Paso Basin Advisory Committee

Meeting of Thursday, June 19, 2014

www.PasoBasin.org

2pm – 4pm
Templeton Community Center
601 S. Main Street, Templeton

AGENDA

1.	Introductions and Determination of a Quorum	Committee/Public	2:00 pm
2.	Approve May Meeting Minutes	Committee	2:05 pm
3.	Consider Various Administrative Actions a. Establishing Meeting Guidelines b. Electing a Chair/Vice Chair c. Identifying Subcommittee Participants d. Recommending Additional Member Positions	Interim Vice Chair	2:10 pm
4.	Review Blue Ribbon Committee Outcomes	John Neil	2:35 pm
5.	Update on AB3030 Basin Plan process	County Staff	3:00 pm
6.	Update on Model Update/Supply Options Projects	County Staff	3:15 pm
7.	Update on Special Legislation	Various	3:30 pm
8.	Public Comment	Public	3:40 pm
9.	Future meeting topics/committee comments	Committee	3:50 pm
10.	Adjourn		4:00 pm

The purpose of the Paso Basin Advisory Committee is to advise the County Board of Supervisors concerning policy decisions relating to:

- Implementation of the Basin Groundwater Management Plan
- Development of an "enhanced" Groundwater Management Plan for the Basin
- Formation of a new water district
- Transition of an initial County-supported district to an independent district
- Other policies and ordinances

The Committee will also serve as a public forum to discuss and collect comments on Basin issues.

PASO ROBLES GROUNDWATER BASIN ADVISORY COMMITTEE:
PASO ROBLES CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

May 22, 2014 Meeting Minutes

An audio recording of the meeting and materials submitted during public comment are available online at www.SLOCountyWater.org.

Approximately 2:00 pm the meeting is called to order

1. Determination of Quorum and Introductions: Until such time the bylaws for the Committee are established, a quorum is considered a simple majority of occupied membership positions being present. A quorum is established.

2. Select Interim Chairperson/Vice Chairperson: Until such time the bylaws for the Committee are established, there is general consensus to elect an interim Chairperson and Vice Chairperson to lead the meetings. Member Larry Werner is elected interim Chairperson, and Member John Neil is elected interim vice-chairperson, both by unanimous vote.

3. Membership Update/Discuss ongoing meeting schedule: Courtney Howard, County Public Works Staff, notes that memberships for the Monterey County Water Resource Agency and the non-viticulture irrigated agriculture alternate member will be taken forward to the Board in June; she is corresponding with other agencies regarding their vacant positions; and she is looking for an alternate member candidate for CSA 16 (Shandon).

   After a brief discussion, general consensus was reached that regular meetings will continue to be on the 3rd Thursday alternating locations and running from 2 to 4 pm. Evening meetings would be considered on a case by case basis.

4. Consider Recommending the Board Approve Bylaws: Courtney Howard, County Public Works Staff, introduces draft bylaws for the Committee and notes that the draft was modeled after the County's Water Resources Advisory Committee bylaws. After discussion of the draft, a motion is made to recommend that the Board approve the draft bylaws amended to reflect annual reporting and bylaw review. After the motion is seconded, the motion passes unanimously.

5. Update on Special Legislation: Alternate Member Reaugh provides an update to the Committee on the State Assembly's consideration of special legislation to modify the governing board structure of a California Water District should one be formed for the Paso Basin, and next steps should it pass the Assembly. Discussion ensues regarding opposition to and support for the legislation, the voting methodology for the formation vote, the Local Agency Formation Commission's role, the County's role, previous Blue Ribbon Committee actions to support the formation of an independent water district and

to support the special legislation, and the role of the Committee in basin governance issues.

6. Update on AB 3030 Basin Plan Process: Courtney Howard, County Public Works Staff, notes that on March 18, 2014, the Board of Supervisors approved a resolution of intent to amend the AB 3030 Groundwater Management Plan (AB 3030 Plan) for the Paso Basin and that staff will be developing a task schedule for amending the AB 3030 Plan. Discussion ensues regarding the content of the existing AB 3030 Plan and the anticipated changes.

7. Update on Supply Options Studies: Courtney Howard, County Public Works Staff, provides an update on the study to evaluate State Water, Nacimiento and Recycled Water supplemental water supply options for the Paso Basin and notes that the announcement regarding whether the US Bureau of Reclamation will study the Salinas River Basin will be in June.

8. Update on Computer Model/Level Data: Courtney Howard, County Public Works Staff, provides an update on the Basin Computer Model Update project, including a description of the calibration process, the subsequent availability of refined inflow and outflow estimates, and the simulations (growth and non-growth) to be run. Results are anticipated to be presented to the committee in July.

   Ms. Howard notes that updated composite well-level hydrographs will be developed after completing requirements associated with the State's groundwater monitoring database program. Discussion ensues regarding data gaps, new volunteers identified as a result of the Blue Ribbon Committee's previous efforts, and continuing to identify new volunteers.

9. Update on Planning Department Efforts: James Caruso and Cheryl Cochran, County Planning Department Staff, provide an update on the residential and agricultural water use offset programs implemented as a result of the County's Urgency Ordinance, including the availability of information at www.pasobasin.org for the former and efforts with the Upper Salinas-Las Tablas Resource Conservation District (RCD) to develop the latter. Staff notes that the Board will be considering the approach to the agricultural water use offset program during its July 8, 2014 meeting. Discussion ensues regarding the general approach for the offset programs, the requirement to meter and monitor use from new wells but not report the information, the timing for urgency ordinance expiration and the development of non-temporary ordinances.

10. Consider Forming Various Subcommittees: After brainstorming and discussing the need and options for various subcommittees, the Committee forms the following subcommittees by unanimous vote: AB 3030 Plan Update, Supply Options Study, Basin Solutions and Implementation, Basin Computer Model Update, and Outreach and Education.

11. Public Comment: Gwen Pelfrey speaks to the Integrated Regional Water Management Program drought grant application for San Luis Obispo County and funding opportunities

Draft

for North County needs. Sheila Lyons reads a letter from the Creston Advisory Body to the Paso Basin Advisory Committee requesting consideration of recommending that the Board add a Creston Advisory Body member and alternate member position to the Committee.

Motion to extend 10 minutes- motion passes unanimously.

12. Future Meeting Topics/Committee Comments: Members suggest reviewing the efforts of the Blue Ribbon Committee and considering additional positions for the Committee during the next meeting.

13. Meeting Adjourned at 4:10 pm

Draft

PASO ROBLES GROUNDWATER RESOURCES ADVISORY COMMITTEE 2014

Organization	Representative		Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS AND ASSOCIATIONS														
Atascadero Mutual Water Company	John Neil	M					X							
	Jaime Hendrickson	A												
Central Coast Vineyard Team	Kris Beal	M					X							
	Willy Cunha	A					X							
City of Atascadero	Vacant	M												
	Vacant	A												
City of Paso Robles	Christopher Alakel	M					X							
	Christine Halley	A												
City of San Luis Obispo	Carlyn Christianson**	M												
	John Ashbaugh**	A												
County of Monterey (Resource Management Agency)	Tom Moss*	M												
	Carl Holm*	A												
Monterey County Water Resources Agency	Robert Johnson**	M					•							
	Howard Franklin**	A					•							
Paso Robles Imperiled Overlying Rights (PRIOR)	Steve Sinton	M					•							
	Kent Gilmore	A					X							
Paso Robles Wine Country Alliance	Patricia Wilmore	M					X							
	Jerry Reaugh	A					X							
San Miguel Community Services District	Anthony Kalvans	M					X							
	Dan Gilmore	A					X							
Shandon (County Service Area 16)	Donna Ellis	M					X							
	Vacant	A												
SLO County Cattlemen's Association	Kurt Bollinger	M					X							
	Dale Evanson	A												
SLO County Farm Bureau	Paul Clark	M					X							
	Megan Silcott	A					X							
Templeton Community Services District	Jeff Briltz	M					X							
	Tina Mayer	A												
Upper Salinas-Las Tablas RCD	Laura Edwards	M					X							
	Devin Best	A					X							
AT-LARGE														
Viticulture Agriculturalist At-Large	Dana Merrill	M					X							
	Robert Brown	A					X							
Non-Viticulture Irrigated Crop Agriculturalist At-Large	Bill Spencer	M					X							
	John DeRosier**	A												
Environmental At-Large	Sue Harvey	M					X							
	Daniel Meade	A					X							
Rural Residential At-Large	Sue Luft	M					X							
	Michael Baugh	A					X							
	Claudia Engel	M					X							
	Maria Lorca	A					X							
	Edward C. Redig	M					X							
	Jim DeRose	A					•							
	Steve Crouch	M					X							
	William Frost	A					X							
	George Tracy	M					•							
	Don Wilson	A					X							
(District 1)	Randy Diffenbaugh	M					X							
	Randy Heinzen	A					X							
(District 5)	Greg Grewal	M					X							
	Dr. Serena Friedman	A												
Undesignated At-Large	Larry Werner	M					X							
	Miller Newlon	A					X							

M = Member; A = Alternate; NM = New Member; NA = New Alternate; O = Other Representitives (e.g Staff, Council, Board, etc.)

~~strikethough text~~ = indicates that this individual is no longer serving in this role; • = Notified of absence or conflict

* = To be confirmed at a future BOS meeting

** = Membership to be confirmed by the BOS on 06.17.14.

PASO ROBLES WATER RESOURCES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

2014 GUEST LIST

NAME	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
Mike Mersmer					X							
Mark Williamson					X							
Dale Tozzi					X							
Laurie Gage					X							
Sheila Lyons					X							
Robert Hartzell					X							
Vicki Shelby					X							
Daniel Heimel					X							
Pal Kaselionis					X							
John Hollenbeck					X							
Blane Reely					X							
C.Z. Whitney					X							

Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Advisory Committee

Proposed Meeting Guidelines

To keep the meetings focused and productive, they will be conducted in accordance with the following guidelines:

1. There is a common understanding that

- The Paso Robles Groundwater Basin (Basin) is an essential agricultural, environmental, and human resource.[1]

- Studies have shown there are declines in groundwater levels in some areas of the Basin.

