

SLO City/County Library Community Room
995 Palm Street, San Luis Obispo CA

Wednesday, June 4th, 2025
1:30PM

MINUTES (FINAL)

Chairperson: Thomas Burhenn
Vice Chairperson: Christine Mulholland
Secretary: Brendan Clark

The following action minutes are listed as they were acted upon by the Water Resources Advisory Committee (WRAC) as listed on the Regular Meeting agenda for **June 4, 2025** together with staff reports and related documents attached thereto and incorporated therein by reference.

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

Call to order at 1:30 PM

1) **Determination of a Quorum and Introductions**

The number of voting Members present is 19. Quorum met.

2) **Approval of May 7, 2025, WRAC Meeting Minutes**

Item start time ~ 00:03:22

T. Burhenn introduces the item and asks for questions or comments from the Committee.

MOTION: Approve the May 7, 2022 WRAC Meeting Minutes, as presented MOTION BY: E. Greening SECOND BY: J. Marderosian				
Motion Carries	AYES: 16	NOES: 0	ABSTAIN: 3	ABSENT: 2

T. Burhenn clarifies that the OceanWell desalination project mentioned during the last meeting is being piloted and tested in the Las Virgenes reservoir – the technology is not currently being used offshore.

C. Mulholland asks if emerging deep-sea desalination technologies are being included for consideration in the County's desalination planning efforts. T. Burhenn responds.

3) **Receive Update from Central Coast Water Board Chair and Executive Officer on Goals, Programs and Projects**

Item start time ~ 00:06:10

T. Burhenn introduces the item and J. Gray and R. Lodge provide updates on the Central Coast Water Board's (CCWB) goals, programs, and projects.

A. Loe asks if the CCWB is responsible for regulating drinking water. J. Gray responds.

E. Greening asks about the cleanliness of Santa Barbara's water supply and the possible discovery of contaminants near Vandenburg Air Force Base. R. Lodge responds.

A. Fletcher asks about the source of 1,2,3,-TCP. R. Lodge responds.

C. Mulholland asks if growers account for the nitrates already present in the water supply when following the irrigated land order. R. Lodge responds.

E. Greening asks for clarification of the jurisdictional authority of the State Water Board versus the CCWB Board regarding the Once-Through Cooling Policy at Diablo Canyon and asks if there will be a public hearing related to discharges and permitting. R. Lodge and J. Gray respond.

C. Mulholland asks about remediation efforts at the Chevron Guadalupe cleanup site and the timeframe of the California Men's Colony WWTP violations. R. Lodge responds.

D. Chipping asks if any non-point source surveys are currently taking place and comments on contaminant sources/issues in Lake Nacimiento and SLO Creek. R. Lodge responds.

D. Crater asks if a call for domestic well testing would trigger longitudinal testing or just a single test. R. Lodge responds.

S. Carter asks for comparisons between ag and domestic well testing costs, frequency, and results/reporting. R. Lodge and J. Gray respond.

M. van Ryn asks how private well owners are contacted and if vendors are soliciting private well testing. R. Lodge and J. Gray respond.

L. Lefebvre asks about permit renewals and efforts to funnel agencies into a general order. R. Lodge and J. Gray respond.

B. Clark asks if there's a mailing list opt-in for specific topics. R. Lodge and J. Gray respond.

4) Receive Update from County Staff Regarding State Water Policies and Consider Actions

Item start time ~ 00:59:05

T. Burhenn introduces the item and W. Thompson provides verbal updates on the proposed draft updates to the State Water Project Policies which will be brought to the District Board for consideration.

D. Chipping asks if there is a placeholder for Los Osos to become a user of State water. W. Thompson responds.

E. Greening asks if an agreed-upon definition of the term "supplemental" exists and whether it is being consistently observed now. N. Engelskirger and P. Brown respond.

D. Crater comments that the text of the draft policy document appears to address the definition of supplemental supply. N. Engelskirger and P. Brown respond.

J. Marderosian asks for clarification on contractual priorities and how much of the 5000 AF reserve has historically been used each year. W. Thompson and N. Engelskirger respond.

C. Mulholland and R. Gaglione comment on the temporary nature of supplemental water not being used as a primary source.

J. Marderosian asks if it would be possible to open supplemental water transfers to private entities/agriculture once public needs have been met, adding that the policy text appears restrictive to this. N. Engelskirger and W. Thompson respond.

D. Crater comments that the draft policy mentions amendments to the SWP Subcontracts for water transfers – why is this included or needed? Do the subcontractors currently have the ability to sell water? N. Engelskirger and W. Thompson respond.

J. Marderosian asks if the SWP subcontractors are primarily cities within the county. T. Burhenn and W. Thompson respond.

R. Gaglione provides historical context on the SWP agencies/subcontractors and their prior funding obligations to secure access to State Water.

