

**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, July 1, 2009  
1:30 p.m.

---

1. **Introductions and Determination of a Quorum**
2. **Approval of June Meeting Minutes**
3. **Public Comment**
4. **Ongoing Updates:**
  - a. **Conservation and Open Space Element**
  - b. **Integrated Regional Water Management Program**
5. **Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Resource Capacity Study**
6. **Agricultural Cluster Subcommittee Report**
7. **Land to Sea Advisory Committee**
8. **Consideration of an August Meeting**

**Future Agenda Items:**

- a. **Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Resource Capacity Study**

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

**Next Regular Meeting:**           **To Be Determined**  
  **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

June 3, 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 May Meeting Minutes - The May 6, 2009 WRAC meeting minutes were approved upon a first by Member Garfinkel, second by Member Hyman, and a unanimous vote with three (3) abstentions.
- 3) Public Comment - John Snyder speaks to the Santa Maria Groundwater Basin litigation, including the availability of stipulating party's reports, the report approval process, the status of the appeal process, public hearings, the importation of State Water and its use within the Santa Maria Valley, and the interpretation of the term "water supply". Jill Ogren, Public Works Department Staff, informs members that the District will be issuing a Notice Of Preparation (NOP) for the EIR for the Arroyo Grande Creek Channel Waterway Management Program. Member Ms. Chipping informs members of the WRAC of a Land Conservancy Fund raiser on June 3, 2009. Member Eby reports that the Nipomo Waterline Intertie Project has been approved by the NCSD Board, the Notice of Determination has been filed, and the NCSD is currently developing the mechanism by which the project will be financed. Member Zimmer informs the WRAC of a Water Awareness Open House at Los Ranchos Elementary School on June 10, 2009 at 7:00 p.m. Courtney Howard, Public Works Department Staff, updates the WRAC on cooperative efforts to install water quality monitoring equipment and a new well in the Santa Maria groundwater basin for seawater intrusion monitoring purposes. Chairperson Winn speaks to the timing of NCSD's comments on the Twitchell Management Report. Mr. Winn and Ms. Ogren speak to current and future Santa Margarita water system improvements and to the construction schedule for the new tank.
- 4) Ongoing Updates:
  - a. County Resource Management System - James Caruso, Department of Planning and Building, indicates that there is no update for this item.
  - b. Conservation and Open Space Element - James Caruso, Department of Planning and Building, indicates that Planning Commission study sessions to review the Conservation and Open Space Element (COSE) are on the

following dates: June 25, July 6, and July 23. Mr. Caruso notes that the Water section of the COSE will be reviewed on July 6, sometime between 1:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m.

- c. Integrated Regional Water Management Program - Courtney Howard, Public Works Department Staff, reports that the Region Acceptance Process interview will occur on June 19, 2009, in Glendale, CA. Ms. Howard, Chairperson Winn, Paavo Ogren (Director of Public Works), and Lidia Gutierrez (Gutierrez Consultants) will represent the region during the interview. Ms. Howard indicates the guidelines for the expedited grant-funding round may be released in late summer or early fall.
  - d. Laetitia Agricultural Cluster Subdivision DEIR - Chairperson Winn reports that Fugro's peer review of the water sections of the DEIR has been finalized and is available to download from the County Planning and Building website.
- 5) County-wide Master Water Plan – Scope, Goals and Objectives - Courtney Howard, Public Works Department Staff, introduces the Master Water Plan and the project consultants. Lou Carella, Carollo Engineers, speaks to the project, the project team, project needs, issues and coordination, and approach. Jose Gutierrez, Carollo Engineers, speaks to the project schedule, study regions, improving reliability, forecasting and uncertainty analysis, reliability and goals. Member Greening seeks clarification on water reliability solutions relative to state water and climate change implications. Member Dr. Chipping asks how the master water plan relates to private utilities and if they are required to follow any of the recommended management strategies. Member Eby speaks to the Governor's goal to reduce water use by 2020. Discussion ensues related to the 20x2020 Plan, Assembly Bill 49, and the California Urban Water Conservation Council. Member Bianchi speaks to the uncertainty of future water supplies relative to climate change. Gewynn Taylor, Los Osos resident, questions how saltwater intrusion and the existence of adjudicated groundwater basins influence the project. Member Harvey speaks to the water demand methodology. Member Dr. Chipping speaks to the need for a dynamic hydrologic model. Discussion ensues regarding project timing, point-of-use recycle systems, and long-term climate changes. James Caruso, Department of Planning and Building, speaks to the relationship between the Master Water Plan and the Conservation and Open Space Element. Member Greening speaks to the alternatives analysis and the environmental review process. Chairperson Winn speaks to providing presentation materials online, sustainability of current supplies, proposed sub-regions, 20x2020 baselines, ocean desalination, WRAC timing/scheduling, and project priorities.
- 6) Vineyard Water Conservation Practices - Courtney Howard, Public Works Department Staff, introduces Kris O'Connor, Central Coast Vineyard Team, to discuss the dynamics and practices of vineyard irrigation management. Ms. O'Connor speaks to the background and seasonality of water usage. Steve Lohr, J. Lohr Vineyards & Wines, speaks to water quality, best practices for water conservation and sustainability. Discussion ensues relative to groundwater flow directions, and winery and vineyard water use. Stacie Jacob, Paso Robles Wine Country Alliance, speaks to the economics of water usage.

- 7) Consideration of a July and/or August Meeting - Member O'Grady moves to hold a WRAC Meeting on July 1, 2009, with a second by Member Greening. The motion passes unanimously.

Member Garfinkel moves to extend the meeting to 4:00 p.m., with a second by Member Ehring. The motion passes.

- 8) Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Resource Capacity Study - James Caruso, Department of Planning and Building, presents the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Resource Capacity Study (RCS). Mr. Caruso presents the history context of the RCS, the concept of a Level Of Severity (LOS), the Todd Engineers Pumping Evaluation, and the constraints, conclusions, recommendations, and schedule for Planning Commission (PC) and Board of Supervisors consideration of the RCS. Member Allen recommends that a LOS recommendation be established for the Estrella/Creston Area of Critical Concern. Discussion ensues related to LOS recommendations, future changes to the format of the Resource Management System, and the RCS recommended actions. Member Bianchi moves to recommend that the Board designate the Estrella/Creston Area of Critical Concern as a LOS III, with a second by Member Allen. Discussion ensues. Chairperson Winn recommends that the motion be modified in the following manner; that the WRAC form a subcommittee to review the RCS, the subcommittee attend the PC meeting on June 11 and compile a composite report to be presented to the WRAC in July. Discussion ensues related to the urgency and timing of the RCS. Member Bianchi moves to amend the motion as recommended, with a second by the Member Allen. The motion passes by a vote of 17-0-0. John Snyder speaks to the definition of perennial yield. Subcommittee members include Members Alakel, Allen, Bianchi, Neil, Luft, and Winn.
- 9) Agricultural Cluster Subcommittee Report - Item deferred.
- 10) Future Agenda Items - Brief discussion.
- a. Land to Sea Advisory Committee
  - b. Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Resource Capacity Study Subcommittee Report
  - c. Agricultural Cluster Subcommittee Report

