

Meeting Minutes  
Santa Barbara Countywide  
Integrated Regional Water Management Plan  
Cooperating Partners Meeting

June 21, 2007  
9 am -12 pm

*Location: County Employees' University, 267 Camino del Remedio, Santa Barbara*

## Attendees

### Cooperating Partners

Robert Almy, Santa Barbara County Water Agency; Joe Barget, Vandenberg Village CSD; Tully Clifford, City of Solvang; Jeff Dameron, La Cumbre Mutual Water Company; Bill Ferguson, City of Santa Barbara, Water Resources Division; Len Fleckenstein, SB County Water Agency; Autumn Malanca, City of Santa Barbara Creeks Division; Bob McDonald, Carpinteria Valley WD; Gary McFarland, Goleta Water District; Wendy Motta, Santa Ynez River WCD, ID #1; Kate Rees, Cachuma CRB and COMB; Teresa Reyburn, City of Santa Maria; Mike Riley, Mission Hills CSD; Bruce Wales, Santa Ynez River WCD; Marty Wilder, Laguna Sanitation District.

### On the Conference Call

Craig Murray, Carpinteria Sanitary District;

### Others Present

Shruti Chandra, Santa Barbara County Water Agency/Dudek; Kathy Caldwell, CH2MHILL.

### Proceedings

The meeting was called to order at 9:10 by Rob Almy.

There were no public comments for items not on the agenda.

The minutes from the Cooperating Partners meetings of May 14, May 18 and May 29, 2007 were approved and adopted as written, with one correction by Jeff Dameron for flow data for La Cumbre's project, as represented in the minutes for May 14.

### IRWMP Approvals

The City of Santa Maria, Santa Barbara County, Goleta WD, Vandenberg Village, and the Santa Ynez River WCD have approved the IRWMP.

Goleta West Sanitary should approve the IRWMP shortly. The Plan is scheduled for adoption on Tuesday, June 26, 2007 by the City of Santa Barbara. COMB and CCRB are expected to approve the IRWMP on Monday, June 25, 2007. Mission Hills will approve it in July. We need most of the approvals to take place by August 1<sup>st</sup>. The Partners were reminded that the County needs to receive copies of the resolutions as soon as possible after they are approved.

### **Funding for Projects Underway**

Rob Almy spoke with Tracie Billington regarding on-going projects such as the Vandenberg Village CSD Wastewater Treatment Plant project. We need to find out how much the previously expended funds count towards the matching funds. Guidelines say that funds can only be used for work that was already performed. VVCSD is asking for the last portion of funding rather than first.

### **Consultant Tasks Under Contract Amendment**

Rob Almy reported that the County Board has approved the contract amendment with CH2MHill for submitting the IRWMP to the State as part of the Prop 50 step 1 application.

Sufficient payments or commitments from Coop Partners have been received by the County to cover the costs of CH2MHill's work on developing the Step 1 application and a workplan for the Step 2 process. Thus, the team continues to be intact for another month and a half to get through Step1, with its August 1 deadline for submittal.

CH's scope of work has been circulated to the Partners. County Water Agency staff have regular conference calls with the consultants on Monday morning at 9:30 AM if anyone is interested in joining the discussion.

### **Prop 50, Step 1**

In our step 1 application, we need to tell DWR the total dollar amount of projects and the total dollar match. Much of the work for Step 1 is going to be explaining how our Plan and projects meet the guidelines.

On July 10 and July 12<sup>th</sup> DWR and SWRCB are holding 2 workshops on the Step 1 application process. The first is July 10 in Sacramento; the second is July 12 in Riverside. Kathy Caldwell and Rob Almy will attend the workshop in Riverside.

Kathy Caldwell summarized the Step 1 process. The 1<sup>st</sup> Draft will be sent to the Partners during the week of July 9<sup>th</sup> and then discussed at our July 16<sup>th</sup> meeting. This schedule will require everyone to contribute information very quickly regarding matching funds, and regarding coordination with other agencies specific to your proposed projects. The key agencies that you may have coordinated with already could include DWR, RWQCB, SWRCB, Bureau of Reclamation, California Department of Fish & Game, etc.

