CCWA staff cooperating on capacity and financial analysis	Review at appropriate milestone during MWP development
Assess Drought and Emergency Preparedness in the County	Optimization of existing infrastructure included in MWP Scope of Work	Review MWP Goals and Objectives and evaluate how this item will be covered in the MWP versus the IRWMP
Identify effective water conservation methods	Establishing a website link for references; Conservation included in MWP Scope of Work	Invite Partners in Water Conservation to report to the WRAC on effectiveness of methods; Include feedback in MWP analysis
<b>INTEGRATED REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN (IRWMP)</b>		
Develop Stakeholder and Public Participation Plan for the IRWM	Memorandum of Understanding available for agencies to sign and become a Regional Water Management Group member; Region Acceptance Process (RAP) materials submitted	Encourage full participation by WRAC member agencies and other stakeholders in IRWM; Review region acceptance process results; Review Prop 84 IRWMP guidelines
Identify projects with water resources impacts and review for consistency with water resources policies	Subcommittees formed for various development projects	Provide feedback to the Board on consistency with water resource policy
Review wastewater issues as they relate to water resources policy	New onsite system regulations and ordinance have been developed; Subcommittee formed for Los Osos Wastewater Project	Provide feedback to the Board on consistency with water resource policy
Survey water management organizations to determine most appropriate form for SLO County (AB 3030 or ?)	Presented alternative management structures in 99/00	Review in light of recent litigation and overdraft situations
Assess Drought and Emergency Preparedness in the County	Updating IRWMP upon release of Prop 84 guidelines	Evaluate how this item will be covered in the MWP versus the IRWMP
Implement BMP's for Co operated Systems	Follow Urban Water Mgt Program prepared for Lopez in 2005.	Implement for County systems (Lopez, Cayucos, Santa Margarita, and Shandon)
Groundwater exchange guidelines	Presented to WRAC in 2000	Consider addressing in the IRWMP
Develop strategies to use GW basins for storage	Presented to WRAC in 2000	Need to address or follow up in the IRWMP
Monitor Invasive Mussel Situation	Vessel inspection and monitoring programs at County Reservoirs; Response Plan under development for County Lakes and Nacimiento Pipeline	Review Response Plan
Develop watershed management policies by WPA	Updating IRWMP upon release of Prop 84 guidelines	Consider addressing in the IRWMP

