

**Santa Barbara Countywide
Integrated Regional Water Management Plan
Cooperating Partners Meeting
Final Minutes
January 17, 2007
9:00 am – 12:00 noon**

Location: Goleta Sanitary District's Board Room, One William Moffett Place

Attendees

Cooperating Partners

Robert Almy, Santa Barbara County Water Agency; Joe Barget, Vandenberg Village CSD; Jeff Dameron, La Cumbre Mutual Water District; Bill Ferguson, City of Santa Barbara Water Resources Division; Brett Gray, COMB; Bob McDonald, CVWD; Kenneth Learned, Mosquito and Vector Control District of Santa Barbara County; Gary McFarland, GWD; Autumn McKee, City of Santa Barbara Creeks Division; Mary Martone, SYRWCD, ID #1; Warren Morgan, GSWC; Lars Nilsson, City of Carpinteria (telephone); Teresa Reyburn, City of Santa Maria; Bob Roebuck, Montecito Water District; Bruce Wales, Santa Ynez RWCD (telephone); Kathleen Werner, Goleta Sanitary District

Others Present

Kathy Caldwell, CH2M HILL (telephone); Shruti Chandra, Santa Barbara County Water Agency/Dudek; Lorraine Woodman, CH2M HILL

Proceedings

The meeting was called to order at 9:17 by Shruti Chandra.

No public comments for items not on agenda were received.

The minutes of the 12-19-06 Cooperating Partners meeting were approved.

Comments on the Preliminary Draft IRWMP are due on January 26, using the comment form provided. Word files will be provided for substantive revisions.

New Project Information forms are due on January 26th as well.

Comments by Lynn Rodriquez, Watershed Alliance of Ventura County

The Ventura IRWMP included participants such as NGOs who didn't necessarily contribute funds. In this way, the Santa Barbara structure for project proponents is set up differently.

It is very important to maintain a strong relationship with DWR and SWRCB. Ventura was active in statewide meetings and met with local regulatory agencies—including the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and Department of Fish and Game.

The SWRCB staff was very supportive and reviewed Ventura's list of projects, goals, and objectives.

They developed a matrix of 152 projects showing how they met objectives, etc. and which projects met regional needs. Whether a project was selected for the grant application had much to do with what was ready to proceed or underway.

They did not do a formal evaluation/prioritization of projects. Those who represented interests in each group decided which projects should be the highest priority.

The County of Ventura will administer the grant and may use a consultant to help. The Project Director will be Sue Hughes. A committee of project proponents in the region will help drive the program.

The Santa Barbara IRWMP needs to talk about who will administer the program. The State won't reimburse for overhead; there is a question regarding whether it can be considered part of the match.

Ventura is doing a survey and collecting information to be kept in a central database. This is addressed in one of the IRWMP appendices and reflects their regional needs.

Lynn believed that Ventura was successful because they have had an inclusive and flexible process. They dropped projects that the State wouldn't fund based on the State's review of their project list. Their plan showed respect for diverse interests, accountability, and was implementation focused.

At first, the State Board adopted funded plans, and DWR funded those without adopted plans. Lynn isn't clear if there is difference in which agency is assigned to an IRMWP region. It could possibly be based on types of projects.

Urban Water Management Plans (UWMPs) have to be deemed complete/adopted before an agreement can be executed. If needed, the State will move the UWMPs to the top of the list for review. Boards need to adopt revisions. Groundwater management plans must be in place if there is a groundwater management component to a project for which grant funding is being sought. This does not apply to adjudicated basins.

Project Evaluation

The Cooperating Partners are seriously considering comments made by Channelkeeper regarding the approach to ranking projects (e.g., there is overlap between objectives, priorities, and strategies that result in double counting and boosting the scores of certain types of projects). For now, we are only trying to sort projects into two buckets; the approach may be modified or a different approach chosen when it is time to apply for grant applications. The public will have a chance to formally review projects and the ranking system during the review period for the Draft IRWMP

Shruti will post tables showing project rankings on the web site.

All successful applicants had at least a 100 percent grant match. Some had more than that. Tracie Billington will be questioned about matching funds – how much is needed and whether this needs to be in the IRWMP. It is important to schedule a discussion in April regarding ranking criteria and matching funds.

Tracie Billington also needs to be asked whether the State will allow administrative costs.

For the IRWMP, the agencies need to think about how they could finance and maintain the projects. The IRWMP probably will have a generic discussion of different funding types for different types of projects. The Cooperating Partners are to provide this text.

Review of Preliminary Draft IRWMP

Cooperating Partners should try to avoid conflicting comments by coordinating internally – one set of comments should be submitted from each agency.

Comments to Lorraine Woodman and cc'd to Shruti Chandra; CH2M HILL will compile the comments into a single matrix and with the County, will review them for issues that require further discussion.

The Preliminary Draft IRWMP was sent to some stakeholders, and their comments will be considered.

Coordination with DWR/SWRCB

Corinne Huckaby and Natalia Deardorff will be at the next Cooperating Partners meeting on February 1st. They have been sent the Preliminary Draft IRWMP, along with Tracie Billington.

The Public Draft IRWMP, projects, and project rankings need to be discussed with the State. The Cooperating Partners may wish to attend this meeting, which is yet to be scheduled.

The Corps of Engineers and Department of Fish and Game has been invited to the IRWMP meetings.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:50.