- Committee members are committed to effectively managing this resource and implementing solutions to stabilize or improve groundwater levels.

- The strategies needed to protect this resource are diverse and will likely entail costs and/or sacrifices by the stakeholders.

- These costs and/or sacrifices should be equitably borne by the stakeholders.

2. Conversation will be focused on solutions, with the prioritized list of solutions approved by the Blue Ribbon Committee as the basic foundation and starting point, and will therefore not include:

- A review or rehash of past failures

- Discussion about the past actions or character of any individual community member in relation to the water issue

[1] Listed in alphabetical order.

PASO ROBLES GROUNDWATER RESOURCES ADVISORY COMMITTEE
SUBCOMMITTEE VOLUNTEERS

Organization	Representative		AB3030	Supply Options	Model Update	Outreach	Solutions	
Atascadero Mutual Water Company	John Neil	M	X	X	X			
	Jaime Hendrickson	A				X		
Paso Robles Wine Country Alliance	Patricia Wilmore	M	X				X	
Templeton Community Services District	Jeff Briltz	M		X				
Environmental At-Large	Sue Harvey	M	X	X	X		X	
Rural Residential At-Large	Sue Luft	M	X		X		X	
	Michael Baugh	A	X	X				
	Claudia Engel	M	X			X	X	
	Jim DeRose	A						any 1 as needed
	George Tracy	M		X	X			either one as needed
(District 5)	Greg Grewal	M					X	
(District 5)	Dr. Serena Friedman	A		X				
Undesignated At-Large	Miller Newlon	A					X	
			6	6	4	2	6	

Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Advisory Committee
Subcommittees

June 19, 2014

1. AB 3030 Groundwater Management Plan Amendments (AB 3030[1]) Subcommittee

The City of Paso Robles and San Luis Obispo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (Flood Control District) developed and adopted the initial AB 3030 Groundwater Management Plan[2] (AB 3030 Plan) for the City and the unincorporated area of the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin (basin) in San Luis Obispo County (exclusive of local agency[3] boundaries) in 2012. Since that time, additional computer modeling and data collection, governance structure and solutions feasibility efforts have been initiated. Consequently, it is timely to begin amending the AB 3030 Plan in a manner consistent with State Water Code in order to incorporate theses basin issues. The Board of Supervisors approved a resolution of intent to amend the AB 3030 Plan on March 18, 2014. Water Code requires that the amended Plan be considered for adoption within two years from that date – March 18, 2016.

Amending the existing AB 3030 Plan for the basin will require the same procedures as its original adoption including the March 18, 2014 resolution of intent, public notifications, stakeholder outreach and participation, hearing requirements, and the opportunity for landowners to protest. If landowners whose land value exceeds 50% of the value of all land covered by the AB 3030 Plan submit protest against adoption of the amendments, then they cannot be adopted or reconsidered for one year. The process and timing of amending the existing AB 3030 Plan will also need to consider water district efforts and legislation that may be approved in 2014.

On December 12, 2013, staff presented a report to the Blue Ribbon Committee (BRC), which included Attachment "A" to illustrate the general approach to amending the AB 3030 Plan. Attachment "B" includes the goals and objectives discussed with the Board on October 1, 2013. At their January Meeting, the BRC supported the approach, which is reflected in Attachment "C."

Charge of the Subcommittee:

- Review the detailed outline associated with amending the AB 3030 Plan and the preliminary Water District comparison from consulting firm HydroMetrics (see Attachment "D") when available
- Advise the full Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Advisory Committee (PBAC) on the salient features of the outline

[1] See CA Water Code Section 10750 et seq. for the legislative provisions associated with the development and implementation of an AB 3030 Plan. Note that certain provisions took effect after the existing AB 3030 Plan's adoption. http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayexpandedbranch.xhtml

[2] http://www.slocountywater.org/site/Water%20Resources/Water%20Forum/pdf/201103%20-%20Paso%20Basin%20Final%20GMP.pdf

[3] Local public agencies that provide water service and other agencies that provide flood control, groundwater management or groundwater replenishment (but do not fall within the statutory definition of "local agency")

- Engage in the amendment process at key milestones to provide updates and seek direction from the full Committee
- Make recommendations to the full Committee on how the 12 components of an AB 3030 Plan required under Water Code Section 10753.7 should be incorporated into the amended AB 3030 Plan.

2. Supplemental Water Supply Options Feasibility Study

On January 28, 2014, the Board of Supervisors approved a contract[4] with Carollo engineers to evaluate water supply options for the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin. In order to inform in detail the public and entities who might implement a project(s), the scope of work includes defining and evaluating:

- How much State Water, Nacimiento Water and Recycled Water may be available, including its quality/suitable uses
- When each water supply option may be available (i.e. how long into the future, duration, wet/normal/dry years)
- Alternative points of delivery to the basin for each water supply option
- Costs
- Other considerations including regulatory, contractual, environmental, financial, timing and public/institutional acceptance

Charge of the Subcommittee:

- Engage in the Supply Options study at key milestones to advise the full Committee. For example:
    - Provide input on the detailed task schedule when available
    - Participate in public workshops
    - Review and provide comment on written materials
    - Make recommendations to the full Committee on the prioritization of supplemental water projects based on availability, reliability, and feasibility.

3. Computer Model Update Subcommittee

The next milestones for the model update are the refined inflow and outflow estimates, using the model to run two baseline scenarios, and the draft Model Update Report. Previous deliverables/milestones were reviewed by the BRC's subcommittee and the steps from April 2014 through the completion of the project are included in Attachment "E".

Charge of the Subcommittee:

- Provide input on the draft report when available

[4] http://www.slocountywater.org/site/Water%20Resources/Water%20Forum/SOS/pdf/Supply%20Options%20Carollo%20Agreement%20Executed.pdf

- Review the various scenarios that could be evaluated with the updated model and make recommendations to the full Committee on which scenarios should be evaluated.

4. Outreach and Education Subcommittee

Charge of the Subcommittee:

- Provide input on the integration of outreach, education and conservation programs into the amended AB 3030 Plan
- Provide input on the approach to advertising for and conducting public workshops associated with basin efforts
- Provide input on the basin website(s)
- Provide input on how to convey technical information, such as the computer modeling results

5. Basin Solutions and Implementation Subcommittee

This subcommittee would focus on basin solutions that are identified on the Blue Ribbon Committee's prioritized solutions list (Attachment "F") and are not covered by a subcommittee named above. Since the subcommittee's charge hasn't yet been tied to a specific project, policy or ordinance being considered by the Board of Supervisors or another agency, initial deliberations might include:

- Following the groundwater/water-related ordinances being developed by the Planning Department and Public Health Agency (ST-2, ST-5, ST-8, MLT-4, MLT-6[5])
- Following the study of recharge areas in the basin being conducted by the Upper Salinas-Las Tablas Resource Conservation District, and implementation of existing programs such as the mobile irrigation lab, conservation projects and best management practice education/certification programs (ST-2, ST-3, ST-4, ST-7, MLT-5)
- Following the Nacimiento Commission's consideration of the Participating Agencies' options for subscribing to the full allocation, short term agreements with agricultural entities, and other items that may affect the basin (ST-12, ST-13, MLT-1, MLT-3)
- Discussing the options/pros/cons for in-basin multi-party sponsored systems to convey or retain supplemental water, groundwater and/or storm water for residential, agricultural and/or environmental needs and groundwater management in geographically specific areas. For example, county service areas, irrigation districts, in- or off-stream retention systems on private property, etc. (ST-1, ST-3, MLT-3, MLT-5)
- Monitor and report on Solutions in progress such as the efforts of the City of Paso Robles and the Atascadero Mutual Water Company to utilize additional Nacimiento water to further recharge the basin. (C-1 through 10)

[5] Relevant Solution Numbers - Refer to Attachment "F"

Attachment A
General Approach to Amending the Basin

Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Management Plan
Draft Outline of Conceptual Modifications
December 2013

Existing Chapter #	Existing Chapter Title	New Chapter Title	Comments
1	**Introduction**	**Executive Summary** • Purpose of the Amended Plan • Summary of Plan Contents • A Guidance Document for Policy Decisions	Move existing contents, which is substantially a summary history of management activities, to a Plan exhibit or addendum and provide that it will be updated as new studies, programs or projects are completed.
2	**Need for Groundwater Management Planning**	**Background on State and Local Issues** • A Need for Comprehensive Groundwater Management • Problem Statements and Solutions	The changes in this chapter should include an expanded discussion of the existing contents to provide readers with context in terms of how groundwater is managed in California, trends and current legislative proposals, and needs specific to the Paso Basin.
3	**Water Resources Setting**	**Water Resources Setting** • Summarized Discussion • Sub-Areas • Metrics	The existing contents of this Chapter should be made more concise with details on the different sub-areas incorporated into exhibits or addendums that can be updated in the annual report. It should also include an explanation of the "Metrics" that will be used to monitor the basin.
4	**Goals and Objectives**	**Powers, Authorities, Goals and Objectives** • Existing contents plus; • More Robust Features, with • References to Water Code Sections that provide more Robust powers	This chapter should provide a discussion of the relationship between "powers and authorities" to "goals and objectives." It should discuss BMO's but details of BMO's and evaluation in comparison to Metrics should be in exhibits or addendums that can be updated in the annual report. addendum

