

Feb 28 9:44PM

From: Sue Luft

To: Ray Dienzo, Linda Chipping

Subj: Comments on Draft 2014-2016 RMS Biennial Report

Please provide these comments for the WRAC's consideration at tomorrow's meeting.

I only reviewed the sections regarding the main portion of the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin. I would hope that Planning staff would address all of the WRAC members' comments and prepare a new draft for review.

- Page 3, Water System, Supply, Usage and Rates. For rural areas without water purveyors, need to add discussion of existing Resource Capacity Studies which were used. If no RCS exists, need to explain source of data.
- Page 26, Table II-2. Safe Basin Yield (Perennial Yield) estimate was updated to 89,600 AFY in Final Model Update Report dated 1-13-15 (see page ES-9). See <http://slocountywater.org/site/Water%20Resources/Water%20Forum/Computer%20Modeling/index.htm>.
- Page 72. Need to add that the Level of Severity III for the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin, excluding the Atascadero Sub-Basin, was certified by the Board of Supervisors on February 1, 2011.
- Page 72. Need to add that water conservation requirements for discretionary land use permit applications and land divisions and general plan amendments within the rural portions of the Paso Basin, outside of the Atascadero Sub-basin, were adopted by the Board of Supervisors on September 25, 2012.
- Page 73 fourth bullet. The discussion regarding the Computer Model Update needs to be revised to reflect the latest work effort by the County. The appropriate report is Refinement of the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin Model and Results of the Supplemental Water Supply Options Predictive Analysis – Final, dated 12-8-16. This report provides the updated change in groundwater storage as a deficit of 3,184 acre-ft averaged over 1981 to 2011 (See Table 1). The report also provides an updated groundwater budget from 2012-2040. The change in groundwater storage during this period is predicted to be 32,844 acre-ft in deficit on average. See <http://slocountywater.org/site/Water%20Resources/Water%20Forum/Computer%20Modeling/index.htm>.
- Page 74, second bullet. This was a step towards compliance with SGMA but did not initiate compliance.
- Page 74, third bullet. Only two of the measures failed – the formation and the funding.
- Page 74, fourth bullet. The County did not provide notification to DWR that they would not serve as the GSA. This statement is incorrect.
- Page 74, fifth bullet. The Computer Model Update is complete. See above.

- Page 74, last paragraph. The first sentence is incorrect and should be deleted.
- Page 75, Table II-19. The data in this table should be revised to align with the recent Computer Model Update data and results. What is the source of the 2012 agriculture and rural data What is “SWRCB WPA 14”?
- Page 86, Paso Robles Groundwater Basin. 1. should state “LOS III for the Basin per the Feb. 2011 Resource Capacity Study”. 2. should state “Continue to support efforts to implement SGMA”.

Thanks,  
Sue Luft