Meeting adjourned approximately 4:01 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				X						
Heritage Ranch CSD	John D'Ornellas	M	X			X								
	Debbie Fransen	A												
Los Osos CSD	Maria Kelly	M		X	X	X	X	X						
	Marshall Ochylski	A		X	X	X	X	X						
	George Milanese	Staff			X									
	Margret Falkner	Staff	X											
Nipomo CSD	Bruce Buel	M	X	X	*	X		X	*					
	Ed Eby	A	X	X	X	X		X	X					
	Jim Harrison	Staff			X									
Oceano CSD	Barbara Mann	M				X								
	Phil Davis	A												
	Kevin Walsh	Staff		X	X	X								
Templeton CSD	Paul Sorensen	M	X		X			X	X					
	Laurie Ion	A												
San Simeon CSD	John Russell	M	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
	Charles Grace	A												
San Miguel CSD	Mike Ellison	M	X	X	X				X					
	Dale Hamblin	A												
City of Arroyo Grande	Chuck Fellows	M						X	X					
	Jim Guthrie	A					X							
City of Atascadero	Russ Thompson	M						*	*					
	David Athey	A						*	*					
City of Grover Beach	Robert Mires	M	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
	Debbie Peterson	A							X					
City of Morro Bay	Betty Winholtz	M	X	X	X	X	X	X	*					
	Dylan Wade	A	X		X									
City of Paso Robles	Christopher Alakel	M		X					X					
	Doug Monn	A												
City of Pismo Beach	Ted Ehring	M		X	X	X	X	X	X					
	Ed Waage	A												
	Dwayne Chisam	Staff	X		X									
	Greg Ray	Staff				X		X	X					
City of San Luis Obispo	Allen Settle	M						X						
	Andrew Carter	A												
	Gary Henderson	Staff	X	X		X		X	*					
	Ron Munds	Staff							X					
District 1	Steve Sinton	M	X	X	X	X		X	X					
	0	A												
District 2	Bill Garfinkel	M	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	*				
	0	A												
District 3	Marilee Hyman	M	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
	0	A												
District 4	Michael Winn	M	X	X	*	X	X	X	X					
	0	A												
District 5	Dan O'Grady	M	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
	0	A												
California Men's Colony	John Kellerman	M	X		X	X		X	X					
	Mike Mintey	A	X											
Camp SLO	John Reid	M	X	X	X	*	*	X	X					
	Nicole Balliet	A												
Cuesta College	Edralin Maduli	M												
	Terry Reece	A												
	Scott Demello	Staff			X									
Atascadero Mutual	John Neil	M							X					
	Jaime Lien	A	X											
	Dan Scalas	Staff				X								
Golden State Water	Mark Zimmer	M		X	X	X	X	X	X					
	Patrick Vowell	A	X	X		X	X	X						
Agriculture at Large	Ray Allen	M	X	X	X	*			X					
	Mike Broadhurst	A	X	X	X			X	X					
County Farm Bureau	Joy Fitzhugh	M		X	X	X	X	X	X					
	Jackie Crabb	A	X											
Environmental at Large	Sue Luft	M	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
	Eric Greening	M	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
	David Chipping	A	X	X	X	X		*	X					
	Sue Harvey	A	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
Coastal San Luis RCD	Linda Chipping	M	X	X	X	X	X	*	X					
	Kathie Matsuyama	A				X								
Upper Salinas RCD	Tom Mora	M												
	Bill Bianchi	A	X	X		X		X	X					
Board of Supervisors	Jim Patterson	Dist. 5							X					
	Amy Gilman	Dist. 5						X						
Public Works	Courtney Howard	Staff	X	*	*	*	*	X	X					
	Paavo Ogren	Staff			X		X	X						
	Dean Benedix	Staff	X	X	X	X			X					
	Sylas Cranor	Staff	X	*	X	X	X	X	X					
	Mark Hutchinson	Staff					X	X						
	John Waddell	Staff					X	X						
	John Diodati	Staff					X							
	Genaro Diaz	Staff					X							
Planning and Building	Jill Ogren	Staff						X						
	James Caruso	Staff	X	X		X		X	X					
Public Health Services	Brian Pedrotti	Staff		X										
	Leslie Terry	Staff		X	X	X		X	X					
	Megan Lillich	Staff		X	X	X		X	X					
	Brad Prior	Staff				X								
	Kalub Emmons	Staff				X								
Agricultural Commissioner	Michael Isensee	Staff	X	X	X	X		X	X					

M= Member; A= Alternate; NM=New Member NA= New Alternate 0 = No nomination received as of 06/18/09

\*\*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		X							
Barrett, Della	Public			X									
Bianchi, Mary	UC Coop. Extension	X											
Bianchi, Shirley					X								
Carella, Lou	Carollo Engineers						X						
Cleath, Timothy					X								
Edwards, Jeff	Private Planner		X	X		X							
Gutierrez, Jose	Carollo Engineers						X						
Jacob, Stacie	PR Wine Country Alliance						X						
Jenning, Dorthy	Citizen						X						
Lohr, Steve	J. Lohr Vineyards & Wines						X						
O'Connor, Kris	Central Coast Vineyard Team						X						
Rafferty, Morgan	ECOSLO			X									
Schauler, Lawson	Lso Osos			X		X							
Senet, Steve	Los Osos			X									
Snyder, John		X	X				X						
Tanaka, Steven	Wallace Group			X		X	X						
Taylor, George			X	X	X	X	X						
Taylor, Gwynn		X	X	X	X	X	X						
Weimer, Keith						X							
Williams, Dawn	League of Women Voters			X									

**TO: Water Resources Advisory Committee**  
**FROM: Syllas Cranor, SLO County Water Resources Engineer**  
**DATE: July 1, 2009**  
**SUBJECT: Agenda Item # 4.a: Conservation and Open Space Element**

**Recommendation**

1. Review the recommendations of the subcommittee; and
2. Distribute the subcommittee's recommendations, should the WRAC approve them, to the Board of Supervisors.

**Discussion**

The County Planning and Building Department has released the Public Hearing Draft and the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Conservation and Open Space Element (COSE). Public hearings started at the County Planning Commission on June 25, 2009 and will continue into late July. It is anticipated that the Water Chapter of the COSE will come before the PC on July 23, 2009 or July 30, 2009.

Subcommittee members include Michael Winn (District 4), Ray Allen (Agriculture At-Large), Betty Winholtz (Morro Bay), and Sue Harvey (Environmental At-Large Alternate). The subcommittee reviewed the Water Resources chapter of the COSD Public Hearing Draft and associated appendices. The subcommittee report is attached.

## WRAC Subcommittee on the Water Element of the COSE

June 25, 2009

Members: Michael Winn, Ray Allen, Betty Winholtz, Sue Harvey, Christopher Alakel

Comments follow:

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

The subcommittee has come to believe that some of our earlier comments (e.g., need for stream gauge data, environmental water metrics, separate reports per each watershed) would be better placed in the Master Water Plan instead of the COSE. Others not repeated here are due to their being more like projects instead of planning policies.

p. 10.1

### Introduction

2<sup>nd</sup> ¶, 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence: Most areas of the county are experiencing groundwater problems. Many have declining water supply and water quality due in part to a lack of available surface water supplies, inconsistent recharge, and previous development permitted without adequate sustainable water supply.

Deleted: Some

Deleted: such as seawater intrusion and

Deleted: and

p. 10.3

[The quotation by Zekster is only partially adequate. What he or someone else should have said is more like:

*The safe yield of groundwater is exceeded when long-term groundwater extraction exceeds aquifer recharge, producing declining trends in aquifer storage. Overdraft is usually evidenced by declines in surface-water levels and stream flow, reduction or elimination of vegetation, land subsidence, decline in groundwater quality, and/or seawater intrusion.*

**Water Quality** [Add a third bullet]

- 
- 
- Self-regenerating water softeners using salts of various types pose a serious threat to the quality of the county's groundwater supplied.

p. 10.5

**Table WR-1**  
**GOALS FOR WATER RESOURCES**

**Goal WR 2** The County will manage groundwater resources [in each watershed](#) to ensure sustainable supplies for all beneficial uses.