Attachment A
General Approach to Amending the Basin

Existing Chapter #	Existing Chapter Title	New Chapter Title	Comments
5	**Groundwater Management Plan Components**	**Groundwater Management Programs and Activities** • Data Collection and Evaluation • Annual Reporting • Resources Needed for Programs • A Program for Developing Project Proposals • Rules and Regulations • Other Programs and Activities	Much of the existing content will carry forward – providing a discussion of the programs that support data collection and evaluation and comparison to BMO's/Metrics. Information relating to capital projects should a) be included in exhibits or addendums that can be updated in the annual report and b) replaced with a discussion of how Project Proposals should be developed – i.e. a "Program for Developing Project Proposals" with a discussion of scope, schedule and budget development; and technical, environmental and financial approaches. A discussion of the future development of rules and regulations should also be included.
6	**Stakeholder Involvement**	**Organizational Roles, Committees and Community-Based Decision Making** • Organization Chart • Committee Structure • Approach to Community Based Decision Making	Much of existing concepts will carry forward and supplemented with business issues and practices. Concepts of "Community-Based Decision Making" will be included to provide guidance on how new and emerging issues will be addressed including when the need to update the Groundwater Management Plan would be required.
7	**Plan Implementation**	**Plan Implementation** • Five (5) Year Budget Projections and Revenue assumptions • Water Code Section Requirement for a Funding Proposition • Proposition 218 for Programs • Proposition 218 for Projects	The title should remain the same but the approach will somewhat differ. A business plan approach with multi-year budget projections should be supplemented with staffing and other cost projections. Discussion of the significant funding issues should be included. Details in the existing chapter on short-term, mid-term and long-term Groundwater Management Activities should be in exhibits or addendums that can be updated in the annual report when appropriate.
8	References	References	

Attachment B
AB 3030 Goals and Objectives

The current Basin Plan identifies numerous management activities that are needed for the basin, including the need to establish funding and inter-agency coordination. The Plan does not, however, include management activities that are compulsory on those who pump groundwater. The Groundwater Management Plan does not include a funding plan and no enforcement provisions exist.

In order to prepare and adopt or amend an AB 3030 Plan, a groundwater management district must follow WCS 10753.2 – 10753.6 which require a resolution of intent, public notifications, preparation and participation of interested parties, hearing requirements, and the opportunity for landowners to protest. WCS 10753.6(c)(2) specifically addresses landowner protests and provides the following:

> *"If the local agency determines that a majority protest[1] exists, the groundwater plan may not be adopted and the local agency shall not consider adopting a plan for the area proposed to be included within the program for a period of one year…"*

Therefore, an objective of the goal to develop a more robust AB 3030 Plan follows:

> Objective 1(A) – Ensure that the development of a more robust AB3030 Plan includes participation of interested landowners and their support so that a majority protest does not result.

A second objective can also be drawn from the language of WCS 10753(a) since the authorization to adopt a plan only exists if the groundwater basin is "not subject to a court order, judgment, or decree…" (for example, the final judgment resulting from an adjudication). It is worthwhile to attempt to avoid the need for a court to enter an order, judgment, or decree governing the Basin.

> Objective 1(B) – Ensure that the development of a more robust AB 3030 Plan does not create obligations or impacts that would trigger an adjudication of the Basin.

Although this second objective may seem more difficult to assess, the guidance needed in developing a more robust AB 3030 Plan would hopefully include the participation of

[1] WCS 10753.6(c)(1) states that "A majority protest shall be determined to exist if… protests filed and not withdrawn… represent more than 50 percent of the assessed value of the land… subject to groundwater management…"

the interested parties who might otherwise be inclined to institute an adjudication. If those parties believe that an adjudication will do substantially better at protecting their interests than the provision of a more robust AB 3030 Plan, then those parties may be more inclined to initiate litigation. While the initiation of litigation does not, on its own, preclude the adoption of an AB 3030 Plan (WCS 10753(a) precludes AB 3030 plans where a court *order, judgment or decree* has been entered), the AB 3030 Plan should endeavor to enable interested parties to avoid the need to file a lawsuit.

Additional objectives can also be drawn from other AB 3030 Water Code Sections.

> Objective 1(C) – Ensure that the development of a more robust AB 3030 Plan includes a comprehensive funding plan.

WCS 10754 establishes the authority to fix and collect fees and assessments needed for the groundwater management activities. WCS 10754.3 states "Before a local agency may levy a water management assessment… or otherwise fix and collect fees for the replenishment or extraction of groundwater… the local agency shall hold an election…" and "that the local agency shall be so authorized…if the majority of the votes cast at the election is in favor of the proposition."

> Objective 1(D) – Ensure that the development of a more robust AB 3030 Plan includes a proposition for registered voters to authorize the ability to generate revenues.

Since the groundwater district will also be subject to Proposition 218 (1996) – the "Right to Vote on Taxes Act," the funding plan should describe how the various provisions of Prop 218 would apply to a groundwater management district. Significant differences exist in Prop 218 between developing assessments, fees and/or charges for the costs of groundwater management activities such as data collection and groundwater monitoring versus, for example, the costs of implementing a water supply project. A robust AB 3030 Plan needs to clearly illustrate these differences so that both landowners and registered voters understand the differences, and so that they can understand what their "Right to Vote on Taxes" means in the context of a groundwater management district. Likewise, it is important that a more robust AB 3030 Plan clearly illustrates how the AB 3030 funding plan will be subject to Proposition 218 even after the district is formed, since Prop 218 is part of the State Constitution and cannot be waived by a groundwater management district's governing board.

> Objective 1(E) – Ensure that the development of a more robust AB 3030 Plan provides for the adoption of rules and regulations by the District.

WCS 10753.9(a) states "A local agency shall adopt rules and regulations to implement and enforce a groundwater management plan…"; WCS 10753.9(b) states that "Nothing

in this part shall be construed as authorizing a local agency to make a binding determination of the water rights of any person or entity."; and WCS 10753.9(c) states "Nothing in this part shall be construed as authorizing the local agency to limit or suspend extractions unless the local agency has determined through study and investigation that the groundwater replenishment programs or other alternative sources of water supply have proved insufficient or infeasible to lessen the demand for groundwater." Consequently, the adoption of the rules and regulations will need to specifically address the details of how the district would enforce its groundwater management activities including any effort to limit or suspend groundwater extractions, if needed in the future.

Objective 1(F) – Ensure that the more robust AB 3030 Plan is acceptable to the Board of Supervisors, acting on behalf of the Flood Control District.

WCS 10750.7 and 10750.8 include language that states "A local agency may not manage groundwater… within the service area of another local agency… without the agreement of the other local agency." On the other hand, WCS 10750.4 states "Nothing in this part requires a local agency overlying a groundwater basin to adopt or implement a groundwater management plan or groundwater management program pursuant to this part." The development of a California Water District to provide supplemental water to specific landowners would seemingly be permissible. Although different paths exist to the formation of a groundwater management district, any such district that is established may need an agreement with the Flood Control District if it intends to develop an AB 3030 Plan. It is important to recognize that the Flood Control District is already implementing the existing AB 3030 Plan. Since the transition from the Flood Control District to an independent groundwater management district is among the options under consideration, issues associated with this process will need further analysis to ensure it is acceptable to your Board.

Objective 1(G) – Develop more robust technical plan components.

Chapters 4 and 5 of the existing Basin Plan identify its "Goals and Objectives" and "Groundwater Management Plan Components." Since the Basin Plan does not included mandatory requirements for data collection or meters, as examples, it should be updated to address more robust technical plan elements. The Basin Plan includes eight (8) sub-areas and developing a more robust AB 3030 Plan should address whether managing the subareas differently may be beneficial. Existing evaluations indicate that groundwater level declines are different in the subareas and it may follow then that different groundwater management activities may be sensible in the different subareas. Overall, the existing Basin Plan is a good start, and has certainly helped to develop a forum for stakeholders to initiate collaborative efforts. Nevertheless, the objective to develop more robust technical plan components is necessary to provide for long-term basin stabilization.

Objective 1(H) – Clearly identify the Sequencing of Issues and Decision-Making.

While Objective 1(G) recognizes that making the existing AB 3030 Plan more robust will need significant technical efforts, Objective 1(H) is intended to help illustrate how the sequencing of those issues leads to decision-making. As previously identified, for example, WCS 10753.9(c) states:

> "Nothing in this part shall be construed as authorizing the local agency to limit or suspend extractions unless the local agency has determined through study and investigation that the groundwater replenishment programs or other alternative sources of water supply have proved insufficient or infeasible to lessen the demand for groundwater."

Consequently, the feasibility studies of supplemental water and determinations must be completed before limiting or suspending extractions can be enforced by a groundwater management district pursuant to an AB 3030 Plan.

Other sequencing issues will also be identified in making the AB 3030 Plan more robust. The ability to manage the basin in its subareas will require a greater understanding of the subareas than currently exists. Dedicated monitoring wells and improved data collection will be needed prior to considering details on how, or what, the groundwater district should do in managing subareas. Likewise, it will be important to focus on some subareas earlier than other subareas. So, it is reasonable to believe that a groundwater management district may deem that management activities in some subareas require less detailed rules and regulations while those in other subareas need more detailed rules and regulations.

Lastly, the sequencing of issues and decision-making is also important to understand which issues should be decided before the creation of the groundwater management district versus which issues should be decided after the creation of the groundwater management district. Theories of "local control" and "self-regulation" might suggest that the groundwater district should be established first, and then that groundwater district would create the new and more robust AB 3030 Plan. Others might contend that the more robust AB 3030 Plan should be prepared first so that the stakeholders understand the "blueprint" on what the proposed groundwater management district will be doing.

In conclusion, the balance between the development of a more robust AB 3030 Plan and sequencing of issues, decisions, and creation of a groundwater management district need to provide as much clarity as possible so that stakeholders understand how the district will function while also recognizing that many decisions can be made only after the groundwater management district is created and its governing board is established.

Objective 1(I) – Ensure that the Plan provides for coordination with other Agencies and other efforts.

