

CC 2c
02/12/08
MVB

**LANCASTER CITY COUNCIL
WATER WORKSHOP
MINUTES
January 29, 2008**

CALL TO ORDER	Mayor Hearn called the City Council Water Workshop to order at 5:12 p.m.
ROLL CALL	<p>Present: Council Members: Sileo, Smith, Vice Mayor Visokey, Mayor Hearn</p> <p>By unanimous vote, the City Council excused Council Member Jeffra from the meeting.</p> <p>Present: Chairman Mann and Vice Chairman Troth of the Lancaster Planning Commission</p> <p>Excused: Council Member: Jeffra</p> <p>Staff Members: Interim City Manager, Interim Assistant City Manager, City Attorney, City Clerk, Planning Director, Public Works Director, Parks, Recreation & Arts Director, Finance Director, Economic Development Director, Housing Director</p>
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	Mayor Hearn
INTRODUCTIONS	Chairman Ken Mann of the Planning Commission introduced Vice Chairman Mark Troth and Commissioner Mary Faux who was seated in the audience.
NB 1. INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION OF WATER CHALLENGES IN THE ANTELOPE VALLEY	The Interim City Manager, Mark Bozigian, thanked the Public Works Director for pulling this meeting together and being able to get all the water agency representatives to attend. He stated that much of the information that Council will hear during the meeting revolves around matters that Council has already set in motion, whether that be recycled water and regional cooperation and the City has been at the forefront of a lot of issues. Water is such a complex issue; there are many, many facets to the water issue. It is important to receive all the information because a decision on one area can impact lots of aspects of the economy and the community, such as a decision on water could impact economic development, the revenues the City receives and the construction trade. The goal this evening is to have Council gather all of this information and the City starts down the road to determine additional steps the City can take in terms of helping with this issue.

LANCASTER CITY COUNCIL
WATER WORKSHOP MINUTES
January 29, 2008

NB 1.
INFORMATION AND
DISCUSSION OF
WATER
CHALLENGES IN
THE ANTELOPE
VALLEY
(continued)

The Public Works Director, Randy Williams, stated that representatives from several Water Agencies were present and would be giving presentations. He reviewed the objectives of the Workshop and introduced the water agency representatives.

Russ Fuller – Representing Antelope Valley/East Kern Water Agency (AVEK) presented information on water supply challenges – regional and local; assets such as natural resources and taxpayer commitment. He presented a PowerPoint presentation which included charts that showed water supply variability; Southern California’s loss of a portion of Colorado River Water Supply; loss of a portion of the Los Angeles Aqueduct supply; Central and Southern San Joaquin Valley’s loss of water from Federal Projects (The Central Valley Project, The Friant San Joaquin River System.) Supply has declined from a theoretical 165,000 AcFt/Year to today’s estimate of 110,000 AcFt/Year. The original project provided flood protection for the North and a water supply for the South, mostly paid for by the South. Today, the flood protection is in place, the North needs the water and continued growth and development are not popular. There has been a failure to complete local facilities needed to deliver imported water and in 2008, the cost to purchase “dry-year water” could exceed \$6 million. The Antelope Valley has been able to deliver about 70% of the State Water Project Supply; however there is a lack of popular support, on a local level for the State Water Project. Mr. Fuller reviewed Antelope Valley Adjudication, State-Wide Water Conveyance System; Ground Water Basin; comparisons to Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD) and the Integrated Regional Water Management Plan. Stressed the importance of having a plan in place and the plan should reach the year 2100. Consider Land/Development strategies; pooling of funds to purchase development rights on land that is set aside for special use, such as agriculture.

Council Member Sileo requested clarification regarding the cost of water of Colorado River water vs. State Water Project vs. the Federal Water project vs. desalinization. He also requested clarification regarding the storing of water in the ground vs. doing something above the ground.

Mayor Hearn stated that one of the best solutions around is conservation.