**WATER RESOURCES ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
DRAFT PRIORITIES FOR 2009**

PRIORITIES	CURRENT STATUS	NEXT ACTION
<b>RESOURCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (RMS)</b>		
Recommend improvements to RMS system/report format	Board has directed Planning Staff to develop recommended improvements over the next 12-18 months	Develop approach for reviewing recommendations
Paso Robles GW Basin Resource Capacity Study (RCS)	Partially complete in early 2008; GW levels and Pumping have been updated	Complete the RCS and present to WRAC prior to Board hearing
Santa Margarita Area RCS	To be developed by Planning Dept. '09-'10	Develop approach for reviewing analysis
Nipomo RCS Level of Severity (LOS) Certification and Actions	Basin litigation updates provided to WRAC; Conservation ordinances enacted	Continue monitoring litigation activities
Los Osos RCS LOS Certification and Actions	LOS III Certified; Conservation ordinances enacted	Monitor implementation of actions
<b>CONSERVATION</b>		
Update the Conservation Element	Draft Report and EIR available for review	Assist Planning Department with Update; Define WRAC's role in developing policies and actions for implementation
Educate users BMP's for golf course, municipal, industrial and agricultural water	RCD's are performing audits with the mobile lab. Several agencies have conservation coordinators.	Participate in promotion of regional water conservation outreach
Assess Drought and Emergency Preparedness in the County	Developing MWP Scope of Work	Evaluate how this item will be covered in the MWP versus the IRWMP and Conservation Element
Identify effective water conservation methods	Establishing a website link for references; Conservation included in MWP Scope of Work	Invite Partners in Water Conservation to report to the WRAC on effectiveness of methods; Include feedback in MWP analysis
Define Best Management Practices (BMP's) for water conservation and for golf course, municipal, industrial, and agricultural water use	Defined at State level, need to screen for local applicability	Invite Partners in Water Conservation/Ag reps to report to the WRAC on effectiveness of methods; Include feedback in MWP analysis
<b>ONGOING DATA COLLECTION AND MANAGEMENT</b>		
Implement improvements identified in the Data Enhancement Plan	Data Enhancement Plan complete	Present results; Develop implementation and funding strategy
<b>DATA ENHANCEMENT PLAN (DEP)</b>		
Increase the County's use of CIMIS network	Data Enhancement Plan complete	Present results; Develop implementation and funding strategy
Review well monitoring locations	Data Enhancement Plan complete	Present results; Develop implementation and funding strategy
Review stream monitoring locations	Data Enhancement Plan complete	Present results; Develop implementation and funding strategy
Review precip'n monitoring locations	Data Enhancement Plan complete	Present results; Develop implementation and funding strategy
Promote use of Mobile lab	Funded through fiscal year 09/10	Review County facility potential and promote use by others
Insure hydrologic data program is consistent in format, collection, documentation and maintenance	Equipment was updated to collect in digital format; Evaluating data management system	Implement recommended improvements for data management system
Develop program to monitor urban, rural, and agricultural water usages.	Purveyor water data is already collected, Resources available for estimations; Evaluating data management system	Identify program improvements during MWP development and as RMS review
Develop unimpaired runoff data from streams and environmental demands	Data Enhancement Plan complete; Environmental demands included in MWP scope of work	Identify program improvements during MWP development and as RMS review
Develop voluntary reporting and tabulation of actual water use to update Phase 1 data	Organizing database with water use information; Evaluating data management system	Identify program improvements during MWP development and as RMS review
Develop applied water tracking program	Evaluating data management system; Plan for ongoing updates of the MWP included in scope of work	Identify program improvements during MWP development and as RMS review

**WATER RESOURCES ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
DRAFT PRIORITIES FOR 2009**

PRIORITIES	CURRENT STATUS	NEXT ACTION
<b>STATE WATER</b>		
Evaluate the costs and benefits associated with use of excess State Water allocation	Optimization of Coastal Branch included in MWP Scope of Work; County, State Water Subcontractors and CCWA staff cooperating on capacity and financial analysis	Review at appropriate milestone during MWP development
Existing Subcontractors and New Participants	Existing subcontractor positions established; documenting new participant requests	Evaluate State Water options in MWP, IRWM
Groundwater Banking Plan (GWBP)	Draft Final Report presented to WRAC	Monitor incorporation of findings into Paso Basin RCS, GW Mngmt Plan and MWP
CCWA Membership	Pros and cons analysis; subcommittee meetings	Develop pro/con analysis after completion of MWP, GWBP, IRWMP update
<b>INFORMATION SYSTEMS</b>		
Digitize hydrologic database & make accessible by public	Data backlog is digitized; website is set up	Continue developing data reports to post to website
Recommend a policy on making well logs available to public	New consent form approved by Co. Counsel; Updating contact info and confidentiality status	Most well owners will provide to consultants for governmental agency reports

**TO: Water Resources Advisory Committee**

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

**DATE: May 6, 2009**

**SUBJECT: Agenda Item #7: Consideration of the Fiscal Year 2009/10 San Luis Obispo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District Budget**

### **Recommendation**

Review and recommend approval of the proposed FY 2009/10 Budget.