The existing AB 3030 Basin Plan covers a portion of the Basin, but not its entirety. In addition, several water purveying entities exist and pump from the basin. AB 3030 limits the ability of the any local agency to implement a plan over the service area of other local agencies without their agreement. As a result, a more robust AB 3030 should address the other agencies and other efforts relating to the overall management of the groundwater basin.

In some cases, updating the AB 3030 Plan will simply require an explanation of those other efforts. For example, the City of Paso Robles is currently developing a Salt and Nutrient Management Plan in accordance with the requirements of the Regional Water Board, which addresses water quality. A more robust AB 3030 Plan should explain the effect of County's ordinances. In addition, the development of a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) should be considered so that the anticipated groundwater management district can convene with the other local agencies, in a formal setting, to review annual reports and to confer on cooperative efforts that should be pursued collectively by the local agencies.

Summary of Goal #1 to develop a more robust AB 3030 Plan.

That intent to develop a groundwater management district has been expressed locally by many as an important component of local efforts necessary to avoid the coercive process of an adjudication. The goals and objectives of a more robust AB 3030 Plan have been developed for your Board discussions to help further identify how to address the decision making of landowners, registered voters, and the County and to identify the need for a funding plan, a funding proposition, rules and regulations, technical improvements and proper sequencing of decisions.

L:\MANAGMNT\OCT13\BOS\PRGB Exhibit B.doc.taw

Attachment C
Letter of Support

From: Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Blue Ribbon Steering Committee
To: SLO County Board of Supervisors

California Water Code Section 10750 et.seq. (commonly referred to as AB 3030) allows the SLO County Flood Control and Water Conservation District ("District") to develop a groundwater management plan for the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin within its jurisdiction exclusive of local agency/water purveyor service areas. The District adopted a Groundwater Management Plan ("AB 3030 Plan") for that portion of the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin in 2012.

The Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Management Plan Blue Ribbon Steering Committee ("BRC") was formed to implement the Plan. On May 7, 2013, the BRC requested that the SLO County Board of Supervisors provide the necessary financial and technical support to implement a Groundwater Management District with participation of all of the stakeholders in the basin.

When the current Plan was adopted, it was with the understanding that its implementation would be voluntary. A “phasing” of the Plan is allowed, which provides for progressive successful implementation as the Plan and the groundwater management structure move forward. The BRC recognizes that a second phase or “enhanced” AB 3030 Plan needs to be adopted, which would identify the specific management activities that need to be implemented to stabilize and protect the basin, as well as the development of a sustainable funding strategy. The “enhanced” AB 3030 Plan has been discussed during several meetings of the BRC and is the direction the BRC is recommending to the SLO County Board of Supervisors.

The BRC is recommending to the SLO County Board of Supervisors that the process of adopting an "enhanced" AB 3030 Plan begin. We are recommending that the Board of Supervisors (acting as the District Board) adopt a resolution of intention to review, study, and draft an enhanced AB 3030 Plan. During this process, there will be opportunities for comment and participation by all interested stakeholders. The final adoption and implementation of the AB 3030 Plan would be best conducted by the proposed Paso Robles Basin Water District. If the Paso Robles Basin Water District is not created within 24 months, the County should adopt the enhanced AB 3030 Plan.

Blue Ribbon Committee
For the Paso Robles Groundwater Management Plan
Meeting of Thursday, January 16th, 2014

2 pm – 4:30 pm
Paso Robles City Council Chambers

Mission Statement
"The Steering Committee will coordinate with stakeholders to implement the Groundwater Management Plan to ensure the health of the basin"

AGENDA

1.	Introductions	Committee/Public	2:00 pm
2.	Meeting Procedure and Expectations	Larry Werner	2:03 pm
3.	Review of Minutes from last meeting	Larry/Mike	2:05 pm
4.	Public comment	Public	2:10 pm
5.	Staff Update Feasibility Studies-Supply Options/Basin Solutions Farm Bureau Member Update Urgency Ordinance Implementation AB 3030 Plan and Legislative Platform Timing	Courtney	2:20 pm
6.	Consideration of Approving a Recommendation to the Board of Supervisors that the Board adopt an item for inclusion in the County Legislative Platform that is consistent with and supportive of the PRAAGS/PRO Water Equity agreement	Jerry/Sue	2:30 pm
7.	Consideration of Approving a Recommendation to the Board of Supervisors that they Adopt a Resolution of Intent to Modify the AB 3030 Plan	Sue	3:00 pm
8.	Consideration of Approving a Recommendation to the Board of Supervisors on a BRC Successor Committee	Larry	3:30 pm
9.	Education/Outreach Committee Update	Claudia	4:00 pm
10.	Public comment	Public	4:15 pm
11.	Future meeting topics/committee comments		4:25 pm
12.	Adjourn		4:30 pm

Paso Robles Groundwater Management Plan
Blue Ribbon Steering Committee

Meeting Minutes
Thursday, January 16, 2014

Paso Robles City Council Chambers
1000 Spring Street

1&2: **Introductions and Meeting Expectations**

Members Present:

Larry Werner, At-Large (Chair)
John Neil, Atascadero Mutual Water Co.
Russ Thompson, City of Atascadero
Keith Larson, City of Paso Robles
Steve Sinton, Paso Robles Imperiled Overlying Rights (PRIOR)
Kent Gilmore, (PRIOR)
Courtney Howard, SLO Co. Flood Control District
Kurt Bollinger, SLO Cattlemen's Assoc.
Jerry Reaugh, Paso Robles Wine Country Alliance (PRWCA)
Joy Fitzhugh, SLO County Farm Bureau
Megan Silcott, SLO County Farm Bureau
Willy Cunha, Shandon, Central Coast Vineyard Team (CCVT)
Patricia Wilmore, PRWCA
Anthony Kalvans, San Miguel CSD
Jeff Briltz, Templeton CSD
Tina Mayer, Templeton CSD
Claudia Engel, At Large
Sue Luft, At Large
Dana Merrill, At Large
Maria Lorca, At Large

Members Absent:

Kris Beal, CCVT
Laura Edwards, Upper Salinas-Las Tablas RCD
Robert Hartzell, Upper Salinas-Las Tablas RCD
Jim Magill, At Large
Mike Cussen, At Large
Monterey County Water Resources Agency Rep

3. **Review of Minutes from Last Meeting** - The minutes from the previous meeting were accepted unanimously with one date clarification by Sue Luft.

4. **Public Comment** - There were no Public comments.

9. **Education/Outreach Committee Update** (moved up on the agenda) - Claudia Engel gave a brief update on the website being down and hopefully coming back in the future.

   Joy Fitzhugh gave a brief overview of work being done on Rainwater collection by Trout Unlimited in the County and suggested the Committee get a presentation on the project. There was general positive response and it was suggested that the SLO Greenbuild website had free downloads of publications on water catchment and legal grey water use.

5. **Staff Update** - Courtney Howard presented the Staff Update on Supply Option Feasibility Studies. They project a cost of 1.5 million dollars for the two studies. They plan to take this proposal before the BOS (Board of Supervisors) on 1/28/14. They are going to ask the BOS to also fund a contract with Hollenbeck Consulting to supply Technical review of the two studies and to offer subcontractor support to both studies for $90,000. They will present the BOS, dependent upon positive action by this Blue Ribbon Committee, a recommendation to form a successor committee to the BRC on 1/28/14. Also dependent upon positive recommendations of this committee they will recommend to the BOS that it support the proposed special legislation concept presented by PRAAGGS and PRO Water Equity for the formation of a special water district under the laws of the State of California and in a parallel tract begin the process to update our AB3030 Plan on February 11th. On 1/28-14 Staff will recommend to the BOS to approve replacing Jackie Crabb with Megan Silcott as the Alternative SLO Farm Bureau Rep. The Planning Dept. Tuesday discussed and voted to use our local Resource Conservation District as the lead in developing an Agricultural "Offset Program" for new planting under our Urgency Ordinance #3246. In the meantime the County will use the Napa County Program as a Model.

6. **Consideration of Approving a Recommendation to the Board of Supervisors that the Board adopt an item for inclusion in the County Legislative Platform that is consistent with and supportive of the PRAAGS/PRO Water Equity agreement** - Jerry Reaugh with Paso Robles Agricultural Alliance for Groundwater Solutions (PRAAGS) and Sue Luft with Pro Water Equity (PWE) gave a short presentation regarding the proposed Paso Robles Basin Water District formation concept and language. The District would be formed by parallel tracts coming together. A local Representative to the California State Legislature, probably Katcho Achadjian, would carry a very simple bill modifying water code to include the process to elect board members for a Paso Robles Basin Water District. The two lawyers representing PRAAGS and PRO Water Equity in consultation with members of those two groups are working on the final language to be presented for review. The water district formation process will go through our local LAFCO for public meetings and review before being voted on by the LAFCO Board. For the District concept to be implemented it must be positively passed by both houses of the State Legislature and signed by the Governor and voted on and passed by our LAFCO. Once

John Neil asks what "balance' means. Steve Sinton answers stop water level declines and with the goal of recovering older higher level. Claudia Engel asks what the "checks and balances" for the District are. Jerry Reaugh answers the diverse 9 Board Members and the election process. Joy Fitzhugh asks if the process to move the legislation, review and rewrite our AB3030 Plan and the LAFCO review happen on separate or parallel tracts. PRAAGS/PWE representatives respond that in order to utilize this year's legislative process, Rep. Achadjian is looking for support from various stakeholder groups and the Board of Supervisors needs to make its recommendation of support by 2/11/14 to introduce the bill in time, and that the goal would be able to start the formation process in early 2015. Someone asked if the District could control water extractions from the basin. Sue Luft answered, via the AB 3030 program, if other efforts fail to stabilize water levels, the Water District Board could control extractions. Sue Harvey asked how the public can comment on the proposal if they cannot see the actual language. The response was that actual proposed language for the legislative action will be available the week of 1/20/14 and that the public will have access to the language (which will be very similar to what was outlined) at BOS meetings, State Legislature Process and during the LAFCO process, and that the bill will be very simple and open giving Basin stakeholders local control.