...

**Goal WR 4** Per capita potable use in the county will decline by 20 percent by 2020, [per the goals in AB49](#).

Chapter 10 **WATER RESOURCES**

[There is a need for contextual history beyond administration and regulation, either here and/or in the Water Resources Appendices. Issues critical to water policy include the county being a 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 the various watersheds, with an overlay showing areas currently experiencing seawater intrusion and/or having a Level of Severity III for water supply.]

p. 10.5

*Implementation Strategy WR 1.1.1 [Implement an Expanded Water Master Plan](#)*

Deleted: Prepare a

c. [Establish](#) a water demand monitoring program in coordination with the County Planning Department's Resource Management System [and the County Public Works' Master Water Plan](#) to monitor municipal, industrial, agricultural, recreational, and environmental demand on an ongoing basis;

Deleted: Evaluate

p. 10.6

### Policy WR 1.3 New Water Supply

Development of new water supplies should focus first on efficient use of our existing resources. Use of reclaimed water, interagency cooperative projects, and groundwater recharge projects should be considered prior to using imported sources of water or seawater desalination.

◇ Implementation Strategy 1.3.1 Work in concert with the DWR and other regulatory agencies to stay current with approved methods of facilitating desalination projects for the county's coastal communities. (See WR 1.15)

◇ [Retain] Implementation Strategy WR 1.2.1

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

### Policy WR 1.7 Water-dependent species

[spelling error]

**Implementation Strategy WR 1.6.1 Evaluate ecosystem water needs.**

[spelling error]

### Policy WR 1.7 Agricultural operations

◇ Implementation Strategy 1.7.1 Discontinue Ag Cluster subdivisions as a planning tool.

◇ Implementation Strategy 1.7.2 Allow no annexations, residential subdivisions, or (if the ordinance is retained) ag cluster subdivisions on land zoned AG or zoned RL or RR with a history of farming, unless they are supplied by supplemental water. (I.e., do not permit residential development outside of URLs or VRLs that draw on groundwater.)

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", Hanging: 0.5"

### Policy WR 1.9 Limit and regulate new water systems

Deleted: Discourage

### Policy WR 1.11 Reduce RMS alert levels

**[Add:**

◇ Implementation Strategy WR 1.11.2 Planning Area Standards Adopt planning area standards for all areas with an RMS Level of Severity for Water I, II, or III. [Use or adapt the standards developed by County Planning for the Nipomo Mesa Water Conservation Area.]

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", Hanging: 0.5"

p. 10.10

### **Policy WR 1.12 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 [and Assembly Bills 32 and 49](#).

### **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.

Deleted: , unless there is an overriding public need

[Delete the last clause, or this becomes unenforceable and relatively meaningless.]

p. 10.11

**Goal Number 2: The County will [work with other agencies and stakeholders to](#) manage groundwater resources to ensure sustainable supplies for all beneficial uses.**

p. 10.12

### ***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 [new](#) well owner for releasing or publishing groundwater data. (GM2)

### **Policy WR 2.3 Well permits**

[New:

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

◇ [Implementation Strategy 2.3.2](#): Permit no new residential wells serving more than one household where groundwater is LOS II or III, [unless it is for an existing well currently used as the residence's only water supply, to be legally abandoned](#).

p. 10.13

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

[New: Implementation Strategy WR [3.1.5 Gradual elimination of self-regenerating water softeners using salts](#)  
[Recognize the real impacts of self-regenerating water softeners on the County's ability to effectively treat and use reclaimed water. Amend ordinance to stop permitting new installations and to gradually eliminate existing equipment everywhere in the county, with the exception of the canister exchange type.](#)

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

[New: [Implementation Strategy WR 3.1.6 Tertiary Treatment of Waste Water](#)

Deleted:  
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", Hanging: 1.06", Tabs: 0.13", Left + 0.25", Left + 1", Left + 1.25", Left  
Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

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 [or moving towards it as the end goal](#).

### 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."

p. 10.18

### 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.

p. 10.20

### Policy WR 4.2 Water pricing structures

Support water-pricing structures to encourage conservation by [all water users](#) (WRM8) and will seek to expand the use of conservation rate structures [in the entire county, particularly](#) in areas with Levels of Severity II and III for water supply.

Deleted: individual

[Add: Implementation Strategy WR [4.2.2 Agencies to lead by example](#)  
[School districts and other governmental agencies shall monitor their water use on a monthly basis and report annually to the County Department of Public Health.](#)

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

10.17

### **Implementation Strategy WR 4.3.3**

Reduce [indoor and outdoor](#), use of water in County-owned, -operated, or -financed facilities through efficient technologies, design and management practices, and other conservation efforts, [for example, County library branches, parks, sports parks paid in part by County moneys, and County golf courses.](#)

Deleted: exterior and interior

Deleted: . F

### **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.

p. 10.21

**Policy WR 4.6 Graywater** [\[N.B. This section has very serious public health implications that must be thoroughly analyzed before the County changes its policies.\]](#)

[Comments:

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?
- Bluntly: People will pee while taking a shower. Other sources of “graywater” can be similarly compromised by diapers etc. Where would a “graywater system” deposit such water without exposing gardeners, indoor/outdoor pets, and playing children to disease?
- 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. 10.22

### **Policy WR 5.1 Watershed approach**

The County will consider [entire](#) watersheds and groundwater basins, [including those that extend across county lines](#), in its approach to managing water resources, [including](#) ecological values and economic factors in water resources development. (WRM1 revised)

Deleted: in order to

#### ***Implementation Strategy WR 5.1.1***

Support development and implementation of watershed management plans for all key watersheds in the county, [including those that cross county lines](#), 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:

p. 10.23

### **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, [and, where applicable, adjoining counties](#).

p. 10.23

### **Policy WR 5.7**

- Errata: Replace “affects” with “effects” in subsections 2) and 4); renumber second 5) at the top of the next page to 6).

10.25

**Table WR 2**

- "Planning Area" need to be replaced by "Watershed".
- 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. 10.28

Add new Implementation Strategy [6.5.3 Recording retention and detention basins](#)  
[Require that each retention or detention basin on new construction be mapped and recorded on their title, with the County to monitor their maintenance no less frequently than every 3 years.](#)

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.63"

**Appendix 10**

**Appendix 10.1 Setting**

Comments:

- This section contains good administrative and regulatory information but lacks essential information about historic rainfall and drought patterns. The information given is useful, but the physical context is also needed.
- This section would benefit from a graph of 30 years of rainfall and population figures for each watershed.

pp. 10.12-14

Appendix 10 WPA Table A10-2

- This table should include "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 usually coincide with an underlying aquifer. Also, the table should add population numbers so per capita usage can be compared and information on the number of acres the agricultural use represents.

Riparian Demands may not be completed for this update, but the WRAC suggests a three-step plan for bringing the Master Water Plan 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.]

When the COSE is updated next (in 5 years?), more complete data should then be available.

#### Appendix 10.11

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

**DATE: July 1, 2009**

**SUBJECT: Agenda Item #5: Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Resource Capacity Study**

**Recommendation**

Review the report and recommendations of the subcommittee.

**Discussion**

Members of the WRAC considered the formation of a subcommittee to review the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin (Basin) Resource Capacity Study (RCS) at their regularly scheduled meeting on June 3, 2009. Subsequently, a subcommittee was formed to review the RCS. Subcommittee members included subcommittee chair Mike Winn (District 4), Sue Luft (Environmental at Large), Christopher Alakel (City of Paso Robles), John Neil (Atascadero Mutual Water Company), Ray Allen (Agriculture at Large), and David Athey (City of Atascadero). The subcommittee met on June 15, 2009, and the report was finalized via email. The subcommittee report and recommendations are attached.