### **Discussion**

Please review the attached proposed budget for next year. Some points worth noting in the budget are as follows:

- Due to revenue from the transfer of the District's unused State Water allocation to the Central Coast Water Authority, the District will be able to complete some additional projects in addition to maintaining consistent levels for essential services that are in line with the last few years as noted below. The District will also be coordinating with CCWA on evaluating the capacity of the Central Coast Branch of the State Water Project.
- Efforts to publish information on [www.SLOCountyWater.org](http://www.SLOCountyWater.org) will continue for the hydrologic data collection and management program. Additionally, the hydrologic data collection allocation includes revenue for implementing several data collection program improvements that were identified in the Data Enhancement Plan, including:
  - New Recording Rain Gauges (2 per yr for 5 yrs)
  - Volunteer Rain gauges (35)
  - Stream Gauge (1/year for 5 years)
  - ALERT Stream Gauge (1/year for 5 years)
  - CIMIS Station
  - Dedicated Monitoring Wells (5/year for 10 years)
  - Data Management System Improvements

The implementation plan for these improvements will be presented to the WRAC at a future meeting. It is anticipated that one of the dedicated monitoring wells will be installed on the coast of the Nipomo Mesa in order to monitor for seawater intrusion adequately and to replace a lost well.

- The new Master Water Plan is now fully funded based on the contract awarded to the consultant team and an estimate of District Staff efforts,

and is sponsored in part by revenue from the transfer of the District's unused allocation.

- IRWM Program efforts will include updating the IRWM Plan to incorporate new guidelines, the four planning grant components and feedback from State agencies through a stakeholder process, working with other IRWM regions in the Central Coast Funding Area to develop guidelines for applying for Prop 84/1E grant monies, and applying for grant funding for the region's high priority projects should an opportunity become available.
- The budget has been organized to also highlight flood control and drainage efforts.

**San Luis Obispo County Flood Control and water Conservation District  
Flood Control - General**

	<b>Final Budget 2008-2009</b>	<b>Estimated 2008-2009</b>	<b>Proposed Budget 2009-2010</b>
<b>Sources</b>			
Property Tax Income	1,032,060	1,032,060	1,041,815
Interest on Reserves & Other	56,500	75,610	48,000
Proposition 50 Grant Revenue	221,104	174,030	0
CCWA/State Water Sales Revenue	0	817,600	0
Transfer in From Other Funds/Loan Repayment	200,000	0	1,510,000
Use of Fund Balance and Reserves	164,152	691,152	(652,244)
<b>Total Sources</b>	<b>1,673,816</b>	<b>2,790,452</b>	<b>1,947,571</b>
<b>Uses</b>			
<b>General Operations</b>			
General	51,867	51,867	23,162
County Wide Overhead	14,177	15,828	24,622
SB2557	25,044	25,044	25,410
Transfer to Other Funds	200,000	1,937,000	500,000
Net Encumbrances	0	(331,418)	0
<b>Total General Operation Costs</b>	<b>291,088</b>	<b>1,698,321</b>	<b>573,194</b>
<b>Water Resources</b>			
Public Comment/Info	17,324	7,272	8,983
Master Water Plan Coordination	374,028	607,900	223,986
SWP Coastal Branch Analysis/Planning	0	0	39,476
Water Conservation Management	11,846	3,000	11,867
Integrated Regional Water Mgt Plan	70,944	38,701	137,051
PR Groundwater Study Coordination	0	5,000	0
Hydrological Data	336,880	336,880	581,453
Preliminary Analysis/USGS Coop	28,830	35,662	29,026
Resource Management System	12,887	12,887	22,064
WRAC - Coordination	37,387	37,387	31,467
Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Agreement	16,273	17,054	0
RCD Mobile Lab Evaluations	19,524	19,524	19,537
Groundwater Banking Plan (IRWM Grant)	39,606	2,143	0
Data Enhancement Plan (IRWM Grant)	50,870	23,727	0
Paso Robles Basin Groundwater Management Plan	0	0	11,440
<b>Total Water Resources Costs</b>	<b>1,016,399</b>	<b>1,147,137</b>	<b>1,116,350</b>
<b>Hydraulics Planning</b>			
Public Inquiry (Flood Control)	22,811	22,811	27,665
Drainage Studies - General	245,306	12,591	0
Templeton Drainage Study	0	13,995	114,094
San Miguel General Drainage/Coordination	0	0	4,939
Nipomo General Drainage/Coordination	0	0	9,489
Oceano General Drainage/Coordination	0	0	7,143
Santa Margarita General Drainage/Coordination	0	0	16,362
Cayucos General Drainage/Coordination	0	0	11,986
Cambria General Drainage/Coordination	0	0	7,306
Drainage Studies - Design	21,904	5,000	0
Drainage Impact Fee Study-Templeton	0	0	10,136
Drainage Impact Fee Study-San Miguel	0	0	25,611
Shandon General Drainage/Coordination	0	0	15,235
Los Osos General Drainage/Coordination	0	0	8,061
Regional Permitting Plan (IRWM Grant)	27,533	13,395	0
Flood Management Plan (IRWM Grant)	48,775	23,805	0
<b>Total Hydraulics Planning Costs</b>	<b>366,329</b>	<b>91,597</b>	<b>258,027</b>
<b>Total Uses</b>	<b>1,673,816</b>	<b>2,937,055</b>	<b>1,947,571</b>
Reserves at end of Fiscal Year			
Designated Reserves	1,945,399	1,418,399	1,924,042
General Reserves	0	0	0
<b>Total Reserves</b>	<b>1,945,399</b>	<b>1,418,399</b>	<b>1,924,042</b>