John Neil moves and Claudia Engel seconds to give our support to the BOS adopting a resolution of support for this concept. It passes unanimously.

Larry Werner is impressed with the progress the Committee made over the last year.

7. **Consideration of recommending to the BOS that they Adopt a Resolution of Intent to Modify the AB 3030 Plan for the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin** – A draft recommendation document from the Committee is reviewed. Steve Sinton expresses concern that the Basin might end up with two AB 3030 plans and that it might be better to wait for the District to form and let that Board create the updated plan. Committee members discuss and decide it would be good to start the process but not have the County adopt the final product if a Water District is formed and revisions to the document are made. Dana Merrill moves and Patricia Wilmore seconds that the Committee recommend that the Board proceeds with developing the language for a more robust AB 3030 but that they wait for the formation of a District, up to 24 months, before adopting the AB 3030 Plan themselves. The motion carries unanimously.

8. **Consideration of Approving a Recommendation to the BOS that they create a successor committee to the BRC** – After brief discussion, the Committee unanimously approves the language found in the County recommendation with the addition of the City of SLO and the inclusion of 1 undesignated at-large member and reducing the representation for rural residential from six to five. The Dept. of Public Works would advertise the openings, collect and analyze the applications and take them to the BOS with their recommendation. The representatives for the Cities, Districts or Organizations would be nominated by those organizations for consideration by the BOS.

10. **Public Comment** - none

11. **Future meeting topics/committee comments** - Claudia Engel thinks the advisory committee should not disband at the point of District Formation. Others suggested that the new District Board would want to form their own advisory committee. Sue Luft wants the Committee to formally propose water saving practices that the community at large could implement in the face of the current drought. John Neil reports that the City of Atascadero is declaring an updated drought level and will be doing public outreach and they fully expect to safe 15%. Larry Werner congratulated both Atascadero and Paso for their innovative short term use of Naciemento Water to reduce their use of basin water. Keith Larsen reported that Paso Robles will have approximately 3,000 acre feet of treated water that could be piped to the east if they had a partner capable of paying for that delivery. Steve Sinton suggests the Committee go over its spreadsheet of Solutions at the next meeting. Willy Cunha agrees that this would be a good chance to visit water infiltration projects and practices along with practices to reduce water use.

Next Meeting: February 20th in Templeton.
Final Meeting: March 13th in Paso
Ides of March the BRC disbands!

Attachment D

HydroMetrics WRI

519 17th Street, Suite 500
Oakland, CA 94612

Mr. Paavo Ogren, Director of Public Works
San Luis Obispo County
County Government Center, Room 207
976 Osos Street
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408

November 13, 2013

Subject: Proposal to Provide Comparative Analysis and Conceptual Initial Operating Budget as part of the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Special District Business Plan

Dear Mr. Ogren:

Thank you for the opportunity to assist with developing a special district to assume responsibility for groundwater management of the Paso Robles Basin. The issues and approach for resolving water supply concerns in that area are intriguing.

As you may recall from my résumé, I have 33 years of local government administration experience. Particularly relevant are my seventeen years as the General Manager of a county water district that was identified as one of California's exemplary and innovative groundwater management agencies by both the Association of California Water Agencies (ACWA) and Stanford University's Woods Institute. I understand urban, rural residential and agricultural stakeholders from having managed an M&I water purveyor while being personally affiliated with agriculture and rural residential well owners. Under my leadership, Soquel Creek Water District was very successful in public outreach and engagement, interagency collaboration, water conservation, and integrated water resources planning to address declining groundwater levels. For these reasons, we believe our firm is uniquely qualified to provide exceptional service to facilitate the creation and start up of a special district for the Paso Robles Basin.

The following proposal responds to your request from last week. In describing the approach to the tasks, I suggest criteria for selecting comparable agencies and elements to

include in the comparison that I believe will be helpful to you and the stakeholders to move toward an acceptable and ultimately successful organizational structure.

Understanding of the Purpose for this Engagement

The San Luis Obispo County Public Works Department is developing a business plan for the proposed Paso Robles Groundwater Management Agency (PRGMA). HydroMetrics WRI has been asked to provide a proposal for completing two tasks associated with the business plan development:

- Task 1: Identify comparable special districts responsible for groundwater management.
- Task 2: Provide a side by side operating and capital outlay budget. The proposed agency's services will include assuming monitoring responsibilities and implementing basin management actions including demand management/conservation and development of supplemental supply. This budget will be used to determine the revenue needs for funding the special district. The budget will not include a capital improvement program for projects associated with acquiring and delivering a future supplemental water supply.

Understanding of Need

The Paso Robles Groundwater Basin encompasses an area of approximately 505,000 acres (790 square miles.) This basin is under stress and experiencing significant decline in groundwater levels, particularly in the area underlying the City of Paso Robles and eastward along the Hwy 46 corridor known as the Estrella Sub-area. Agricultural water users constitute an estimated 67 percent of the Basin's pumping. There are also numerous M&I water suppliers, including the cities of Paso Robles and Atascadero, whose primary source is groundwater. Individual domestic groundwater users and isolated subdivisions are located throughout the Basin, often in the more rural areas dispersed among the agricultural areas. There is some conflict between larger agricultural pumpers and rural residents with wells completed in the shallow aquifer, who are concerned about their wells going dry.

A Blue Ribbon Task Force comprising agricultural, M&I, and rural residential stakeholders has been formed by the County of San Luis Obispo to: 1) recommend actions to stabilize the basin; 2) recommend structures for management and accountability of GMP activities; and 3) recommend financing and cost sharing approaches for implementation activities.

The SLO County Department of Public Works is developing a business plan that will provide information on the initial revenue needs and accelerate completion of the initial work program for the proposed special district by providing a template from which to develop the organization and proceed with addressing groundwater issues.

Approach

Task 1: Identify comparable special districts responsible for groundwater management.

We will research and select three to five comparable groundwater management agencies within California for comparison using the following criteria:

1. Groundwater pumping includes a mix of users including agriculture, M&I and rural residential. At least 50% of basin extraction should be for agriculture.

2. The agency should perform the following functions:
    a. Collects and manages pumping data
    b. Monitors groundwater levels and quality
    c. Performs groundwater studies to understand aquifer characteristics and sustainable yield
    d. Establishes and administers water demand management/conservation programs
    e. Develops supplemental water supply sources and distribution systems
    f. Assesses fees and charges to support the agency's programs and projects

Following is a preliminary list of groundwater management agencies that will be evaluated against the criteria for use in the comparison. We will do additional research to identify others that could be good matches.

- Desert Water Agency
- Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency
- Long Valley Groundwater Management District
- Honey Lake Groundwater Management District
- Kern County Water Agency
- Mendocino City Community Services District
- Mono County Tri-Valley Groundwater Management District
- Ojai Groundwater Management Agency
- Pajaro Valley Water Management Agency
- Semitropic Water Storage District
- Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District
- Willow Creek Groundwater Management Agency

Deliverable: We will provide a summary of the governance structure, functions and other features that make each of the selected agencies appropriate models for development of the proposed Paso Robles Groundwater Management Agency. This summary will be presented to the SLO County Director of Public Works for approval prior to proceeding with Task 2.

Task 2: Provide a side-by-side, five-year operating and capital outlay budget.

We will contact each of the selected agencies to: 1) obtain a current operating budget; 2) understand the fee structure for acquiring operating revenues and whether capital improvement project costs are proportioned according to benefit; 3) identify staffing classifications and numbers and associated salaries and benefits (including whether the agency is a PERS member); 4) identify ongoing consultant costs and services, e.g. hydrogeologists, legal and engineering services; and 5) understand how pumping quantities are determined for purposes of rates, i.e. are all wells metered or only large wells with flat rates assigned to smaller wells based on water use factors.

Using information provided by the surveyed agencies and personal knowledge of groundwater management agency organizational needs and costs, we will develop a side-by-side comparison of staffing, professional services and other cost allocations for the surveyed agencies, compare rates and charges structures, and develop a conceptual five-year operating and initial capital outlay budget for the proposed PRGMA.

Deliverable: Side-by-side comparisons of staffing, professional services and other cost allocations as well as rates and charges structures for the surveyed agencies, and a conceptual five-year operating and initial capital outlay budget for the proposed PRGMA.

Project Team and Estimated Cost

I will be the primary contact and will perform all work except clerical support on the final report. I anticipate doing most of my research using the internet and telephone surveys, although I will meet in person with the Pajaro Valley Water Management Agency given their strong comparability to the proposed PRGMA. The firm's president, Derrik Williams, will be a resource for me and review my work. The proposed budget is attached. It assumes one meeting with you in San Luis Obispo. The project cost will be based on actual hours spent with a not-to-exceed total of $12,600.

Schedule

The Task 1 deliverable will be submitted within two weeks of the notice to proceed. The Task 2 deliverable will be submitted within three weeks of receiving approval of Task 1.

This proposal was prepared according to my understanding of your objectives. I am happy to discuss any modifications that would better suit your needs. Thank you again for this exciting opportunity. I look forward to hearing from you about proceeding with this project.

Sincerely,

Laura D. Brown

Laura D. Brown
Senior Manager
HydroMetrics Water Resources Inc.

Attachment: Cost Estimate for PRGMA Comparative Analysis

Attachment E

APRIL 2014

NEXT STEPS TO COMPLETE UPDATE OF THE PASO ROBLES GROUNDWATER BASIN COMPUTER MODEL

After putting the preliminary estimated inflow and outflow data presented in December 2013/January 2014 into the model, the next steps required to complete the model update include: 1) developing a model calibration plan; 2) performing the recalibration process; 3) performing a sensitivity analysis of the groundwater flow model; 4) conducting two predictive model runs; and, 5) preparing a draft final model update report for review and comment. A description of each step is provided in the following sections.