Planning and Public Works Department Staff is meeting with Atascadero Subbasin water purveyors (Paso Robles, Atascadero/Atascadero Mutual Water Company, Templeton CSD) on July 15, 2009 to discuss the process and scope for cooperatively updating the analysis of the Atascadero Sub-basin which will better inform the decisions on the recommended level of severity and actions, consistent with WRAC subcommittee recommendations. The timing of this effort will also be discussed at the meeting, but it is unlikely the effort will conclude prior to an August WRAC meeting.

# **WRAC Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Resource Capacity Study Subcommittee Report**

## **Subcommittee Purpose**

At the June 3, 2009 meeting, the WRAC formed a subcommittee to review the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Resource Capacity Study (RCS).

Subcommittee met on June 15, 2009. The report was finalized via email.

## **Subcommittee members**

Chair – Mike Winn – District 4, WRAC Chair  
Sue Luft – Environmental at Large, WRAC Vice Chair  
Christopher Alakel – City of Paso Robles, WRAC  
John Neil – Atascadero Mutual Water Company, WRAC  
Ray Allen – Agriculture at Large, WRAC  
David Athey – City of Atascadero, WRAC

## **Observers**

Russ Thompson – City of Atascadero, to replace David Athey on WRAC  
Warren Frace – City of Atascadero  
Sue Harvey – Environmental at Large, WRAC alternate

## **Summary of Discussion**

### General

Mike Winn explained Resource Management System and annual report, proposed revisions to the RMS/LOS definitions, and water rights in general, management areas of a groundwater basin, and the County's health and safety authority.

Christopher stated that Todd Engineers only looked at water demand numbers, as requested. He stated that an update to the water balance is needed. See Table 72 of Fugro's August 2002 report.

John presented the concerns outlined in the Atascadero Mutual Water Company letter to County Planning. One missing value appears to be the net return flow of 1,000 AFY from the Atascadero wastewater treatment plant, as estimated by Fugro. He stated that an update to the water balance is needed.

The subcommittee agreed that the water balance should be reviewed as soon as possible. Christopher and John will ask Fugro for cost and timeframe for updating water balance.

#### Specific Comments on RCS

The subcommittee requests some changes to the recommendations in the RCS as highlighted in the attached document.

#### **Action Requested**

The subcommittee requests that the WRAC approve this report and the attached recommended changes to the RCS. The subcommittee asks that the water balance data and the revised RCS be placed on the agenda for consideration at an August WRAC meeting.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **A. Paso Robles Groundwater Basin**

Recommended Level of Severity: I

Recommended Actions:

1. Prepare a Groundwater Management Plan to, among other things, identify basin management objectives and adopt a plan to reach those objectives. One of the basin management objectives should be to attain the lowest LOS feasible within the framework of the plan.
2. Encourage the agriculture industry, especially vineyards, to collect pumping data from all growers, report water use, and identify water use trends with the goal of reducing pumping on an industry-wide basis. Encourage the agriculture industry to increase conservation and sustainability efforts. Report on the outcome of such conservation outreach efforts **twice a year, fall and spring.**
3. Conduct **semi-annual** groundwater measurements to help gauge the scope of groundwater level declines. **County to coordinate and collect data from other entities.**
4. Require new discretionary development that uses groundwater to:
  - a. Provide for monitoring of on-site groundwater wells by the County in areas where data is needed to better estimate groundwater levels.
  - b. Meter and monitor water usage on a **monthly basis and report the results each year** to the Department of Public Works.
5. Conduct another **water balance** update after the initial delivery of Nacimiento water and the completion of the Groundwater Management Plan **or within 5 years of the water balance update (to coincide with the City/CSD Urban Water Management Plan updates), whichever is sooner.** Additional measures will be recommended at that time as appropriate. One such measure, in the event that groundwater levels do not show improvement in the area of **on-going** concern, would be to amend the County Growth Management Ordinance to establish a lower growth rate in that area.

## B. Atascadero Subbasin

Recommended Level of Severity: Assigning an LOS III would be premature. Water balance data is needed prior to that, and is in the process of being developed. [To be completed for review at August WRAC meeting. Can the County or Fugro commit to this date?]

Recommended Actions: In addition to the preceding recommendations A1-5:

1. Encourage the Atascadero Mutual Water Company, the City of Paso Robles, and the Templeton Community Services District to continue and expand their water conservation efforts.
2. Do not approve General Plan amendments or land divisions in the Atascadero subbasin that result in a net increase in the non-agricultural use of water until the water balance analysis is complete and an LOS rating, if any, is certified.

## C. Estrella/Creston Management Area of On-going Concern

Recommended Level of Severity: I\* – Area of continuing well level decline

Recommended Actions: In addition to the preceding recommendations A1-5:

1. Require new development in the “Estrella/Creston Management Area of On-going Concern” that would result in a net increase in the non-agricultural use of water and that is subject to discretionary approval by the County to offset its new water use.
2. Do not approve General Plan amendments or land divisions within the “Estrella/Creston Management Area of On-going Concern” that would result in a net increase in the non-agricultural use of water.

\* Since the management area is not a defined basin, a safe yield cannot be determined. Therefore, under the current definition of Level of Severity, an LOS cannot be assigned; but the continued decline of the groundwater merits precautionary measures.

**Attachments:**

- Attachment 1: Map of the Basin and subareas.
- Attachment 2: Estrella/Creston Management Area of On-going Concern – (Map needs to be revised to include the City of Paso Robles within the management area).
- Attachment 3: Evaluation of Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Pumping, Water Year 2006, Todd Engineers, May 2009.

# **COMMENTS ON WATER RESOURCES WITHIN THE EXPANDING GROUNDWATER DEPRESSION IN THE PASO ROBLES BASIN EAST OF HIGHWAY 101**

W.C. Bianchi, June 2009

The continued drawdown of the groundwater storage in the basin (fall in water table elevation) year by year indicates that groundwater extraction exceeds natural recharge from rainfall, runoff water course percolation and subsurface groundwater flow from peripheral watershed areas. While periodic runoff in the water courses may provide local seasonal basin recharge and water table rise, the magnitude of the drop in water elevation as depicted by Todd (figure B-1 May 2009) from the limited well monitoring would indicate mining of groundwater on a continuing basis.

As a whole, the drawdown of basin ground water elevation is now such that little groundwater is lost as underflow. So the net recharge equates to that amount of water that flows beyond the root zone of the basin vegetative cover plus infiltration from stream channels, ponding/waste disposal/runoff catchment areas less evaporation.

The evaluations that are missing for a determination of the seasonal water balance and water budget trends are:

The estimation of effective precipitation, that amount rainfall that penetrates the soil surface exclusive of interception and direct evaporation off plant cover( can be up to 10% of measured annual precipitation) less runoff . The net inflow into the plant root zone and fractionally into the vadose zone (that portion of the vertical profile below the root zone, unsaturated and above the water table.)

The evaluation of ground water accessibility. That is the storage between the water table and the ultimate maximum well drawdown where water extraction is feasible and water quality is acceptable for use it is intended.

