

## MINUTES (Approved)

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 **May 6, 2026** 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**

T. Burhenn called the meeting to order. 17 voting Members were present, constituting a quorum.

### 2) **Approval of April 1, 2026, WRAC Meeting Minutes**

*Item start time ~ 00:04:30*

T. Burhenn introduced the item and opened the floor for questions or comments from the Committee.

**MOTION:** Approve the April 1, 2026 WRAC Meeting Minutes

**MOTION BY:** E. Greening

**SECOND BY:** C. Mulholland

<b>MOTION CARRIES</b>	AYES: 16	NOES: 0	ABSTAIN: 1	ABSENT: 0
-----------------------	----------	---------	------------	-----------

### 3) **Receive Presentation on the DESAL Plan**

*Item start time ~ 00:04:55*

T. Burhenn introduced the item, and the DESAL Plan Project Team presented an update on the DESAL Plan Feasibility Study and progress to date.

Presentation section 1: The Project Team provided an overview of the project background, objectives, scope, future water supply demand projections, and the evaluation of screened alternatives.

E. Greening asked for clarification regarding Nacimiento water exchanges with Templeton and whether alternatives exist to pumping water over the mountains. L. Holmes responded.

D. Chipping asked about the constraints analysis and whether it is necessary to locate the subsurface intake farther offshore. L. Holmes responded.

M. van Ryn asked about the south county state park properties identified in Alternative D and the permitting process required to proceed with a project in those managed areas. L. Holmes responded.

C. Mulholland commented on the Chumash Heritage National Marine Sanctuary and potential project restrictions, raised concerns regarding energy demand and brine disposal, and referenced alternative desalination technologies and desalination efforts underway in Norway and San Diego. L. Holmes responded.

E. Eby asked if there is a brine dilution requirement and if those numbers are available today. L. Holmes responded.

M. van Ryn asked whether population growth projections were considered in the analysis. L. Holmes responded.

D. Crater asked why the alternative sites are limited to using existing outfalls, including those with no current flow. L. Holmes responded.

J. Edwards commented on the California Coastal Commission's review of the CalAm and Carlsbad desalination projects and asked whether established Coastal Commission policies are being considered as part of the screening methodology for this study. L. Holmes responded.

Presentation Section 2: The Project Team provided an overview of community engagement and outreach efforts conducted throughout the study.

S. Gault asked whether industry professionals or representatives from other counties had provided comments or engaged with the project team. C. Berg responded.

D. Chipping asked how the costs of a scaled-down desalination facility similar to the Carlsbad facility would compare if constructed on the Central Coast. C. Berg responded.

C. Mulholland asked about the size of the on-land facilities and whether potential locations had already been considered in the analysis. L. Holmes responded.

D. Crater asked how the partner agencies have been engaged and if they are funding any portion of the current project phase. A. Ford responded.

J. Marx commented on the City of San Luis Obispo's prohibition on wheeling water and noted the City's surplus supply of recycled water as a consideration in the analysis and future decision making. L. Holmes responded.

C. Mulholland commented on the historical significance of the City of San Luis Obispo's decision to prohibit wheeling water.

E. Greening asked about the report review process and schedule, and expressed concerns regarding timing constraints and opportunities for the WRAC to review the content before the study is submitted to the Board of Supervisors. L. Holmes responded.

Presentation Section 3: The Project Team provided an overview of high-level cost estimates, potential efforts that may follow completion of the feasibility study, and anticipated next steps.

An unidentified attendee asked about the State's requirements for exhausting other water supply sources before desalination is considered and how that determination is made. L. Holmes responded.

E. Eby asked how survey participants are selected and whether members of the public can sign up to participate. L. Holmes responded.

E. Greening asked whether desalinated water would receive centralized chlorination, noted the importance of understanding environmental considerations associated with different treatment methods, and asked how pipeline construction standards would be considered. L. Holmes responded.

Advisory Committee members and staff discussed the possibility of holding a special meeting to further discuss the study, the timing of the report's submission to the Board of Supervisors, and the potential formation of an ad hoc subcommittee to review the report and provide comments prior to Board consideration to receive and file.

#### **4) Ongoing Updates**

*Item start time ~ 01:29:23*

a) Rain & Reservoir Report  
No comments.

b) California Drought Monitor Summary  
No comments.

c) Groundwater Basin Management Efforts  
No comments.

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

No comments.

j) Open Reporting on Water Conservation Opportunities & Information

No comments.

**5) Future Agenda Items**

No comments.

**6) Public Comment for Items not on the Agenda**

E. Greening commented on challenges facing the Colorado River system and expressed concern about the potential health and environmental impacts of prolonged periods of above-average temperatures associated with climate change.