

MEMBER UNITS EXHIBIT NUMBER 59

## MINUTES

### CITY OF LOMPOC - CACHUMA PROJECT MEMBERS NEGOTIATIONS POLICY COMMITTEES

June 15, 1994 - 7:00 p.m.  
Public Meeting Room, 630 Garden Street  
Santa Barbara

#### Members Present:

Joyce Howerton, City of Lompoc  
Harold (Rusty) Fairly, City of Santa Barbara  
John Gilmour, Carpinteria Water District  
William Mullins, City of Lompoc  
Jay Fisher, Santa Ynez River Water Conservation District  
John Singer, Goleta Water District  
Jan Abel, Montecito Water District  
Matt Loudon, Santa Ynez River Water Conservation District, I.D. #1

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

1. Changes to the Agenda None
2. Approval of Minutes of December 13, 1993 Meeting

The minutes were approved as submitted.

3. Report from Technical Committees on Progress of Negotiations

Steve Mack presented a summary of the work that has been done to date by the Modeling Subcommittee. He noted that the work has not been budgeted in terms of either time or money by any of the parties involved, so it has had to be accomplished as time and available funds permit. The modeling work prepared by Tim Durbin and that prepared by Jon Ahlroth have yielded very similar results regarding historical flow at the Narrows. The analysis shows that the Cachuma Project has the effect of reducing flow at the Narrows by approximately 25,000 to 30,000 AFY, as would be expected. The two analyses also looked at the reduction in the amount of recharge to the Lompoc groundwater basin as a result of the Cachuma Project, with Mr. Ahlroth's work estimating a reduction of 1,000 AFY and Mr. Durbin estimating a reduction of 2,300 AFY. It was noted that the difference is not great given the large amount of flow involved. The difference was attributed to differing assumptions as to the rate of recharge in the Lompoc Basin.

Mr. Mack stated that the subcommittee stopped work in April 1994 and reported back to the Technical Committees, without moving into the more complex issue of potential water quality impacts of the Cachuma Project. The Technical Committees met in May and June 1994 and decided that it was appropriate to move ahead in two areas: 1) water quality, and

2) water management alternatives. It was also agreed that the Technical Committees should recommend an extension of the agreement to allow the work to continue. Mr. Mack reviewed a conceptual model addressing water quality, both with and without the Cachuma Project, and summarized the efforts proposed for outlining management alternatives. Mr. Mullins inquired as to how broad the scope of the management alternatives analysis would be. Mr. Keefe responded that it would include everything the subcommittee could think of. Mr. Mack concluded by acknowledging the valuable work done by Jon Ahlroth and stating that the efforts of the Technical Committees to date have been very useful and constructive. He noted that the subcommittee on management alternatives is aiming to have a preliminary report by January 1995, and the modeling subcommittee is aiming to have a preliminary report by April 1995. He noted also that the Technical Committees are recommending extension of the agreement to January 1995.

There was discussion among the members of the Policy Committees in response to the information presented. There was consensus that subcommittees should continue to address water quality and water management alternatives. The potential for speeding up the work was discussed. Mr. Mullins suggested moving the target date for next committee reports from January 1995 back to mid-December 1994. Mr. Mack said that this would not be a problem. Mr. Loudon inquired whether we are as close as possible on the issue of water quantity. Mr. Mack indicated that the committees are as close as necessary at this point in time.

4. Proposed Extension of Target Date for Reaching Agreement

Mr. Fairly introduced David Schuster speaking on behalf of the Technical Committee of the City of Lompoc. He discussed reasons why Lompoc staff supports extension of the date for reaching agreement. He concurred with the summary presented by Mr. Mack. He raised the question of whether State Board Decision 89-18 solves the impact of Cachuma on recharge in the Lompoc Basin and noted that some work still remains to be done on this issue. He noted that the water quality issue will be the primary driver from Lompoc's perspective. He reviewed the establishment of the January 1995 date for reporting back on management alternatives, indicating that he anticipated there might be some interaction with the Cachuma Project EIR/EIS process. He also raised a question as to what extent management solutions should go beyond the impact of Cachuma to address potential solutions to water quality issues related to uses within the Lompoc plain. Mr. Fairly asked whether lack of budgeting is slowing the process. Mr. Schuster responded that the work conducted by consultants for Lompoc has not been constrained since it is funded as required. Mr. Mack indicated that availability of time is more of a constraint than availability of funding.

Mr. Schuster introduced Mr. Paul to speak from the perspective of the Cachuma Project Members. Mr. Paul clarified that he was speaking primarily from his own perspective. He acknowledged progress made to date on the water quantity issues and confirmed that water quality will be the more important issue. He repeated Mr. Durbin's observation at an earlier meeting that water quality in the Lompoc Basin would continue to deteriorate, though at a slower rate, even if Bradbury Dam were removed entirely. He raised this point to emphasize the importance of trying to find a management solution that works to the benefit of all

involved. He likened the effort of finding a management solution to the efforts to address the fishery issues on the river, in that it should be expected to be a long term effort that will necessarily extend beyond the point in time when the EIR/EIS is certified. He concluded by concurring with the target of December 1994 for reporting back on management alternatives.

Mr. Singer asked how the Technical Committees could expect to reach consensus on the more difficult issue of water quality by December 15, 1994. Mr. Mack responded that he is not hoping to reach consensus by that date, but to report back on progress at that time. Mr. Singer asked whether there would be checks and balances on the water quality work as there had been on the water quantity work. Mr. Schuster suggested that the water quality effort might be speeded by the fact that there is only one model available to discuss, i.e. Mr. Durbin's model, which can be discussed and built upon by all the parties involved. Mr. Almy noted that the USGS is about to publish a model of the Lompoc basin which can be used as a check on other models. He also suggested that the water quality model(s) may be useful in evaluating water management alternatives.

Ms. Howerton indicated support for the December 1994 date for a report back from the Technical Committees and suggested that the process might move more quickly now that the various parties are familiar with working together. Mr. Fairly concurred and asked whether there is consensus that the agreement should be extended to December 15, 1994. The members of the Policy Committees concurred by acclamation with this date. Mr. Loudon asked whether A.B. 3030 would affect the negotiations. Mr. Paul indicated that A.B. 3030 jurisdictions were discussed as a potential part of management alternatives, but were not included based on a feeling that any action on A.B. 3030 should be done at the local level and should not have the negotiation process injected into it.

5. Other Business None

6. Public Comment None

7. Date and Time of Next Meeting

The members proceeded to discuss the date of the next meeting of the Policy Committees. It was agreed that the next meeting would be tentatively set for 7:00 p.m. on Wednesday, October 19, 1994 in Lompoc. Procedures for formalizing the extension of the agreement were discussed. The December 15, 1994 date for the extension of the agreement was confirmed.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:20 p.m.