The achievable and sustainable yield (safe yield)

The projection of climate change on sustainability

## **PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS**

Need for expanded monitoring:

Water use and minimum requirements for rural residential and agriculture demand and potential for operational and conservation requirements for achieving this minimum

Evapotranspiration determinations for various urban and Ag land uses on a water year basis for trend studies

Adequate rainfall and evaporation transpiration ET data for an area estimation of net recharge into groundwater storage (expansion of CIMIS stations)

Expanded well measurement network and pump production, and in particular wells classed as agricultural (see Todd figure B-2)

Inventory of well logs, new wells and re-drill deepening occurrences as a measure of the stratigraphy and related site specific accessibility of groundwater within the area

Water quality trends as a response to the above deepening to determine presence of connate water boundary leading to the determination of the maximum depth of fresh water extraction

Repeat 1997 USGS Open File Report 00-447 InSAR study determining seasonal extraction distribution patterns and determine seasonal and total surface subsidence through the measurement period as a result of continued overdraft, potentially giving the extent and distribution of subsurface aquatards (clay lenses) in compression response from increased overburden loading as the water table falls

## **ACTIONS AND SOLUTIONS**

Alternatives to reach sustainability:

Imported water (Coastal Aqueduct? Nacimiento?)

## Conservation

No fresh water use on landscape or horse pastures etc.  
Dry farm agriculture

## Promote Groundwater Recharge

Define protect recharge areas within the basin

Enhance wet year recharge through artificial recharge structures (sand dams and off channel ponding) in and along runoff features and establish programs to maximize soil surface water intake and infiltration, that is, promotion of a no runoff program

As climate change projects less total precipitation but an increase in the frequency of high intensity storms placement of the recharge structures above depends upon the preservation of the existing sand aggregate bed-load of the natural water courses to spread the water over a maximum land surface thus extraction mining counters recharge engineering strategy

Otherwise start looking at an extraction regulation program and a control program for the hauling of safe fresh water to homes from sources of water surplus. Where ever they may be?

## **POLITICAL SOCIO-ECCONOMIC ISSUES**

Individual property owners over this expanding groundwater depression must recognize that continued depletion of a groundwater supply is a problem for all overlying land owners in common. A political structure directed at the solution of their common problem is required. Unfortunately, California water law is not written to accommodate the latter without landowner unity of purpose defined by a local vote, through/by State legislation, District formation, or imposed by the authority of the State Water Resources Boards for cause.

Precedent says where the water table falls beyond user access that those with the deepest wells or the economic capability to deepen their wells will survive longest. Even this is conditioned by site-specific geohydrologic conditions at any given location in the basin.

**TO: Water Resources Advisory Committee**  
**FROM: Syllas Cranor, SLO County Water Resources Engineer**  
**DATE: July 1, 2009**  
**SUBJECT: Agenda Item #6: Agricultural Cluster Subcommittee Report**

### **Recommendation**

1. Review the recommendations of the subcommittee;
2. Consider if the number of residential units should be capped in agricultural clusters; and
3. Distribute the subcommittee's recommendations, should the WRAC approve them, to the Board of Supervisors.

### **Discussion**

#### **Background**

The Board of Supervisors (Board) adopted the agricultural cluster ordinance in 1984 as a tool available to inland property owners to “encourage the preservation of agricultural lands...for the continuing and enhanced production of food and fiber...” As an incentive, the ordinance states that it is the Board’s policy to “encourage the use of clustering by allowing the number of cluster parcels to equal the number of dwelling units normally permitted on a standard agricultural land division”<sup>1</sup>. The agricultural cluster ordinance, provides that landowners can double the number of allowable houses on the property, so long as they are concentrated on 5% of the land, leaving the other 95% as open space or in agricultural use.

During 2004, agricultural cluster ordinance changes were adopted in an attempt to reflect new Agriculture and Open Space Element (AOSE) policies.

During 2006 and 2007, the Planning Commission (PC) held a series of public study sessions on the effectiveness of a handful of AOSE policies. The PC identified the agricultural cluster ordinance as problematic and, after numerous agricultural cluster specific study sessions, wrote a letter to the Board recommending a number of changes to the ordinance.

On February 17, 2009, the Board directed staff to begin the scoping process that ultimately may lead to approved amendments to the agricultural cluster ordinance, the General Plan, and Land Use Ordinance.

---

<sup>1</sup> SLO County Land Use Ordinance Section 22.04.037

On June 9, 2009, the Board directed County staff to:

- Prepare a revised analysis of base density that takes into consideration the entire property, including its agricultural viability, environmental constraints and increase the 20 acre base density minimum;
- Determine what is a “reasonable conventional subdivision” without reducing parcels to the minimum size allowed;
- Allow only one cluster unless it can be shown a discontinuous development has a better environmental result;
- Verify the ag production history of the property;
- An independent survey of an adequate water supply be completed;
- Residential impacts are appropriately mitigated including Assembly Bill 32 standards;
- Establish eligibility requirements for a major and minor ag cluster, that includes 95% of the remaining ag land be placed in a permanent ag easement and the maximum 5% to be developed be calculated on an envelope basis, including roads and buffers on the residential cluster;
- The property be within 2 miles of the urban reserve line;
- Placing a cap on the number of residential units per parcel; and
- Continue discussions with the various affected agencies for their input.

Some Supervisors also indicated that they hoped that the WRAC would opine on the content of the Board’s direction to staff. The subcommittee met prior to June 9, 2009 and was unable to formulate recommendations relative to the Board’s direction to staff.

### **WRAC Involvement**

Members of the WRAC considered the formation of a subcommittee to review the water and wastewater impacts of agricultural clusters at their regularly scheduled meeting on April 1, 2009. A subcommittee to review the water and wastewater impacts of agricultural clusters was formed. Subcommittee members included Michael Winn (District 4), Sue Luft (Environmental at Large), and subcommittee chair Joy Fitzhugh (County Farm Bureau). The subcommittee met on May 27, 2009 and their report is as follows:

Beginning with the first Agricultural Cluster in 1984, the purpose of such clusters was to provide the agricultural landowner with needed financial support while retaining ninety-five (95%) of the land in agricultural production, thus avoiding what is often called “cookie cutter development”.

Normally water allocation for agricultural use is not government’s business, but with Ag Clusters the number of residences is supposed to be proportional to the sustainable ability to irrigate crops.

It is the recommendation of the WRAC subcommittee:

1. That agricultural clusters should be limited to existing developable legal lots of record, with sufficient water supply on the project property.
2. The safe yield, or comparable hydrogeologic determination, of the agriculture's sustainable water supply upon which the number of residences is calculated must be determined prior to approval of an agricultural cluster.
3. The agricultural cluster developer must retain responsibility for adequate residential water supply for a period of years found by independent hydrogeologists to be adequate for its long-term water sustainability.

Question: Does the WRAC feel that a cap on the number of residential units allowable in Ag Clusters would be appropriate?

It is the intent of the subcommittee that the Members of the WRAC consider approving these recommendations, discuss the potential restriction on residential units in agricultural clusters, and forward those recommendations, should they be approved by the WRAC, to the Board.

**TO: Water Resources Advisory Committee**  
**FROM: Courtney Howard, SLO County Water Resources Engineer**  
**DATE: July 1, 2009**  
**SUBJECT: Agenda Item #7: Land to Sea Advisory Committee**

**Recommendation**

Consider whether the WRAC is the appropriate forum to accomplish the goals of a Land to Sea Advisory Committee and provide feedback to the CORRT Project on the formation of such a committee.

**Discussion**

The Coast and Ocean Regional Roundtable (CORRT) Project will be presenting the recommended actions of its June 4th meeting for review by the Water Resources Advisory Committee (see attached report). The formation of a Land to Sea Advisory Committee was one of the topics addressed at CORRT's second annual meeting conducted jointly by the Environmental Center of San Luis Obispo (ECOSLO) and the Planning and Conservation League Foundation (PCLF).

