

Meeting Minutes  
Santa Barbara Countywide  
Integrated Regional Water Management Plan  
Cooperating Partners Meeting  
Tuesday, January 15, 2008  
9:00 am – 12:00 pm

Location: Central Coast Water Authority, 255 Industrial Way in Buellton.

Directions: Exit Hwy 246 off Highway 101; head west on Highway 246;

Make a left on Industrial Way

*Conference call phone: 1-877-873-8016 and participant code 861785*

Attendees

**Cooperating Partners**

Robert Almy, SB County Water Agency (County); Joe Barget, Vandenberg Village CSD; Bill Ferguson, City of Santa Barbara, Water Resources Division; Autumn Malanca, City of Santa Barbara, Creeks Division; Gary McFarland, Goleta Water District; Teresa Reyburn, City of Santa Maria; Bruce Wales, Santa Ynez Water Conservation District

**On the Conference Call**

Craig Murray, Carpinteria Sanitary District; Autumn Malanca, City of Santa Barbara, Creeks Division; Kate Rees, COMB and CCRB; Bob McDonald, Carpinteria Valley Water District; Mike Maxwell, CH2MHill; Laura Eckert, CH2MHill;

**Others Present**

Kathy Caldwell, CH2MHill (CH); Tom Evans, Dudek; Shruti Chandra, Aspen Environmental

**Proceedings**

The meeting started at 9:05 AM. There were no Public comments for items not on the agenda. The meeting minutes from the December 19<sup>th</sup> meeting, were approved as written.

**Step 2 Application Status**

The good news is that CH has been working on hard on the engineering for the Disadvantaged Communities (DACs) and as a result, the Cuyama CSD projects have changed and the project comes in well under the original budget. Additionally, Laguna Sanitation's project also came in under the original grant request which resulted in the total grant request from the State being reduced. We are now under the \$25 Million dollar cap and we no longer have to do a reduction in all of the agencies request by 2%.

**Partners review of draft final application- January 14<sup>th</sup>- 17<sup>th</sup>**

The draft of the application was sent out yesterday and the CH staff won't be able to accept any comments after Thursday, January 17th. Kathy Caldwell brought a hard copy of the draft application to show the Partners that were in attendance what the application would look like. The hard copy she brought did not include all the exhibit and attachments.

Brian Whitaker of CH is still working on the DAC project presentation in the application. It will be posted on the ftp site once it is complete. References still need to be consistent throughout and so this needs to be worked on. Another issue is that the pagination keeps changing based on last minute changes. Comments will be incorporated Friday and production will begin next week.

Each person from CH that interviewed the Partners regarding their projects is currently now reviewing all the projects for consistency across the board. Kathy Caldwell asked the Partners to contact herself or Laura Eckert of CH if they had any questions.

Kathy then went over the status of each section. If your project in any way impacts groundwater either negatively or positively, then you will need a Groundwater Management Plan (GWMP). CH has divided the Partners into three categories based on their need for GWMP. Kathy said that we are now at a point where we need to knit the projects together. So far, we have been working separately on each of our projects. We need to figure out how to show that the projects are linked. Kathy put it out to the Partners to tell her how the projects might affect each other.

Gary McFarland pointed out that their well project will provide emergency supplies should COMB have any issues providing water. They both provide reliability of water supplies. Kathy asked that Gary provide some language to CH regarding this. This information will go in the Workplan (Att. 3). Carpinteria Valley Water District (CVWD) would have the same kind of linkage to the COMB project.

Integration is a weak factor among our projects. Our regional geography also puts us in this position. All the wastewater treatment plant projects can show that they are trying to increase water basin health, water quality and making better use of existing water supplies.

If the Santa Barbara Region is awarded grant funds and the County will take the lead on disbursing the funds, then each agency with a project will be reporting to the County on a quarterly basis. We will look at L.A and Ventura Prop 50 contracts and use some language from them which we will pull into our new MOU. A new MOU would be put into place in mid-May (when the other MOU expires). The structure would be an umbrella MOU with specific project agreements for each project.

The guidelines say that we should indicate a priority of projects. We may say something like all the projects are high priority. We could also say that the projects that are more ready to go would be higher priority. The City of Santa Barbara's project shows that the project plan would not be completed until end of 2008. The

City needs to provide language explaining timing clearly. We can also mention that we prioritized projects from the original 120 projects. Some are needed to address regulatory requirements as well as health and safety issues for safe drinking water. The DACs are a good example of that.

The Partners need to make sure that they have provided all supporting documentation to CH for the application. Please make sure when reviewing the draft application that if there are any references to documents which have not been provided, then they need to be provided to CH. The draft application was then reviewed by the Partners.

Attachments 3 and 6 are the places where need to score highly, the Partners should focus their review on those sections. Table 3-1 does not require Partners input as requested. CH can pull that information from the IRWMP.

Project Budgets- The 2% reduction to all grant requests is no longer needed. Please review the schedule.

We also need to explain what would happen if the project was not implemented. The internal team will try to address this first and then the Partners will be asked specific questions if need be.

Bruce Wales asked about the State review process and whether one person reviews the whole document or each individual attachment gets reviewed separately. This is difficult to predict, we hope that it will be reviewed in its entirety rather than in pieces.

The economic analysis is pretty well done. This section gets double points making it very important. We need to show the benefits of the project.

Program preferences- We are in a better position from Round 1 to Round 2. The preferences are more applicable to us for Round 2, which is good.

We have no letters of opposition, which is good. We need to apply costs of engineering for DACs as match. Kathy Caldwell stressed that the Partners need to make sure that there is consistency across the document.

### **Last minute information requests**

If you get a call from CH in the next week, please make sure that you get everything to CH and make sure to coordinate with them ASAP.

### **Schedule now to application submittal**

The Partners will finish review of the draft application and CH will begin production next week to turn in the application to the State on January 28<sup>th</sup>.

### **Next Steps after Application Submittal**

We expect to hear from the State in April or May 2008 regarding the grant award status. It is expected that the State will make the actual award of funds in June 2008. Then a contract would need to be signed with the State by July 1<sup>st</sup>.

Draft guidelines for Prop 84 will be out in April. The Governor has about \$452 Million dollars allocated in his 2009 budget for this. It appears that the State is poised to move forward on Prop 84. They took a lot of criticism from Prop 50 and have learned a lot of lessons on how to structure the program.

We have two agreements to work on. One is to carry us through the Prop 84 process which will include maintaining and continuing to develop a relationship with other Central Coast interests. The more immediate agreement has to do with the structure with the grant award. We need to set up a meeting in mid-February to figure out how other contracts from Round 1 have looked and use it to create our next MOU. The target date for the Grant MOU maybe sometime in April or May 2008.

**Next Meeting:** Will be decided via email

**Adjourn at 11:10 AM**