1. Perform Model Recalibration

Objectives of Model Recalibration

The objectives of the recalibration process to update the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Model are to ensure that the calibrated flow model provides satisfactory agreement between model results and the hydrologic conditions observed within the Basin, and that the updated model will be capable of producing reliable predictive results for use in the support of basin groundwater management.

Calibration Approach

Calibration is the process of adjusting the model parameters to produce the best-fit between simulated and observed groundwater system responses. During the process of calibration, model parameters are adjusted using reasonable anticipated values until model-generated groundwater levels match historical levels. The recalibration period will be for water years 1981 to 2011 using a semi-annual stress period. This process is likely to result in refined inflow and outflow estimates that will be reported when the model calibration process is finished.

Calibration Targets

A groundwater flow model calibration target consists of measured groundwater elevations at specific well locations. The calibration target set will consist of measured groundwater elevations from a representative distribution of wells in the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin.

Evaluation of Recalibration Results

Hydrographs of model-generated water levels will be prepared and used to compare to measured levels in the calibration target wells that are screened in the different model layers. The agreement between model-generated water levels and measured water levels will be used to provide a graphic representation of calibration results. A scatter plot of modeled versus observed water levels will be generated, displaying calibration statistics such as mean residual, maximum residual, minimum residual, standard deviation and relative error. A histogram of water level residuals (i.e., measured levels less model-generated levels) will also be prepared.

In general, transient model calibration is acceptable with a relative error (the standard deviation of the groundwater level residuals divided by the observed head range[1]) of 10 percent.

[1] Zheng, C. and Bennett, G.D., 2002. Applied Contaminant Transport Modeling, Second Edition.

2. Sensitivity Analysis

The purpose of a sensitivity analysis is to assess input parameters which have the greatest effects on a model's simulation results. To assess the sensitivity to individual model input parameters, each parameter will be varied individually while the others remain constant. Parameters to be varied for the model sensitivity test are:

- Deep percolation of streambed seepage,
- Deep percolation of direct precipitation and return flow from applied water,
- Subsurface inflow through the Basin boundary,
- Deep percolation of discharged treated wastewater effluent,
- Groundwater pumping, and
- Subsurface outflow through the Basin boundary.

Each parameter that is identified to cause a change in the model results will be investigated thoroughly to identify flow model uncertainty.

3. Perform Management Scenario Runs

The updated and calibrated Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Model will be used to simulate two management scenarios (Baseline 1 and 2) developed to test the response of the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin under current and projected water demands and changes in growth. Specifically, the two management scenario runs include:

a) Baseline 1 – No Growth Model Run (Water Years 2011-2041)

- 2011 water demand
- 2011 Nacimiento usage
- No growth (i.e., development)

b) Baseline 2 – Growth Model Run (Water Years 2011-2041)

- Projected water demands
- Projected Nacimiento usage
- Projected growth (includes vineyards and 1% growth for existing rural development)

4. Model Update Summary Report

The results of the model recalibration, sensitivity analysis, and simulated predictive basin management scenarios will be submitted as a draft model update report for review. All comments and resolutions will be documented and incorporated into the final model update summary report.

Attachment F

Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Management Plan
Blue Ribbon Steering Committee
Top Ranked Solutions
August 21, 2013

Solution Number	Solution Category	Water User	Solution
Emergency Solutions			
E-1	Management	Rural Residential	Provide a potable water source for use in trucking water to homes for emergency purposes.
E-2	Management	All areas	Create a structure to achieve an equitable allocation of safe yield for all Basin water users.
Short Term Solutions (Implementation in 1 to 5 years)			
ST-1	Management	All areas	Create a Basin-wide groundwater management structure(s). Create water districts or other management authorities to convey water to agricultural users and create small community systems for rural communities.
ST-2	Conservation	All areas	Identify, implement, and make available appropriate Best Management Practices.
ST-3	Management	Rural Residential, Agriculture and Rural Non-Domestic	Encourage projects that detain or slow runoff to recharge the Basin.
ST-4	Conservation	Rural Residential and Rural Non-Domestic	Maximize water use efficiency as appropriate to achieve water use reduction.
ST-5	Conservation	All areas	Meter all new and replacement wells and measure all well outputs and report.
ST-6	Conservation	Urban - Templeton and San Miguel	Participate in California Urban Water Conservation Council policies and practices as appropriate.
ST-7	Conservation	Rural Residential, Agriculture and Rural Non-Domestic	Conduct regular outreach activities.
ST-8	Management	Rural Residential, Agriculture and Rural Non-Domestic	Require new development to be water neutral.
ST-9	Management	All areas	Annually monitor status of Basin to determine whether solutions are effective.
ST-10	Management	Rural Residential	Require disclosure when land is sold that Basin is in decline and may not be suitable to rely on for intensive use.
ST-11	Conservation	Urban – Paso Robles, Atascadero, Templeton, San Miguel	Reduce per capita consumption to offset growth in service area where appropriate.
ST-12	Supplemental	All areas	Exchange or bank Nacimiento water with Santa Margarita Lake to benefit Basin.
ST-13	Supplemental	Paso Robles	Structure operations to use alluvial water first, Nacimiento water second and Basin last.
Medium and Long Term Solutions (Implementation in 6-10 years (Medium) and greater than 10 years (Long Term)			
MLT-1	Supplemental	All Areas	Implement water supply options associated with State Water and the Salinas River Corridor (may include use of Nacimiento & other areas of Basin & increasing the capacity of Santa Margarita Lake).
MLT-2	Supplemental	Monterey County	Explore opportunities with Monterey County including Lake Nacimiento / Lake San Antonio intertie (tunnel).
MLT-3	Supplemental	All areas	Direct delivery of unsubscribed Nacimiento or State Water Project allocation water.
MLT-4	Management	All areas	Prohibit groundwater exports from the Basin.
MLT-5	Management	All areas	Establish mechanisms to protect recharge areas and maximize watersheds.
MLT-6	Recycling	All areas	Incentivize the installation of grey water reuse systems onsite.
Completed or Already in Progress Solutions			
C-1	Supplemental	Atascadero	Utilize the full allocation (2,000 AFY) by fully utilizing the existing percolation ponds.
C-2	Conservation	Urban – Paso Robles and Atascadero	Participate in California Urban Water Conservation Council policies and practices.
C-3	Conservation	Agriculture – Irrigated Crops	Conduct outreach for County's groundwater level monitoring program.
C-4	Management	Agriculture & Rural Residential	Implement ordinances to prohibit subdivisions of land or General Plan Amendments in the Basin.
C-5	Management	Rural Residential	Implement landscaping ordinance.
C-6	Management	All areas	Establish baseline conditions of Basin through updated model.
C-7	Management	All areas	Implement landscaping ordinance (ag processing).
C-8	Management	Rural Residential	Implement Low Impact Development standards.
C-9	Supplemental	Templeton	Maximize or increase the use of the full Nacimiento allocation (250 AFY).
C-10	Supplemental	Shandon	Connect Shandon to State Water Project and set up distribution system (100 AFY).

Summary of Blue Ribbon Committee Outcomes

March 12, 2012: Concurrent with its adoption by the County Board of Supervisors (BOS), the individuals and agencies engaged in the development of the 2012 AB 3030 Groundwater Management Plan (AB 3030 Plan) were formally approved as a 2-year term Blue Ribbon Committee (BRC) charged with implementing the AB 3030 Plan and making recommendations to the BOS.

BRC's Approach: The BRC established the following mission statement:

> *"The Steering Committee will coordinate with stakeholders to implement the Groundwater Management Plan to ensure the health of the basin"*

The BRC reviewed and reorganized the implementation task schedules in the Plan (Chapter 7) to identify the top priority near term actions and formed subcommittees. Efforts of these volunteers included:

- Identifying property owners willing to join the County's well level measuring program and address data gaps
- Developing a website, radio spots and an outreach brochure to educate the public about conditions in the basins, water use efficiency measures and the BRC
- Assisting in the update of the computer model of the basin
- Evaluating and prioritizing the various supplemental water, management, conservation and recycled water options to achieve Basin management objectives

Major Outcomes:

- After identification and review of about 100 potential properties, approximately 24 new volunteers were added to the County's well level measuring program.
- Based on content development by and input from the subcommittee, the Central Coast Vineyard Team sponsored the design and creation of a BRC website (www.ourwaterbasin.org) and brochure, and the City of Paso Robles sponsored radio public service announcements.
- The computer model update subcommittee provided technical data and local input on the methodology for the update and helped to develop the approach to the baseline growth and no-growth simulations to be run.
- As a result of the "Solutions" subcommittee's monthly deliberations, the following actions were taken by the BRC:
    - April 18, 2013: Requested that the Board provide the technical and financial support needed to implement a Groundwater Management District for the Basin (Attachment 1)
    - August 15, 2013: Approved a list of prioritized solutions (Attachment 2)
    - March 17, 2014: Recommended that the BOS support the proposed Paso Robles Basin Water District (Attachment 3)

Attachment 1

Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Steering Committee

Larry Werner
Chairperson

Dana Merrill
Vice Chairperson

pasobasincommittee@gmail.com

April 23, 2013

Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of San Luis Obispo
County Government Center
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408

The management of our water resources is a high priority for the Board of Supervisors, Municipal and Private water providers, Agriculturists and Rural Residential water users.

On March 27, 2012 the Board of Supervisors recognized The Blue Ribbon Committee for the implementation of the Paso Robles Groundwater Management Plan as the appropriate group of stakeholders.

The Committee immediately created a strategic approach to implementing the Plan by developing a prioritized Task List as the base functional document and strategy. The basic implementation plan was based on a series of short term and long term tasks and goals that highlight data collection, education and outreach, engineering modeling, and Solutions.