V:\Water Resources Program\WRAC\AGND&MIN\Agenda 2009\May\WRAC budget summary.XLS





# **WRAC Los Osos Wastewater Project Subcommittee Report**

## **Subcommittee Purpose**

The WRAC formed a subcommittee to look at the Los Osos Wastewater Project, and the ancillary items discussed at the April 4, 2009 meeting, with the intent of bringing their comments to the WRAC in May. (Motion passed 14-0-1)

Subcommittee met on April 10 and April 16, 2009. The report was finalized via email.

## **Subcommittee members**

Chair – Sue Luft – Environmental at Large  
Mike Winn – District 4, WRAC Chair  
Maria Kelly – Los Osos CSD  
Linda Chipping – Coastal San Luis RCD  
Joy Fitzhugh – Farm Bureau

## **Issues Considered**

Subcommittee considered the issues brought up by WRAC members at the April 4, 2009 meeting, as follows:

- Tertiary treatment – The WRAC moved to recommend to the Board that the project scope include tertiary treatment and that the budget for the project scope include the costs for tertiary treatment. (Passed 15-0) [Note: Tertiary treatment implies Reclaimed Title 22 Water.]
- Conservation – The WRAC moved to recommend that the County start encouraging, as they may, every water purveyor to develop and implement water conservation programs now. (Passed unanimous)
- STEP/STEG – A motion failed to recommend to the Board to have staff keep all technologies open, including STEP-STEG, within the design-build process. (2 votes in favor)
- Removal of agricultural land – alternate sites – to the extent this impacts water resources.
- Use of spray fields / effluent disposal.
- Scope of project, that it should be more comprehensive.

## **Summary of Discussion**

### General

The subcommittee had some general comments that they want to include in their report.

We are pleased that the County's process has worked, and that the County is carrying it forward. The subcommittee's intent is not to delay the project. Our concern is protection of water resources. The sewer project is a necessary project that must go forward to meet the RWQCB's mandate, alleviate nitrate contamination of groundwater, and allow for pumping pressure on the lower aquifer to be reduced.

We hope that the County will continue to move the process forward with flexibility in the decision making process so that the final project that is approved is the best, all things considered, even if it is not the currently Proposed Project. The process has studied all of the components of the Los Osos Wastewater Project (LOWWP). The specific project that is constructed will include various pieces which have been studied. We urge the County to keep in mind the long-term design of the project even if some other temporary measures are needed.

### Tertiary Treatment

The subcommittee is very pleased that tertiary treatment of the wastewater effluent to Title 22 (unrestricted reuse) will be part of the project. Tertiary treatment allows many options for the use of the treated water, which were not available with only secondary treatment.

