

MINUTES (Approved)

Chairperson: Andy Pease
Vice Chairperson: Thomas Burhenn
Secretary: Brendan Clark

The following action minutes are listed as they were acted upon by the Water Resources Advisory Committee (WRAC) as listed on the Regular Meeting agenda for **September 6, 2023** together with staff reports and related documents attached thereto and incorporated therein by reference.

The video recording of the meeting and materials submitted to the WRAC are available online: [https://www.slocounty.ca.gov/Departments/Public-Works/Committees-Programs/Water-Resources-Advisory-Committee-\(WRAC\).aspx](https://www.slocounty.ca.gov/Departments/Public-Works/Committees-Programs/Water-Resources-Advisory-Committee-(WRAC).aspx)

Call to order at 1:30 PM

1) Determination of a Quorum and Introductions

The number of voting Members present is 18; quorum met.

2) Approval of June 7, 2023 WRAC Meeting Minutes

Item start time ~ [00:05:43](#)

A. Pease introduces the item and asks for questions or comments from the Committee.

C. Mulholland moves to approve the June 7, 2023 meeting minutes and C. Weirick seconds the motion. Motion carries 18-0-0.

3) Presentation from City of San Luis Obispo on Water Resource Recovery Facility Project

Item start time ~ [00:06:40](#)

A. Pease introduces the item and M. Anderson from the City of San Luis Obispo presents on the Water Resource Recovery Facility project.

D. Chipping asks for clarification on how solid waste is sorted from liquids. M. Anderson responds.

E. Greening asks if the project updates are going to result in any changes in the quantity or quality of sludge. M. Anderson responds.

Unidentified attendee asks about the bioreactor and if the nitrogen goes away with the solvents. M. Anderson responds.

D. Chipping asks what the difference is between the minimum discharge requirements from Fish and Game for fish in the creek and the excess water being produced that could be used to sustain groundwater levels in the valley, and to what extent this is being considered by the City of San Luis Obispo. A. Floyd responds.

C. Mulholland asks if there are plans to expand reclaimed water distribution opportunities within the City of San Luis Obispo. A. Floyd and A. Pease respond.

Unidentified attendee asks if there is still a chlorine requirement when using ultraviolet light to process recycled water. M. Anderson responds.

A. Pease asks if a new permit will be pursued once updates to the whole system are complete. M. Anderson responds.

Unidentified attendee asks how much these improvements will cost. Matt Anderson and A. Floyd respond.

Unidentified attendee asks what percent complete is the project. A. Floyd responds.

C. Mulholland asks if this system would clear out any PFAS that may be getting into the effluent from homes. M. Anderson responds.

A. Pease comments on creek discharge requirements and whether they can be better utilized to be more in line with the natural hydrology of the creek.

C. Mulholland comments on the previously adjudicated discharge requirements of 1.74 cubic feet per second. A. Pease responds.

D. Chipping asks about efforts to stop stormwater from entering their sewage treatment system and how well the City has prevented this from happening. A. Floyd responds.

E. Greening comments on the principles of natural versus constant flow.

4) Update from Ad Hoc Committee on Water Sections of the Dana Reserve Project EIR and Consider Action

Item start time ~ [00:35:05](#)

A. Pease introduces the item and L. Chipping provides an update on the Ad Hoc Committee's initial review and comments of the Water Sections of the Dana Reserve Project EIR.

E. Eby comments on tentative agreement between the Developer and County, which covers issues related to supplying water, who pays for infrastructure improvements, and other relevant topics.

W. Clemens asks for clarification regarding the amount of acre feet per year the Nipomo Community Services District will supply to meet the demand of the project. E. Eby responds.

C. Mulholland comments on the committed allocations and availability of water to meet the demand of the project.

D. Chipping comments on the perceived availability of water to meet the demand of the project, adding that it does not consider the general decline of water levels across the basin or the lower than expected in levels shown in the key well index. E. Eby responds.

A. Pease and L. Chipping comment on the range and scope of the issues addressed by the Ad Hoc Committee's report.

A. Pease asks for actions or recommendations from the Committee.

E. Greening recommends receiving and filing the Ad Hoc Committee's report for now and revisiting again during November's meeting for approval to forward to the Board of Supervisors.

The Committee agrees to receive and file the report and revisit the item in November for further actions.

5) Update from Ad Hoc Committee on Bylaws and Consider Action

Item start time ~ [00:45:50](#)

A. Pease introduces the item and provides an update on the Ad Hoc Committee's review of the WRAC Bylaws.

E. Eby asked why the bylaws were missing a notation that meetings cannot be held if technology issues prevent remote access. A. Pease responds.

E. Greening comments on the Brown Act concerning online/remote access.

C. Mulholland moves to recommend that the WRAC bylaw revisions be sent to the County Board of Supervisors for approval. E. Greening seconds the motion. Motion carries 18-0-0.

6) Ongoing Updates

Item start time ~ [00:53:00](#)

a) Rain & Reservoir Report

No comments.

b) California Drought Monitor Summary

No comments.

c) Groundwater Basin Management Efforts

T. Burhenn provides an overview of the Paso Basin Grand Jury Report dated June 23rd and describes the status of responses from the basin management entities. A. Pease responds.

D. Chipping comments on the County's involvement in managing the Paso Basin and asks how to check the progress of GSP implementation/initiatives. S. Sinton responds.

C. Mulholland comments on a New Times article concerning the Paso Basin Grand Jury report, the impacts of current drilling/pumping taking place in the basin, and the importance of SGMA being kept as a discussion topic within WRAC.

S. Carter comments on the five-year reporting requirements of SGMA and the ongoing/near-term basin management efforts.

S. Sinton comments on the Governor's executive order that allowed local water agencies to divert floodwater to recharge groundwater supplies, noting how it didn't allow for capturing water to refill empty reservoirs.

d) Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM)

No comments.

e) Master Water Report (MWR) Update

An update will be provided at December's meeting.

f) State Water Project (SWP)

No comments.

g) Desalination Executable Solution and Logistics Plan (DESAL Plan)

C. Mulholland comments on the language used to describe the DESAL Plan and recommends using clearer language to describe energy use and environmental considerations.

h) Various County Water Programs, Policies, and Ordinances

E. Greening comments that the Board of Supervisors will be reexamining their State Legislative platform at their next meeting, which could be of interest for WRAC Members to provide comments on specific topics that could have water implications.

- i) Open Reporting on Water Conservation Opportunities & Information
No comments.

7) Future Agenda Items

Item start time ~ [01:09:37](#)

A. Pease comments that the October WRAC meeting will be canceled.

November Items:

- Receive Presentation from SLOCOG on the Regional Housing Infrastructure Framework
- Receive Presentation from County of SLO Groundwater Sustainability Director Blaine Reely on an Evapotranspiration (Eto) Pilot Project

8) Public Comment for Items not on Agenda

Item start time ~ [01:11:46](#)

D. Howard provides an update on the efforts of the SLO Beaver Brigade.

B. Clark comments the staff will post a collection of State Legislative items that are related to water to the WRAC website for review.

D. Chipping requests an update on the Los Osos Basin, the status of saltwater intrusion, and why a new well is being drilled over a formation that has never been part of the aquifer.

Unidentified attendee asks if the Dana Reserve Ad Hoc Committee reviewed state water allocations and how they may impact the available water supply. L. Chipping and E. Eby respond.