Throughout the last year the Committee has worked in four areas:

- Data collection

  It was apparent that the collection and analysis of data was of fundamental importance. The Committee determined that the best way to expand the database was to engage in a personal outreach effort to target areas lacking in data and contact property owners to request their participation in well level monitoring. As a result of personal outreach there was a significant increase in well level monitoring participation, with particular success in the targeted areas. This will provide the base data for the effective modeling of the Basin Solutions.

Mission Statement
"The Steering Committee will coordinate with stakeholders to implement the Groundwater Management Plan to ensure the health of the basin"

- Education and Outreach

  The Committee prepared an outreach brochure that was mailed to over 6,000 rural residents and launched a website to educate the public and to provide access to historical technical reports, agendas, minutes and links to other resources.

- Engineering Modeling

  The Committee assisted County Staff in preparing a scope of work and securing grant money for the modeling effort.

- Solutions

  The Solutions Committee spent hundreds of man-hours assembling a comprehensive list of potential solutions for the stabilization of the groundwater basin. In the interest of transparency and completeness all solutions proposed by the Blue Ribbon Committee, Solutions Committee, County Staff and the public have been included in one comprehensive list, which is attached.

As the Solutions Committee was assembling and ranking the proposed Solutions it became apparent that in order to implement many of the Solutions a broad management structure would be necessary to implement the Solutions for the stabilization of the basin. To this end, the Solutions Committee prepared a recommendation to the Blue Ribbon Committee and on April 18, the Blue Ribbon Committee unanimously approved the attached recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

It is the request of the Blue Ribbon Committee that the Board of Supervisors immediately provide the necessary financial and technical support to implement a Groundwater Management District with participation of all of the stakeholders in the basin. The Committee recognizes that implementation of a District is a process that involves many steps and opportunities for public review and input.

The formation of a Groundwater Management District will take time. It is therefore the intent of the Blue Ribbon Committee to complete the ranking of the Solutions and bring viable short term and long term Solutions to the Board for consideration and potential implementation in the meantime.

Respectfully submitted,

Larry Werner
Chairman

Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Management Plan Blue Ribbon Committee
Solutions Recommendations
Adopted April 18, 2013

The Solutions Subcommittee of the Blue Ribbon Committee was tasked with compiling an exhaustive list of all potential solutions for consideration for the implementation of the Paso Robles Groundwater Management Plan, which is attached. These potential solutions are categorized as Conservation, Supplemental Water, Recycling and Management.

With Blue Ribbon Committee concurrence, SLO County Public Works is taking the lead on evaluation of the Supplemental Water and Salinas River Management Solutions so that technical information can be developed to better vet the alternatives. As longer-term options may require immediate implementation actions, and due to the complexity of the evaluation and implementation, the technical analysis of these alternatives needs to start now.

The Solutions Subcommittee is now embarking on the task of ranking the Conservation, Supplemental Water, Recycling, and Management Solutions based on timeframe, acre-ft of water potentially provided, cost and feasibility.

In preparation for the May 7th update to the SLO County Board of Supervisors, the Solutions Subcommittee began discussion of the potential solution(s) that clearly rank the highest. The highest solution was presented to the Blue Ribbon Committee at the April 18th meeting and unanimously approved for submittal in the report to the Board of Supervisors.

The Blue Ribbon Committee believes that the structured management of the groundwater basin is the solution that is the most crucial to the basin. The Blue Ribbon Committee believes that the management of the groundwater basin might be best served by a special district dedicated to the goals and objectives of the Paso Robles Groundwater Management Plan. Without management of the groundwater basin, well levels will likely continue to decline. Adoption of many short term or long term solutions requires that a management structure be in place to enable financing and implementation of those solutions.

A groundwater management structure can take several forms in order to implement the proposed solutions on the attached Solutions list. A basin-wide groundwater management district, a rural water district, and/or an irrigation district can be formed. The district(s) could have the authority to contract for water supplies, convey water, store water, contract for professional services, purchase easements, provide incentives for conservation, monitor basin level changes, and perform other services necessary to manage the groundwater basin. The intent of the district(s) would be to meet the Basin Management Objectives of stabilizing and maintaining the groundwater basin well levels. A management district is the umbrella under which comprehensive management can occur.

The groundwater management structure needs to be put into place immediately as the well level declines are escalating throughout the majority of the groundwater basin. Having a dedicated management structure with a daily focus effort on water management, there would be a mechanism to stabilize the groundwater basin levels and protect the significant economic investments of agriculturalists, municipal users, and the rural residents throughout the groundwater basin.

In order to start this process, the Blue Ribbon Committee is requesting the SLO County Board of Supervisors supports securing technical and legal advice, in coordination with other groups and individuals investigating this solution, to formulate the most feasible structure and public process to enable the formation of a Groundwater Management District.

Approved unanimously
April 18, 2013

The Blue Ribbon Committee additionally requested at their April 18th meeting the following:

- Funding for help for the Flood Control and Water Conservation District staff.

- Direction and support to District staff to prepare an annual report for the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin every year.

- Direction and support to District staff to update the well level hydrographs are soon as possible after each April and October well testing.