Since tertiary treated water will be available, the subcommittee asks that the County consider moving the LOWWP Seawater Intrusion Mitigation Level from a Level 2b to Level 2a or 2c (pages 7-58 through 7-61 of LOWWP Draft EIR). Levels 2a and 2c both incorporate agricultural reuse and require much smaller sprayfields – which should be temporary, as discussed below.

### Water Conservation

Water conservation was discussed at length by the subcommittee. Los Osos CSD and Golden State Water Company have some conservation measures in place. SLO County has adopted toilet and showerhead retrofit ordinances for new development and all properties in Los Osos at the point of sale. The subcommittee believes that more needs to be done by all users of the basin.

Los Osos CSD, Golden State Water, and S & T Mutual need to develop water conservation plans, with information on consumption rates and consideration of

tiered rate structures and other measures (Nipomo CSD and SLO City were provided as examples). SLO County needs to assist by developing ordinances to address landscape water use, which is the largest water consumption on larger lots, and to encourage water conservation by properties which use individual water wells. The County also needs to encourage best management practices for agriculture and by rural water users. Short courses in irrigation management, soil moisture monitoring, ET water budgeting, etc. are helpful.

### Use of Sprayfields

The subcommittee believes that sprayfields are acceptable during startup of the wastewater project. Their use will be discontinued after the upper aquifer is dewatered adequately so that the Broderson leachfield can accept all of the water from the project and/or other options – purple pipe for reclaimed water, agricultural exchange, etc. – can be put to full use. Since the wastewater will be treated to tertiary standards, a crop can also be grown on the sprayfields while they are in use. The disadvantage to sprayfields outside the Los Osos basin at the Tonini site is that they do not provide any seawater intrusion mitigation benefits. (Page 7-63 of the Draft EIR)

Since tertiary treatment will be utilized, the subcommittee also requests that the County consider other methods – recharge ponds or constructed wetlands overlying the basin or creek discharges – instead of, or in addition to, the sprayfields. A phased approach of adding connections to the sewer system and removing the septic discharge might allow dewatering of the upper aquifer to occur in conjunction with testing of the full potential of the Broderson leachfield, possibly rendering the sprayfields unnecessary.

### Alternate Treatment Plant Sites

The subcommittee understands that most of the potential treatment sites are constrained by either biological resources or agricultural resources. Each site will involve a trade off. However, since the sprayfields should be removed in the future, consideration should be given to a treatment site within the basin. Ultimately, the treated water should be used entirely within the basin. Proposed Projects 1, 2, and 3 (Table 2-2, page 2-8 of the Draft EIR) and the Mid-Town site, as they are all located within the basin, should be strongly considered.

### Scope of Project

The subcommittee discussed the concern of some WRAC members that the project should be more comprehensive. Since the sewer project is long overdue, supported by the majority of the community, and mandated by the Regional Water Quality Control Board within a short timeframe, the subcommittee feels that the wastewater project should not be further delayed.

Seawater intrusion mitigation measures should be considered by the water purveyors in parallel with the wastewater project. These measures can include additional water conservation measures, reduced municipal pumping, additional ag exchange to reduce agricultural pumping within the basin, use of additional leachfields to introduce fresh water into the lower aquifer, re-injection of fresh water, etc. Investigation of these measures should be done through the Interlocutory Stipulated Judgment (ISJ).

The ISJ appears to provide an avenue for development of a groundwater management authority – once all basin users are included. However, the ISJ process is closed to the public, which is normal. An open process would create greater understanding, assuring the public that progress is being made towards resolution of the seawater intrusion issue.

The subcommittee requests that the County negotiate an interim report of the ISJ process to the community in the near future. The public needs to understand the ISJ process and how it can enable a solution to the seawater intrusion issue. Injection wells, leachfields, reduced pumping and other technologies involve a great deal of studies and testing in order to determine their effectiveness. Regular reports to the community would provide a level of understanding of the progress in remediating the seawater intrusion problem.