The CORRT proposed action is aimed at establishing a mechanism for local level review of policies and practices that relate to coastal watersheds and marine resource management. The CORRT project has been initiated to consider the recommended actions of the California Ocean Protection Council and also of the Joint Ocean Commission Initiative in considering coastal county interests in new directions in the state's marine and coastal resource policies. The CORRT Project is funded by the Resources Legacy Fund Foundation to support local action to achieve integrated management of coastal and marine resources. The CORRT Project may seek support and/or further suggested actions from the Water Resources Advisory Committee, including potential formal recommendations to the Board of Supervisors.

In addition, WRAC may wish to consider whether the WRAC itself is the appropriate advisory committee to consider land to sea issues, whether WRAC memberships should be expanded to include marine resource expertise, and /or whether WRAC member(s) should be appointed to a Land to Sea Advisory Committee if that separate committee is in fact established. The attached report includes issues identified with this possibility during the June 4<sup>th</sup> meeting.

## **The Coast and Ocean Regional Roundtable Project**

Project contacts:

Monica Hunter, Planning and Conservation League Foundation

Morgan Rafferty, Environmental Center of San Luis Obispo

### **Project Description**

The *Planning and Conservation League Foundation* and the *Environmental Center of San Luis Obispo* have joined in a collaborative effort to conduct a regional forum to consider the land-sea nexus of coastal and marine resource management for San Luis Obispo County. The purpose of the project is to establish a set of priorities and actions that will meet the needs of our coastal communities to conserve, protect and restore coastal watersheds and marine areas in ways that are consistent with new statewide goals for improving California's marine and coastal ecosystems. San Luis Obispo County is one of five coastal counties in the South Central Marine Region that have the opportunity to help define and initiate implementation of marine policy with local action.

The CORRT Project is modeled on the *California and the World Oceans Forum* held in California in 2006, organized to bring the best technical and policy experts together to address new priorities in marine resource management for California and the West Coast. Similarly, the CORRT project has endeavored to identify local resource experts and program managers to address new perspectives and potential gaps in current local and regional programs where innovative solutions will be needed in order to fully implement California's goals to achieve integrated management of coastal and marine resources.

The CORRT Project was initiated in 2008 and was developed through a Planning Group process designed to harness existing local expertise from both marine and land-based conservation groups in order to generate a new perspective on coast and ocean protection that is strategic, collaborative, and regionally specific. This process was developed to maximize the effectiveness of existing efforts, identify new and emerging tools and resources for conserving coastal and marine resources in the future, and serve as an example for other coastal counties seeking to maximize existing expertise and capacity for local-level implementation of new coastal and marine policies. This project is funded by a grant from the Resources Legacy Fund Foundation under its Coastal California Marine Initiatives Program. Project Team members include Marti Johnson, Project Coordinator, and Dennis Bowker, Project Facilitator. Organizations that have participated in the Planning Group process include the following:

### CORRT San Luis Obispo, Planning Group Participants

Agricultural Water Quality Coalition
Bay Foundation
Central Coast RC & D Council
Central Coast Salmon Enhancement
Coastal San Luis RCD
County Water Resources Advisory Committee
Environmental Center of San Luis Obispo (ECOSLO)
Greenspace
Guadalupe Dunes Center
Land Conservancy of San Luis Obispo
Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary
Morro Bay National Estuary Program
Sierra Club, Santa Lucia Chapter
San Luis Obispo County
SLOSEA CalPoly
Surfrider SLO Chapter

### Review of the Second Annual Coast and Ocean Regional Roundtable for San Luis Obispo County: Formation of a Land to Sea Advisory Plenary Session, June 4, 2009

On June 4, the second annual CORRT meeting was held in San Luis Obispo. Approximately 50 people attended the day-long event to participate in a series of strategy sessions. The final session of the day was conducted as a plenary discussion to consider formation of a *Land to Sea Advisory*. This action was proposed by the participants of the CORRT 2008 meeting as a mechanism for local level review of policies and practices that relate to coastal and marine resource management (see Appendix A: 2008 CORRT Recommended Actions). The group was asked to consider options for a Land to Sea Advisory including potential guidance from the recommended actions of the Ocean Protection Council and also of the Joint Ocean Commission Initiative (see cd for copies of these reports), as well as to consider the SLOSEA Project as a model for local level integrated management of coastal and marine resources. The discussion was guided by the following questions:

- I. What is the charge for a Land to Sea Advisory Committee?
- II. What might its structure look like?
- III. Where should the Land to Sea Advisory function be housed?
- IV. How might membership be selected?
- V. How might the reporting hierarchy be structured?
- VI. Consider the following points:
  - *local links* to resource agencies and local government
  - *regional links* to state and federal resource agencies including CDFG; State Parks; Coastal Commission; NOAA; OPC: Coastal Conservancy; Statewide Watershed Program, USGS, and others

## Summary of Plenary Session Comments

### D) Committee Charge

Provide advice and education re land use; land planning; broad based watershed management. The advice would be supplied to policy and decision-makers; land use planners and developers; and land and marine resource users and managers. The charge will be to help implement ideas proposed in the Joint Oceans Committee Initiative (JOCI) report “*One Coast, One Future*” from pages 23-4, 26, and 32-35 (see Appendix A: Excerpted Sections of the JOCI Report). The charge will include providing advice regarding:

*-Making the Land to Sea connection: Recommend ways that existing codes and ordinances can adequately protect the health of coastal freshwater and ocean ecosystems, focusing in particular on reducing the impact of land uses and development on water quality.*

*-Collecting and integrating locally relevant information: Identify and facilitate the collection and integration of high quality coastal freshwater and ocean systems information that is critical for informed local decision making.*

*-Recommend ways to creatively consolidate and rearrange existing resources through partnerships, joint ventures, networks, etc.*

*-The LTSA could provide feedback on projects (proposed and funded/underway)*

*-The LTSA should be an advocate for its charter, and promote wide acceptance of its role.*

(Other notes: Add the term “freshwater” where appropriate to emphasize the connection between coastal watersheds and the marine environment.)

### II. Structure

Ideas presented for the Land to Sea Advisory Committee (LTSA):

- a.) Expand the existing Water Resources Advisory Committee (WRAC) in San Luis Obispo County to incorporate the LTSA

*Issues:*

- such a move could expand the WRAC role too far; may be better to have them be a partner/participant in the LTSA
- This would require a shift from present vertical structure (answerable to the Board of Supervisors) to a more horizontal one with wider connections to cities, etc.
- Is the County prepared to take on the issue of ocean stewardship?

- b.) The LTSA and its advice should be multi-objective and multi-jurisdiction
- c.) The LTSA could function as an organ of the Ocean Protection Council (OPC), with three (or four, if Santa Barbara County is included) County subcommittees

*Issues:*

- The scale needs to be feasible
- This option will likely require regular meetings among the 3 (4) counties
- It might work to hold occasional (bi-annual?) meetings, with ongoing County to County liaison and communication

- d.) Create an informal coalition of existing organizations and entities based on projects, not organizational structure

*Issues:*

- Leaves a void in leadership (“who’s in charge”) – would need someone to take responsibility for logistics, communication, follow-through, etc.
- Would work best if the group can find alignment on priority issues among land and marine management organizations and agencies

- e.) Develop SLOSEA type management action memoranda

*Issues:*

- Who develops them? Based on what? To whom should they be delivered?