LANCASTER CITY COUNCIL
WATER WORKSHOP MINUTES
January 29, 2008

NB 1.
INFORMATION AND
DISCUSSION OF
WATER
CHALLENGES IN
THE ANTELOPE
VALLEY
(continued)

Curtis Paxton – Representing the Palmdale Water District presented a PowerPoint presentation. The mission of the Palmdale Water District is to provide high quality water to our current and future customers at a reasonable cost. He gave an overview of the District; issues facing the District; future plans. The District’s primary service area covers approximately 46 square miles and includes the eastern portion of the City of Palmdale and unincorporated County of Los Angeles Area. Number of connections: 26,500; Population served: 115,000; 2008 Water Demand – 30,000 acre-feet. Mr. Paxton reviewed the three sources of water: 1) State Water Project (imported surface water); 2) Littlerock Dam and Reservoir (local surface water); 3) Groundwater (24 active wells). The District is one of 29 State Water Contractors this is contracted with the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) to receive water. The District’s annual Table “A” amount is 21,300 acre feet. The District is one of three State Water Contractors in the Antelope Valley AVEK Water Agency, Littlerock Creek Irrigation District, Palmdale Water District).

Adam Ariki – Representing Waterworks District No. 40, presented information regarding water demand and supplies in 2007 and projecting forward to 2030. The District maximizes the use of imported State Water Project (SWP) water and over the last 10 years, SWP water has constituted between 60 and 80% of the District’s supply. During normal rainfall years, approximately 70k afy of AVEK’s SWP entitlement is available to the District. The District uses groundwater to meet its customers’ remaining water demand and the use of groundwater in the District varies from year to year depending on the availability of SWP water. During the last 10 years, groundwater constitutes between 20 and 40% of the District’s supply. Mr. Ariki reviewed factors effecting water supplies such as the Delta Smelt; reduction in SWP during dry periods; risk of failure of any of the SWP facilities. He also reviewed strategies to manage water supply such as groundwater banking; conjunctive use; use of surface storage and aquifer storage and recovery. Efforts to increase water supply revolve around recycled water and conservation. The goal of the Antelope Valley Integrated Regional Water Management Plan is to develop a comprehensive plan to meet the Antelope Valley’s future water supply; reliability; utilizing local recycled water; storm water; protecting groundwater supply; quality; securing additional water supplies.

Council Member Sileo requested further information from Mr. Ariki on - if the valley does get close to running out of water and there are competing uses between residential, industrial and commercial uses, how does the agency look at this and how does land use planning fit into this equation as well.

LANCASTER CITY COUNCIL
WATER WORKSHOP MINUTES
January 29, 2008

<p>NB 1. INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION OF WATER CHALLENGES IN THE ANTELOPE VALLEY (continued)</p>	<p>Vice Chairman Troth commented on the 2007 demand and the 2030 demand and if the State Water Project is projecting whether they will be able to give the additional acre feet per year.</p> <p>Mayor Hearn requested clarification regarding the will-serve letter process.</p> <p>Vice Mayor Visokey stated that currently there is a halt on the will-serve letters and requested further information on this process.</p> <p>Council Member Smith requested further information on the need for demand which is seasonal and a challenge, clarification of the capture problem. Important to look at the infrastructure surrounding this issue and the importance of water banking; clarification of storage issues; deep water aquifer and the cause of the increase of arsenic within the storage.</p>
<p>RECESS RECONVENE</p>	<p>The City Council recessed the Water Workshop at 7:00 p.m.</p> <p>The City Council reconvened the Water Workshop at 7:06 p.m.</p> <p>Curtis Paxton - Representing the Antelope Valley State Water Contractors Association (AVSWCA) – presented information on the Joint Powers Authority (AVEK Water Agency, Littlerock Creek Irrigation District and Palmdale Water District) and stated that the boundary of the Association covers the entire Antelope Valley. He discussed the challenges of the Delta Smelt, water suppliers; land use planners; imbalance of supply vs. demand. The Association will act as contracting entity with the State of California on behalf of the Regional Water Management Group of the AVIRWMP for Prop 50 grant funds and additionally, it will act as the contracting entity with various consultants required by the Leadership Team for the AVIRWMP. The primary current focus of the Association is to facilitate and encourage water banking activities in the Antelope Valley. He discussed the pilot in-lieu recharge project with LACWWD/PWD/AVEK in 2007/08 and that they take on an independent monitor role for water banking activities.</p> <p>Robert Neufeld – Representing the Rosamond CSD – presented information on the Semitropic Water Storage Bank; it is the first water banking operation permitted in the Antelope Valley; Joint Powers Authority Partners include Semitropic Water Storage District, Rosamond Community Services District; Western Development and Storage (Valley Mutual Water Company). The goals of the JPA are to market and sell water bank capacities to customers over and above each JPA Member’s needs. They study, acquire, construct, develop, finance, operate and market storage in the water bank and seek long term third party customers to enter into contracts for storing water and allowing for recovery of stored water.</p>