1. Conservation

1.1 Urban – Paso Robles, Atascadero, Templeton, San Miguel

1.1.1 Reduce per capita consumption to offset growth in service area.

1.1.2 Limit pumping to winter time water use.

1.1.3 Participate in California Urban Water Conservation Council policies and practices.

1.2 Agriculture – Irrigated Crops

1.2.1 Perennial crops

1.2.1.1 Vineyards

1.2.1.1.1 Reduce water usage on a per acre basis.

1.2.1.1.2 Identify and implement BMPs, including frost protection BMPs.

1.2.1.2 Other perennial crops

1.2.1.2.1 Reduce water usage on a per acre basis applicable to each crop.

1.2.1.2.2 Identify and implement specific BMPs.

1.2.2 Annual crops

1.2.2.1 Reduce water usage on a per acre basis applicable to each crop.

1.2.2.2 Identify and implement specific BMPs.

1.2.3 Agricultural processing, including wineries

1.2.3.1 Reduce water usage on a per unit basis for each type of ag processing.

1.2.3.2 Identify and implement specific BMPs.

1.2.4 For all irrigated crops and ag processing facilities.

1.2.4.1 Conduct regular outreach activities.

1.2.4.2 Conduct outreach for County's groundwater level monitoring program.

1.2.4.3 Identify BMPs and set targets to measure success.

1.2.4.4 Install water meters on irrigation and ag processing wells.

1.3 Rural Residential

1.3.1 Reduce water usage on a per household basis.

1.3.2 Identify and implement specific BMPs.

1.3.3 Conduct regular outreach activities.

1.3.4 Install water meters on domestic wells.

1.4 Rural – Non-domestic (Golf courses, industrial, equestrian pastures, recreational, etc.)

1.4.1 Reduce water usage on a per unit basis applicable to each operation.

1.4.2 Identify and implement specific BMPs for non-domestic uses.

1.4.3 Conduct regular outreach activities.

1.4.4 Install water meters on non-domestic wells.

2. Supplemental Water

2.1 Nacimiento Water – 6,095 AFY unsubscribed and available for purchase.

2.1.1 Expansion of current infrastructure

2.1.1.1 Urban and Urban – Non-Domestic

2.1.1.1.1 Paso Robles

2.1.1.1.1.1 Build water treatment plant to full capacity of 4,000 AFY.

2.1.1.1.1.2 Structure operations to use alluvial water first, Naci water second and basin last.

2.1.1.1.1.3 Connect the Paso Robles / Templeton system to Atascadero by installing 1,400 feet of pipe.

2.1.1.1.1.4 Increase alluvial well pumping to maximize use of Salinas River appropriation.

2.1.1.1.2 San Miguel

2.1.1.1.2.1 Develop a San Miguel turnout.

2.1.1.1.3 Atascadero

2.1.1.1.3.1 Utilize the full allocation (2,000 AFY) by fully utilizing the existing percolation ponds.

2.1.1.1.4 Templeton

2.1.1.1.4.1 Maximize the use of the full allocation.

2.1.1.1.5 All Urban

2.1.1.1.5.1 Maximize use of remaining unsubscribed allocation in other ways.

2.1.1.1.6 Monterey County

2.1.1.1.6.1 Negotiate with Monterey Co for additional Naci water to utilize full hydraulic capacity of pipeline.

2.1.1.2 Agriculture – Irrigated crops

2.1.1.2.1 Agriculture to use Nacimiento water.

2.1.1.3 Rural Residential

2.1.1.3.1 Wheel water through existing community systems or build infrastructure to deliver water.

2.1.2 Injection

2.1.2.1 Implement injection where it will replenish groundwater basin.

2.1.3 Recharge

2.1.3.1 All areas –Develop recharge basins.

2.1.4 Other options

2.1.4.1 Develop other carryover storage options.

2.1.4.2 Deliver unsubscribed allocation directly to area of concern.

2.2 Other water sources

2.2.1 Exchanges – All areas

2.2.1.1 Exchange or bank Nacimiento water with Santa Margarita Lake to benefit basin.

2.2.1.2 Exchange or bank Nacimiento water with Lopez Lake to benefit basin.

2.2.1.3 Exchange or bank Nacimiento water with State Water Project.

2.2.2 New Off / On Stream Storage

2.2.2.1 Jack Creek Dam

2.2.2.2 Santa Rita Creek Dam

2.2.2.3 Other new dam locations

2.2.2.4 Salinas Dam – Santa Margarita Lake - Raise and reinforce to increase storage.

2.2.2.5 Other streams

2.2.2.5.1 Alluvial flow capture (Estrella River, Huer Huero Creek, etc.)

2.2.3 Basin creeks

2.2.3.1 Establish a high flow waterway management system.

2.2.3.2 Establish live stream water flow throughout the watershed areas

2.2.4 Salinas River

2.2.4.1 Develop high flow waterway system management system.

2.2.5 State Water Project (SWP) – Up to 15,273 AFY available

2.2.5.1 Connect Shandon to SWP and set up distribution system.

2.2.5.2 Connect San Miguel/Paso Robles /Templeton /Atascadero to SWP.

2.2.5.3 Turnout the SWP Coastal Branch at the City of San Luis/Nacimiento junction.

2.2.5.4 Connect Creston to SWP.

2.2.5.5 Agriculture – Direct delivery

2.2.5.6 Rural Residential – Direct delivery

2.2.6 Desalination

2.2.6.1 Desalinization of sea water or brackish water.

2.2.7 Precipitation Enhancement

2.2.7.1 Cloud seeding

3. Recycled Water

3.1 Urban and Urban Non-Domestic

3.1.1 Paso Robles, San Miguel, Templeton, Atascadero

3.1.1.1 Upgrade wastewater treatment plants for distribution to end users.

3.1.1.2 Install grey water reuse systems onsite.

3.2 Agriculture

3.2.1 Install grey water reuse systems onsite.

3.3 Rural Residential

3.3.1 Install grey water reuse systems onsite.

4. Management

4.1 Groundwater management

4.1.1 Prohibit groundwater exports from the Basin.

4.1.2 Develop an equitable allocation of safe yield for all overliers.

4.1.3 Establish baseline conditions.

4.1.4 Continuously monitor status of basin to determine whether solutions are effective.

4.1.5 Manage pumping from all wells in the basin.

4.1.6 Provide a potable water source for use in trucking water to homes for emergency purposes.

4.1.7 Groundwater banking.

4.2 Alternative Governance Structures

4.2.1 All Areas

4.2.1.1 Create a basin-wide groundwater management district management system.

4.2.1.2 Do nothing.

4.2.2 Rural Residential

4.2.2.1 Connect rural residential properties adjacent to urban water providers.

4.2.2.2 Create small community systems for rural communities.

4.2.2.3 Create a rural water district.

4.2.3 Agriculture – Irrigated Crops

4.2.3.1 Create irrigation districts or other management authorities to convey water to agricultural users.

4.3 Land Use Management

4.3.1 Ordinances and Policies - Agriculture

4.3.1.1 Implement ordinances to prohibit subdivisions of land or General Plan Amendments in the Basin.

4.3.1.2 Implement landscaping ordinance (ag processing).

4.3.1.3 Establish policies and funding to take irrigated agricultural acreage out of production.

4.3.1.4 Establish ordinances to protect recharge areas and watersheds.

4.3.1.5 Encourage the segments of the ag industry that are comparatively water neutral.

4.3.1.6 Encourage existing low water use crops to remain.

4.3.1.7 Encourage projects that detain or slow runoff.

4.3.1.8 Enforce erosion and sediment control plan per current grading ordinance.

4.3.1.9 Enact urgency ordinance for new/expanded ag to limit per parcel water use to sustainable level.

4.3.1.10 Require hold harmless notice when land sold that basin in decline and not rely on for intensive use.

4.3.1.11 Enact urgency ordinance for new/expanded users that they provide guarantees to maintain residential water supplies.

4.3.1.12 Enact urgency moratorium restricting new wells to no greater than 6 inch casing.

4.3.1.13 Adopt urgency plan for fair and equitable allocation of groundwater that protects residential users.

4.3.1.14 Enact urgency moratorium on all ag overhead irrigation, including frost protection.

4.3.1.15 Enact urgency moratorium banning construction of all reservoirs for storage of irrigation water.

4.3.2 Ordinances and Policies - Rural Residential

4.3.2.1 Implement ordinances to prohibit subdivisions of land or General Plan Amendments in the Basin.

4.3.2.2 Implement landscaping ordinance.

4.3.2.3 Require new development to be water neutral.

4.3.2.4 Encourage projects that detain or slow runoff.

4.3.2.5 Implement Low Impact Development standards.

4.3.2.6 Enforce erosion and sediment control plan per current grading ordinance.

4.3.2.7 Require hold harmless notice when land sold that basin in decline and not rely on for intensive use.

4.3.2.8 Adopt urgency plan for fair and equitable allocation of groundwater that protects residential users.

Attachment 2

Solution Number	Solution Category	Water User	Solution
Emergency Solutions			
E-1	Management	Rural Residential	Provide a potable water source for use in trucking water to homes for emergency purposes.
E-2	Management	All areas	Create a structure to achieve an equitable allocation of safe yield for all Basin water users.
Short Term Solutions (Implementation in 1 to 5 years)			
ST-1	Management	All areas	Create a Basin-wide groundwater management structure(s). Create water districts or other management authorities to convey water to agricultural users and create small community systems for rural communities.
ST-2	Conservation	All areas	Identify, implement, and make available appropriate Best Management Practices.
ST-3	Management	Rural Residential, Agriculture and Rural Non-Domestic	Encourage projects that detain or slow runoff to recharge the Basin.
ST-4	Conservation	Rural Residential and Rural Non-Domestic	Maximize water use efficiency as appropriate to achieve water use reduction.
ST-5	Conservation	All areas	Meter all new and replacement wells and measure all well outputs and report.
ST-6	Conservation	Urban - Templeton and San Miguel	Participate in California Urban Water Conservation Council policies and practices as appropriate.
ST-7	Conservation	Rural Residential, Agriculture and Rural Non-Domestic	Conduct regular outreach activities.
ST-8	Management	Rural Residential, Agriculture and Rural Non-Domestic	Require new development to be water neutral.
ST-9	Management	All areas	Annually monitor status of Basin to determine whether solutions are effective.
ST-10	Management	Rural Residential	Require disclosure when land is sold that Basin is in decline and may not be suitable to rely on for intensive use.
ST-11	Conservation	Urban – Paso Robles, Atascadero, Templeton, San Miguel	Reduce per capita consumption to offset growth in service area where appropriate.
ST-12	Supplemental	All areas	Exchange or bank Nacimiento water with Santa Margarita Lake to benefit Basin.
ST-13	Supplemental	Paso Robles	Structure operations to use alluvial water first, Nacimiento water second and Basin last.
Medium and Long Term Solutions (Implementation in 6-10 years (Medium) and greater than 10 years (Long Term)			
MLT-1	Supplemental	All Areas	Implement water supply options associated with State Water and the Salinas River Corridor (may include use of Nacimiento & other areas of Basin & increasing the capacity of Santa Margarita Lake).
MLT-2	Supplemental	Monterey County	Explore opportunities with Monterey County including Lake Nacimiento / Lake San Antonio intertie (tunnel).
MLT-3	Supplemental	All areas	Direct delivery of unsubscribed Nacimiento or State Water Project allocation water.
MLT-4	Management	All areas	Prohibit groundwater exports from the Basin.
MLT-5	Management	All areas	Establish mechanisms to protect recharge areas and maximize watersheds.
MLT-6	Recycling	All areas	Incentivize the installation of grey water reuse systems onsite.
Completed or Already in Progress Solutions			
C-1	Supplemental	Atascadero	Utilize the full allocation (2,000 AFY) by fully utilizing the existing percolation ponds.
C-2	Conservation	Urban – Paso Robles and Atascadero	Participate in California Urban Water Conservation Council policies and practices.
C-3	Conservation	Agriculture – Irrigated Crops	Conduct outreach for County's groundwater level monitoring program.
C-4	Management	Agriculture & Rural Residential	Implement ordinances to prohibit subdivisions of land or General Plan Amendments in the Basin.
C-5	Management	Rural Residential	Implement landscaping ordinance.
C-6	Management	All areas	Establish baseline conditions of Basin through updated model.
C-7	Management	All areas	Implement landscaping ordinance (ag processing).
C-8	Management	Rural Residential	Implement Low Impact Development standards.
C-9	Supplemental	Templeton	Maximize or increase the use of the full Nacimiento allocation (250 AFY).
C-10	Supplemental	Shandon	Connect Shandon to State Water Project and set up distribution system (100 AFY).

Attachment 3

Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Blue Ribbon Committee

Larry Werner
Chairperson
Dana Merrill
Vice Chairperson
pasobasincommittee@gmail.com

March 17, 2014

Honorable Bruce Gibson
Chairperson, Board of Supervisors
County of San Luis Obispo
1050 Monterey Street
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408

Re: Support for Paso Robles Basin Water District legislation

Supervisor Gibson and Members of the Board of Supervisors,

The Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Management Plan Blue Ribbon Steering Committee ("BRC") was created in March 2012 to advise the San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors regarding the state of the Paso Robles groundwater basin ("Basin"), to implement the Groundwater Management Plan, review studies of the Basin, and to investigate, prioritize and suggest possible solutions for management of the Basin.

One of the solutions that the BRC recognized early on as needing an immediate start was to form a management structure for the Basin. To that end, the BRC recommended a water district that would be locally designed, locally organized and would have a management structure that would be directly responsive to the overliers, and with a charter to manage and balance the Basin.

With a population composed of rural residents, rangeland and dry-farmed agriculture, as well as a strong irrigated agricultural community, the Basin's overliers are varied and represent many interests. The Paso Robles Basin Water District is proposed to have a hybrid board of directors which gives everyone a voice but no one control. This hybrid board is the basis of the special legislation – AB 2453.

The BRC unanimously endorsed the special legislation. On February 18, 2014, your Board approved a policy statement for inclusion in the 2014 legislative platform which supported special legislation to facilitate creation of a new independent Water District with unique governance features that reflect the diverse interests of landowners overlying the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin.

During the March 13, 2014 meeting the BRC unanimously approved the following motion with two abstentions: The Blue Ribbon Committee requests the County to continue to actively support the proposed Paso Robles Basin Water District as the most appropriate solution to our unique groundwater situation.

Thank you for your continued support for this important issue.

Sincerely,

Larry Werner, Chair

cc: Supervisor Arnold
Supervisor Hill
Supervisor Mecham
Supervisor Ray
Paavo Ogren, Director, SLO County Public Works

Mission Statement
"The Steering Committee will coordinate with stakeholders to implement the Groundwater Management Plan to ensure the health of the basin"