- f.) Develop a Joint Powers Agreement among the Counties and Cities on the Central Coast

*Issues:*

- Scale is an issue – how big is too big, and how small is too small? Should Santa Barbara County be included?
- Could meet on an as-needed basis to deal with cross-cutting priority issues
- Could use video conferencing owing to the travel distances across the region
- Some form of structural liaison among the counties will be important

- g.) Hold two CORRT sessions annually in each of the three (four) Counties, and distribute the outcomes widely to the other Counties

*Issues:*

- who will take the lead?
- Are the Counties ready to add another formal layer of responsibility?
- 

### **III. Membership selection**

- a.) Research how the SLOSEA members are selected. (The organization has no formal “head” and funds are handled through CalPoly SLO)

- b.) WRAC members are selected by the Board of Supervisors, and include non-government members (nominated by whom?)
- c.) However chosen, the method should ensure representation of a diversity of perspectives and issues among the group
- d.) Selection method should also ensure that those who receive the advice see the group as having credibility and believability
- e.) The selection should focus on finding a balance between just informing and specific advocacy. The group should be willing to address difficult issues with objectivity and sound recommendations based on the best available science and information (explicit excessive or exaggerated risk avoidance by the LTSA)

#### **IV. To whom will the group send advice (local observations)?**

Ocean Protection Council

County and City governing bodies

Flood control and water management agencies

Local, state and federal agencies (Coastal Commission, Coastal Conservancy, Regional Water Quality Control Board and other agencies with interests in coastal watershed and marine resources)

#### **V. Potential Financial support**

If the function is strictly advisory, it may not require a large investment

It could be funded through in-kind service, rather than through grants

It could be supported with user fees and service contracts

#### **Additional notes and observations:**

A sample (test) question was proposed to test whatever structural or procedural model is considered. The issue is to what degree the LTSA could address trade-offs among competing (or apparently competing) interests in the coastal zone. The test suggested as an exercise would require working through a local situation to explore the various proposals to find an answer to "How do we deal with off highway vehicles using the beach dunes?" as an example of the types of broad scale management issues that the LTSA would pursue.

## APPENDIX A: CORRT 2008 RECOMMENDATION ACTIONS

At the second annual meeting of CORRT held on June 4, 2009, participants were asked to consider the formation of a Land to Sea Advisory for San Luis Obispo county following recommendations of the CORRT 2008 project participants.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS		Strengthening Regional Communication & Collaboration		Integrating Management with Science		Integrating Local to Regional Governance	
		SLO	MC	SLO	MC	SLO	MC
A	Clearinghouse/access to information and resources; coordination of information development to meet local needs <sup>1</sup>	<u>✓</u>	<u>✓</u>	✓	<u>✓</u>	<u>✓</u>	✓
B	Conduct regular local/regional forums to facilitate exchange of ideas, information, foster collaboration, networking including state level programs (e.g., OPC); enhance multiple benefits outcomes through collaboration; promote active communication to the public (CORRT; Regional Stewardship Council)	✓	<u>✓</u>	✓	✓	<u>✓</u>	✓
C	<b>Land to Sea Advisory Program; informing local to regional scale through integrating scientists, managers, elected officials, gaining broad perspective (beyond specific project level goals)</b>	✓		<u>✓</u>	✓	<u>✓</u>	✓
D	Accountability in decision making; mechanisms to integrate and evaluate best science; create rapid response process to diminish negative impacts			<u>✓</u>	<u>✓</u>	<u>✓</u>	✓
E	Develop mechanism for science review, ongoing training/mentoring for program professionals; strengthen program links to UCCE/SeaGrant	✓		<u>✓</u>			✓
F	Local representation at regional/state level to convey local needs and priorities, inform state level funding programs; support for value of regional strategies linked to state goals	<u>✓</u>	✓			✓	
G	Statewide mandate for meeting ecosystem health goals (CEQA, or other local scale mechanisms)						✓

\*Underscore indicates priority action

<sup>1</sup>Information needs include:

- Enhanced reliability
- Increase value through timeliness
- Resources – plans, materials, services (facilitation), funding, technical expertise
- Jurisdictions of agencies
- Areas of interest of local/state/fed agencies
- Case studies, successful programs/partnerships as models
- Compendium of current plans and those in progress
- Current priorities of key resource agencies and programs

SLO = San Luis Obispo County; MC = Monterey County

## APPENDIX B:

### Excerpts from the Joint Oceans Committee Initiative (JOCI) report: *"One Coast, One Future"*

pp 23-24

*"4. MAKE THE LAND-SEA CONNECTION. Ensure that existing codes and ordinances adequately protect the health of coastal and ocean ecosystems, focusing in particular on reducing the impact of land uses and development on water quality.*

*Some land-based activities can cause detrimental impacts to coastal and ocean ecosystems and communities, including loss of wildlife habitat from inappropriately sited development, changes to community character and quality of life of citizens from sprawling growth, and loss of valuable top-soils from erosion. However, the most damaging impacts on West Coast marine ecosystems may come from land-based pollution of coastal and ocean waters. Feasible and effective solutions to many coastal water quality problems have been developed. Unfortunately, there are many examples along the West Coast of local codes that do not allow, let alone encourage, developers and property owners to conduct innovative and beneficial activities. Comprehensive plans, zoning maps and codes, and local regulations should encourage concentration of new development in existing urban centers and away from key ecosystem features, promote clean marina and plastics recycling programs, and require Low Impact Development to allow water to filter naturally, among other activities. It is also important for metropolitan planning organizations and other state and local entities with responsibility for transportation planning to account for impacts on ocean and coastal health when making a range of decisions that affect coastal land uses, air and water quality, and other important elements. Not only will these actions protect and restore water quality, they can help communities achieve other goals as well, such as preserving valuable farm and conservation land; reducing traffic, commute times, and gasoline use; increasing a sense of community and neighborhood safety; and preserving habitat in natural areas that contribute to high quality of life for families.*

*Reducing land-based coastal water pollution may be local leaders' most important contribution to the health of coastal and ocean ecosystems and to the protection of tourism, fishing, recreation and other activities that depend on clean coastal waters.*

*It is also one of the most challenging authorities to exercise because it calls for influencing activities on private property. Key issues related to coastal water quality that local and state leaders should address include polluted storm water runoff, inadequate waste treatment systems, and marine debris including abandoned fishing gear and trash.*

*To address polluted storm water runoff into rivers and coastal waters, local leaders should:*

- Protect key natural features, such as wetlands, that filter storm water naturally by establishing and enforcing strong rules and providing compelling incentives, such as urban growth boundaries and in-lieu fee conservation programs, that encourage new development to occur in appropriate areas.*
- Require the use of Low Impact Development techniques where feasible in all new development. Implementation of Low Impact Development is also advocated in the 2008 Action Plan of the West Coast Governors' Agreement on Ocean Health, is being examined for more widespread application by the California Ocean Protection Council, and was recently ordered by Washington's Pollutions Control Hearings Board to be implemented by that state's largest local governments.*
- Work with landowners, farmers, and businesses to implement best management practices for water quality protection. State and federal agencies and nongovernmental organizations have developed a detailed body of best management practices (BMPs) for water quality protection for a*

*broad range of land use activities. Local leaders are uniquely positioned to create incentives for and/or require widespread implementation of these BMPs in their communities.*

*To address inadequate wastewater systems, local leaders should:*

- Ensure that septic systems are functioning properly, tapping into citizen concerns about water quality to motivate action. Local leaders in many places on the West Coast have developed innovative, citizen-led initiatives that provide education and assistance to property owners whose septic systems require repair and updating.*
- Address the problem of combined sewer overflow systems that inject large amounts of waste into water bodies during storm events. Many cities on the West Coast are struggling with outdated sewer systems, a challenge that can be addressed with strong local leadership.*