J. Hendrickson asks if the Committee will have a chance to review a final draft of the policy before it goes to the Board of Supervisors. W. Thompson responds.

MOTION: Recommend that the Board of Supervisors delay action on any SWP plan updates that lacks clear definitions for 'supplemental' and other ambiguous terms.

MOTION BY: E. Greening

SECOND BY: E. Eby

Motion Rejected

AYES: 2

NOES: 18

ABSTAIN: 0

ABSENT: 1

MOTION: Recommend that District staff present the proposed draft SWP Transfer Policy to the District Board for consideration, with the understanding that staff may continue to receive comments and suggest refinements prior to or during the Board's adoption process.				
MOTION BY: A. Loe				
SECOND BY: D. Chipping				
Motion Carried	AYES: 19	NOES: 1	ABSTAIN: 0	ABSENT: 1

5) Receive Update from County Staff on Central Coast Blue Project's Award in Proposition 1, Round 2 Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Implementation Grant and Consider Actions

Item start time ~ 01:49:50

T. Burhenn introduces the item, and B. Clark provides updates on the IRWM Program and subject grant process, the Central Coast Blue Project award under the Prop 1, Round 2 Implementation Grant, the need for an amendment to the grant agreement due to changes in the Projects' scope and timeline, staff's recommendation to the District Board to direct staff to return to the Board with a proposed project (or suite of projects) to replace the Central Coast Blue Project, and the Regional Water Management Group's approval of staff's recommendation during their June 4, 2025, meeting.

R. Gaglione provides comments on the status of the project and why it should not be removed from the subject grant award, including the range of benefits provided by the Project, what the current plans for the project are, opportunities to potentially amend the current agreement, the risks and timing involved with opening up a new project selection, the ability to begin construction within the proposed timeline, and how all grant funding helps to lower cost of ratepayers.

A. Loe asks if it's possible to simultaneously pursue both amending the agreement and replacing the project. B. Clark responds.

T. Walters asks if there is an advisory body at the State level that can weigh in on the options presented. B. Clark responds.

S. Inman reiterates the comments provided by R. Gaglione regarding the scope, construction timeline, and benefits that will be provided by the Project.

A. Loe asks if the project cost was a main factor behind staff's recommendation. B. Clark responds.

R. Gaglione comments on DWR's ability to extend a project's construction timeline.

D. Chipping asks where the Project's water would be injected into. R. Gaglione responds.

T. Burhenn asks how the Project would be impacted if there was an open solicitation for projects and the City of Pismo Beach were to reapply. R. Gaglione responds.

An unidentified attendee asks if other projects from the 2022 solicitation could be considered as a replacement project. B. Clark responds.

A. Ford asks what would happen to the funds if an amendment was pursued and denied. B. Clark responds.

An unidentified attendee asks if the RWMG voting results were unanimous. B. Clark responds

J. Edwards comments on the unlikelihood of obtaining a land use permit for the project and the ability to start or complete construction by the March 2027 deadline, and supports amending the grant with replacement projects.

MOTION: To support the Regional Water Management Group's recommendation to recommend the District Board of Supervisors direct staff to return to the Board with a proposed project or suite of projects to replace Central Coast Blue in the Prop 1, Round 2 IRWM Implementation Grant.

MOTION BY: E. Eby

SECOND BY: S. Duffield

Motion Carried

AYES: 12

NOES: 2

ABSTAIN: 1

ABSENT: 6

6) **Ongoing Updates**

Item start time ~ 02:17:50

a) Rain & Reservoir Report

No comments.

b) California Drought Monitor Summary

No comments.

c) Groundwater Basin Management Efforts

D. Crater comments on the upcoming Prop 218 vote for the Paso Basin.

T. Burhenn comments on two studies issued by the County for the Paso Basin which are currently open for public comment – <https://www.pasobasin.org/additional-resources>:

1. Paso Robles Groundwater Subbasin State Water Project Supplemental Water Supply Project State Water Project Supply Options and Costs (June 2025)
2. Paso Robles Subbasin State Water Project Supplemental Supply Study Preliminary Engineering Report (June 2025)

d) Flood Control Zones

No comments.

e) Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM)

No comments.

f) Master Water Report (MWR) Update

No comments.

g) State Water Project (SWP)

No comments.

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

No comments.

i) Various County Water Programs, Policies, and Ordinances

D. Chipping comments on the upcoming County budget hearings and that a draft of the updated Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan is currently available for review.

S. Inman asks if WRAC will be receiving an update of the consolidation analysis efforts.

B. Clark responds.

j) Open Reporting on Water Conservation Opportunities & Information

No comments.

7) Future Agenda Items

No comments.

8) Public Comment for Items not on the Agenda

No comments.