Mary Fullwood  
[Redacted]  
04/06/2009 08:40 AM

To mwwinn@sbcglobal.net  
cc scanor@co.slo.ca.us  
bcc  
Subject Fwd: Viewpoint Submission - Reply to County Staff on Los Osos Sewer

Dear Michael and Sylas,  
Here is our Reply to the County Staff that we would like you to distribute to the WRAC. Thank you for your meeting on the LOWWP.

Sincerely,  
Mary  
San

Fullwood, Los Osos Representative  
Luis Bay Chapter of the Surfrider Foundation

Begin forwarded message:

> From: Sarah Corbin <scorbin@surfrider.org>  
> Date: Mon Apr 6, 2009 8:14:01 AM US/Pacific  
> To: "letters@thetribunenews.com" <letters@thetribunenews.com>  
> Subject: Viewpoint Submission - Reply to County Staff on Los Osos Sewer  
>  
> Please consider running the attached letter (also pasted below) in  
> response to the Viewpoint article written by County staff regarding  
> the Los Osos Wastewater Project.

>  
>  
>

> Thanks!

>  
> Sarah Corbin  
>  
> Central California Regional Manager  
>  
> Surfrider Foundation  
>  
> scorbin@surfrider.org  
>  
> cell phone: 831 239 1520  
>  
>  
>  
>

> Viewpoint Submission - Reply to County on Los Osos Sewer  
>  
>  
>

> Dear Editor,  
>  
>  
>

> In the March 30 viewpoint "Gravity Solution is Best for Los Osos," SLO  
> County staff writers attempted to give the impression that the  
> Surfrider Foundation endorses or should endorse a single collection  
> technology as the appropriate technology for all coastal sewer  
> systems, by implying that Surfrider is inconsistent in supporting a  
> gravity sewer for Santa Barbara while supporting a STEP/STEG system  
> for Los Osos. Given the unique circumstances of each coastal  
> community, we believe that various technologies need to be  
> investigated to determine which will best serve the specific local  
> needs for wastewater conveyance. Unlike the County staff, we do not  
> promote a "one-size-fits-all" mantra and are not compelled to believe

> that implementation of a particular technology in one community makes  
> this technology appropriate for all coastal communities.

>  
>  
>

> Additionally, we are not of the opinion that the collection technology  
> alone is what defines a sustainable wastewater project. In fact, we  
> are discouraged that the opinion piece focused almost entirely on  
> collection systems and failed to offer discussion on other important  
> issues such as seawater intrusion remediation, beneficial reuse of  
> wastewater, and resiliency in the face of global climate change. While  
> we do believe that a STEP/STEG system makes far more sense for Los  
> Osos than a gravity sewer due to the area's topography, high water  
> table and proximity to an estuary, we see this as one component of the  
> overall project—all of which need to work in harmony to protect water  
> quality, address water supply issues, and withstand the many stresses  
> of our changing environment.

>  
>  
>

> It is regrettable that project staff are devoting their energies to  
> composing opinion pieces against environmental groups. It is even more  
> regrettable that the project team has given short shrift to the  
> opportunity to fully investigate affordable solutions by not allowing  
> STEP/STEG design teams to propose a project. Instead, the team  
> is urging County Supervisors to not allow a STEP/STEG team to even  
> enter a bid, thwarting a real comparison of costs.

>  
>  
>

> No matter which system you may think you prefer, we encourage all  
> residents of Los Osos to turn out for the April 7 Board of Supervisors  
> meeting to urge the County to include a STEP/STEG design team in the  
> County's request for proposals process. That way we can all see, for  
> the first time, some real numbers. This is how the County can maintain  
> its commitments to affordability and community engagement.

>  
>  
>

> Jeff Pienak, Chair  
>  
> Surfrider Foundation, San Luis Bay Chapter

>  
>  
>

> and

>  
>  
>

> Sarah Corbin  
>  
> Central California Regional Manager  
>  
> Surfrider Foundation

>  
>  
>



Viewpoint Submission Response\_Los Osos Sewer\_Tribune\_040409.doc