For step 1, we also need to focus on how we frame the major water issues, especially how we address the governance issue.

### **IRWMP in Other Southern California Regions**

Kathy Caldwell suggested we should re-convene discussion among the 3 regions that are part of the Southern California area for Prop 50 funding, so that we can address how to tackle the issue of funds available. It is still unclear how much will be available to the various groups. Rob Almy agreed to set-up a time to talk with the other Regions.

### **Preparing for Step 2 Grant Application**

Kathy Caldwell: looking ahead to Step 2 process, it is a very complicated grant application and the earlier you get started, the better it will be for the Partners. All the various components of the step 2 application are onerous.

**Kate Rees and Teresa Reyburn-** The Partners' work on Step 2 should begin as soon as possible - - before we find out the outcome of the State's review of the Step 1 application.

**Gary McFarland-** We also need to know (1) an estimate of funding necessary to develop the Step2 application; and (2) the probability of being asked back for Step 2.

**Rob Almy-** We need to understand from CH2 how much Step 2 will cost the group.

### **Lead Agency for Grant Applications and Administration**

**Rob Almy-** A near term project is an MOU for on-going IRWM coordination, especially for the Step 2 application and possibly including Prop 84 work. The most important thing that I got out of my meeting with DWR and SWRCB is that the State agencies want to know how we are going to implement the Plan. We have little time to spare between step 1 and step 2 applications.

**Gary McFarland-** The County, especially the Water Agency, is best equipped to handle coordination of the Step 2 process. We should hold a meeting of the Partners and County managers to convince the County that they need to take the lead. We need to present the historical role that the Water Agency has played and how it is the most logical entity as part of governance. We have to explain to the County that the State is pushing this down on local government.

**Rob Almy-** The County staff first needs to have conversations with County management, and particularly the CEO office, about whether the County should be a part of Step 2 as they have been so far. The administrators are not convinced that the County should play the lead role. There is concern about the appropriate County role and partly there is a philosophical issue with respect to smaller vs. bigger government.

**Len Fleckenstein-** Beyond role of government and staffing issues, there are other concerns related to the County's long-term commitment and to the degree of responsibility and accountability for project implementation.

**Bruce Wales-** You can go to the County Water Agency Code to see how the Water Agency would be a logical fit for a leadership role on Prop 50 and 84. Also, rather than forming a new entity we are utilizing an existing entity. This is a better approach because we are not forming an additional bureaucracy.

**Tully Clifford-** Put forward a motion to support the County Water Agency as lead for the remaining IRWMP and Prop 50 grant process, based on the Water Agency's historical role, and on the governance components of the MOU for the IRWMP.

**Bob McDonald-** Seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously.

**Rob Almy-** If you wish to communicate with County officials, it would need to happen quickly, because the Partners collectively need to make some decisions regarding Step 2.

**SubCommittee on an MOU**

The Partners agreed to form a Subcommittee to address an MOU and governance issues. The Subcommittee members will be Kate Rees, Bruce Wales, Bill Ferguson, Joe Barget, Gary McFarland, Rob Almy and Teresa Reyburn. Kate Rees will take the lead on planning a meeting with County managers. The Subcommittee will convene immediately after conclusion of today's Cooperating Partners meeting.

**Kate Rees-** A new MOU or a possible amendment that takes you through Prop 50 may make sense; or maybe we should have one MOU that includes the transition to Prop 84. This would show the State that we have a long-term intention to keep things moving forward.

**Kathy Caldwell-** It might be good to look at Malcolm Pirnie memo which details the lessons learned related to governance structure and decision making from other IRWMP regions. Shruti Chandra will re-circulate Malcolm Pirnie memo to Partners

**Next Meetings**

The next few meeting are scheduled as follows: July 16<sup>th</sup> and July 25<sup>th</sup>. The location for the July 16<sup>th</sup> meeting is to be determined, but the meeting on July 25<sup>th</sup> will be in Santa Maria.

Meeting was adjourned at 10:45am.