LANCASTER CITY COUNCIL
WATER WORKSHOP MINUTES
January 29, 2008

<p>NB 1. INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION OF WATER CHALLENGES IN THE ANTELOPE VALLEY (continued)</p>	<p>Mr. Neufeld explained the storage options and the benefits of the SRWB. The Banking Partners deliver their wet year or surplus water to Semitropic and when called upon, Semitropic under its original phase of the program returns the water to the California Aqueduct by exchanging its entitlement and/or by reversing the intake facility to return an additional 90,000 acre-feet per year of water to the California Aqueduct. He stated that Semitropic's Groundwater Banking program has proven results. It has increased groundwater levels by storing hundreds of thousands of acre-feet of water and it is positioned in an ideal location amongst the Central Valley and State Water projects.</p>
<p>COUNCIL DISCUSSION</p>	<p>The Public Works Director, Randy Williams, followed up all the presentations with additional information regarding average annual water supply; issues facing the Antelope Valley; changes that have taken place; details on water supply vs. land use planning and Senate Bill 610 and Senate Bill 221. He discussed the goals of the Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP); population projections; water demand projections; supply vs. demand; where to look for opportunities; regional strategy areas; future steps. He stated that Lancaster can influence Water Supply Management; Water Quality Management; Land Use/Planning Management; Environmental Resource Management and Flood Management. Mr. Williams shared some of the thoughts that the participants' have shared with him such as: convince ourselves that there is a water crisis; don't slow growth; should be better managed growth – intelligent growth; importance of partnerships; strict regional policies; conservation to allow more development; finding the right balance; education of the community. A brain-storming session took place with the Department Directors and some of the approaches that were discussed included: building of water-saving projects and banking credits; developers paying impact fees at C of O in exchange for 1.2 to 1 conservation retrofit; offering incentives; broad array of conservation programs to reduce per capita use to under 200 gallons per day per person; higher population densities.</p> <p>Council comments and concerns included: no simple answers, this is a very complex issue; some hard and tough decisions must be made; importance of synchronizing conservation; importance of political will and involvement; important to move forward; importance of groundwater storage; education of the public at-large; incentive programs to match future growth; importance of having the buy-in of all stakeholders; continually look at improvements; stricter landscape requirements; importance of the right balance – it is easy with new development but more of a challenge with existing users; strict development standards.</p>

LANCASTER CITY COUNCIL
 WATER WORKSHOP MINUTES
 January 29, 2008

NB 1.
 INFORMATION AND
 DISCUSSION OF
 WATER
 CHALLENGES IN
 THE ANTELOPE
 VALLEY
 (continued)

Addressing the Council on this matter:

David Paul – Importance of conservation; concerned with the future of the City budget in relationship to decisions on water.

Ray Chavira – Distributed a draft initiative regarding eminent domain and how it could affect needed water projects.

Arnold Rodio – Importance of strict landscaping; developer water credits; all must be done on a planning level.

Nicole Parson – Look into the infrastructure in relationship to fire suppression.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Mayor Hearn's adjourned the City Council Water Workshop at 8:41 p.m. and announced the next regular meeting of the City Council would be held on Tuesday, February 12, 2008, at 6:00 p.m.

ATTEST:

APPROVED:

 GERI K. BRYAN, CMC
 City Clerk
 City of Lancaster

 HENRY W. HEARNS
 Mayor
 City of Lancaster

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES) ss
 CITY OF LANCASTER)

CERTIFICATION OF MINUTES
 CITY COUNCIL

I, _____, _____ of the City of Lancaster, CA, do hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of the original City Council Water Workshop Minutes, for which the original is on file in my office.

WITNESS MY HAND AND THE SEAL OF THE CITY OF LANCASTER, on this _____ day of _____, _____.

(seal)