*To address marine debris, local leaders should:*

- Reduce the amount of trash that enters coastal waters by enhancing recycling programs, enforcing litter laws, and discouraging consumption of single-use plastics through public outreach, education, and incentives.*
- Establish clean marina programs and reduce derelict fishing gear through programs for recycling gear and fishing lines.*

p 26

*5. COLLECT AND INTEGRATE LOCALLY-RELEVANT INFORMATION. Facilitate the collection and integration of high quality coastal and ocean information that is critical for informed local decision making. State agencies should collect information about the condition of coastal and ocean resources at a scale that is useful for making decisions at the local level, as well as monitoring of the effectiveness of policies and regulations and the effects of those policies on the health of coastal ecosystems and local economies. The kind of information needed includes:*

- Updated high resolution seafloor and coastal land mapping (both bathymetry and LIDAR) and local-scale models for inundation and storm surge from sea level rise and other impacts of climate change, tsunamis, and other coastal hazards*
- Information about key natural features that must be protected for proper functioning of ecosystems, including coastal and nearshore habitats for both target and forage species of fish and other wildlife • Information about regional-scale movement of sediment so that governments are able to better manage shorelines by protecting feeder bluffs and other natural sources of sand for beaches and important nearshore habitats*
- Socioeconomic data about coastal and ocean uses that go beyond just the extractive industries, including recreational boating and fishing, beach going, bird watching, and other activities that contribute significantly to local coastal economies, but are often under-considered in decision making*

pp 33-35

### **Acquiring Resources to Implement an Integrated Approach**

*Local and state leaders striving to protect and restore coastal ecosystems and the economies that depend on them need resources to do so. These leaders are well aware of traditional sources of state and local government funding that can be used for ecosystem protection and restoration activities, including general obligation and revenue bonds, certificates of participation, intergovernmental transfers and assistance, leases of lands and waters, special tax districts, and mitigation and use fees.*

*Many local communities and states will need additional resources to implement an integrated approach for coastal and ocean management and may look to the federal government for assistance. Despite the efforts of Congress, competing national priorities have led to only very modest increases in funding for key ocean agencies, such as National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Both local and state leaders should raise their voices in support of strong federal funding for ocean and coastal science and management, and to ensure that the needs of coastal communities to adapt to climate change and address other critical challenges are taken into account as federal priorities. Raising awareness is particularly important in light of the current financial crisis and the potential for cuts in funding for existing ocean and coastal programs. In addition, now more than ever, leaders at the local and state levels will need to be creative with existing resources and defend current funding for coastal and ocean ecosystem protection programs.*

*9. MAINTAIN OR ENHANCE FUNDING FOR CORE COASTAL AND OCEAN PROGRAMS. In this time of economic slowdown, it is particularly important for leaders at all levels of government to vigilantly ensure that the core coastal and ocean programs so important to protecting ecosystem health maintain current funding levels, and are enhanced where possible. Adequately funded environmental protection and natural resources management programs at all levels of government are essential for supporting ocean ecosystem health and the vitality of coastal economies.*

*10. SEND A CLEAR MESSAGE TO CONGRESS AND THE ADMINISTRATION. Local and state leaders should call on Congress and the incoming Obama Administration to establish a national ocean trust fund and increase funding to address critical coastal and ocean issues important to the nation. To address a shortage of federal funding, the Joint Initiative recommends the establishment of a national ocean trust based on a dedicated source of revenues for the improved management and understanding of coastal and ocean resources. A portion of the fund should be shared with all coastal states to support their efforts at sustainable management of coastal lands and waters. The Governors of California, Oregon, and Washington have stated their strong support for creation of a national ocean trust fund in the Action Plan of the West Coast Governors' Agreement on Ocean Health. Local and state elected leaders who are concerned about the lack of funding for addressing coastal and ocean issues are encouraged to express their support for the creation of an ocean trust fund to their representatives in Congress.*

*Local and state leaders should call on Congress and the new Administration to increase funding to address critical coastal and ocean issues that are important to the nation. The Joint Initiative urges Congress to include funding and technical assistance to coastal states and communities for adaptation and mitigation in any future climate change legislation. The passage of other federal legislation, such as reauthorization of the Coastal Zone Management Act should include an increase in funding for state and local efforts to address important coastal issues such as nonpoint source pollution and coastal habitat protection.*

*11. CREATIVELY CONSOLIDATE OR REALLOCATE EXISTING RESOURCES. Local leaders should ensure they are taking advantage of the full range of grants for conducting coastal research, protection, and restoration that are offered by federal and state agencies. Examples of federal sources of funds include: transportation enhancement grants that can be used for land conservation; programs of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration such as the National Estuarine Research Reserve System, and in particular grant programs under the Coastal Zone Management Act such as coastal enhancement grants, Special Area Management Plans, and the Coastal and Estuarine Land Conservation Program; Federal Emergency Management Agency Hazard Mitigation and Pre-Disaster Mitigation grant programs; U.S. Department of Agriculture grant programs such as the Environmental Quality Incentives Program and the Conservation Security Program; Department of the Interior programs that address coastal and ocean issues, such as the U.S. Geological Survey and the Coastal Program of the U.S Fish and Wildlife Service; and the Environmental Protection Agency's National Estuary Program, among others.*

*Local leaders should leverage resources with other jurisdictions in their watershed or other coordination area to address shared priorities and fund projects that have the greatest positive impact. Adjacent communities can find creative ways to leverage nonmonetary resources by sharing scientific information and join forces in hiring experts and staffing coordinated efforts. They can also collaborate in reaching out to the private sector and state and federal agencies for support and in mobilizing local volunteers. Such cross-jurisdictional efforts can enhance already effective programs by leveraging limited resources and lead to new programs that are effective and efficient. For example, establishing multi-jurisdictional in-lieu fee mitigation programs may be more effective and less costly than relying solely on traditional wetlands mitigation programs.*

*Local leaders should build on existing progress being made by watershed councils, conservation districts, and other local mechanisms that are currently working to coordinate and implement actions to protect and restore coastal resources in many places on the West Coast. These initiatives often have valuable knowledge and experience, relationships with partners, volunteers, and citizens, and resource channels. In addition, federal and state protected or research areas, such as the National Estuary Programs or the National Estuarine Research Reserves, are often eager to engage with local communities and form partnerships to expand science, protection, and restoration efforts outside of their boundaries.*

*State legislatures should establish programs to formally recognize and give priority status for state grants and other funding to local communities that demonstrate a commitment to an integrated, ecosystem-based approach and that need funding for implementation. To assist communities in making informed decisions about coastal issues, states should provide increased technical assistance, funding, and staff for locally-relevant scientific research, public education, updating of local codes and regulations, effective enforcement, and adaptive management. Communities committed to taking an integrated approach to protecting coastal resources should be given priority for some of these state resources.*

**12. ESTABLISH PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS FOR FUNDING AND IN-KIND RESOURCES.** *Local leaders should consider establishing public-private partnerships to develop and implement strategies for coastal and ocean health. Private foundations, businesses operating in the area, and national, regional, state, and local environmental advocacy groups can provide assistance for ecosystem restoration and protection projects in the form of funding and in-kind services. Community foundations are likely candidates, as are individual corporations' giving programs, and high net worth individuals interested in local ecosystems. Chambers of Commerce and faith-based institutions may also meet their objectives through assisting local government with coastal protection and restoration efforts. Manufacturers of software and other management tools might be willing to engage in local pilot projects that can benefit both the company and the community.*

*Leaders of local communities that are coordinating in a watershed or other ecosystem area should consider forming coalitions with other watershed or ecosystem-scale groups to increase their visibility and effectiveness in seeking funds from government agencies and private foundations, which are sometimes reluctant to funding one small watershed group at a time."*