

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

July 25, 2007
9 am -12 pm

Location: Santa Maria City Hall Conf Room, 110 East Cook St., Santa Maria

Attendees

Cooperating Partners

Cindy Allen, Vandenberg Village CSD; Mike Alvarado, La Cumbre Mutual Water Company; Bill Brennan, Central Coast Water Authority; Bill Ferguson, City of Santa Barbara, Water Resources Division; Len Fleckenstein, SB County Water Agency; Charles Hamilton, Carpinteria Valley WD; Gary McFarland, Goleta Water District; Kate Rees, Cachuma CRB and COMB; Teresa Reyburn, City of Santa Maria; Kathleen Werner, Goleta Sanitary District.

On the Conference Call

Robert Almy, SB County Water Agency; Bruce Wales, Santa Ynez River WCD.

Others Present

Shruti Chandra, Dudek; Kathy Caldwell, CH2MHILL.

Proceedings

The meeting was called to order at 9:40 by Len Fleckenstein.

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

The minutes from the Cooperating Partners meeting on July16, 2007 were approved with one minor change. Page 2 of the minutes is revised to reflect the timing for a Step 2 application as indicated in the State's Round 2 guidelines.

Step 1 Application Process

Review of edits to Step 1 Application: Kathy Caldwell and discussion/comments

We are on the verge of being able to submit the Step 1 application. There are regions that have submitted to the State already.

In the application form, CH2M Hill (CH) will include the number of resolutions of approval that have been adopted by the Cooperating Partners. Right now, we have 21 resolutions in hand. There are a few smaller CSD's, including Cuyama CSD, and a small city that have not adopted the IRWMP yet. We also would like more input from Guadalupe on the public review process for their project. Ideally, we'd like to get the

others to provide letters of support if they haven't adopted a resolution. Len will contact Cuyama CSD regarding the status of their adoption of the Plan.

In the meanwhile, an email should be sent to those Stakeholders who are named in the application, informing them that their organization is mentioned as having been involved in the IRMWP process.

The attachments to the application were reviewed and input was provided by Partners.

Authorize consultant to submit application

Len pointed out that Section G on Implementation will probably need to be revised after the "Governance Subcommittee" meets with County management on 7/26. The Partners agreed to empower the County staff and consultant to make any last minute edits to the application as needed before it is submitted to the State by the 8/1 deadline.

The County Water Agency will send the Step 1 application and attachments electronically to the Partners after it is submitted to the State.

Step 2 Application Process

Eligibility Review

In order to perform a review of project eligibility for a Prop 50 grant, CH will need the basic workplan information for each project. The Partners will be given between 3 and 4 weeks to prepare a preliminary workplan.

Components of Step 2 application: Kathy Caldwell

Kathy mentioned that the Step 2 submittal is a very intensive application process. Kathy went over the Step 2 submittal requirements to familiarize the Partners with what types of information will be required of them. A project workplan is one of the State's requirements, so CH will need to see each workplan twice: once as part of the project eligibility review and secondly as part of the Step 2 application process. The first workplan can be less detailed than the second workplan.

We need to clarify what the State agencies mean by project "readiness" - - with respect to timing for start of construction versus earlier steps such as designing the project. When the County provides the State with input for topics for the State's Step 2 workshop, this topic may be one to suggest.

The group continued going over Step 2 requirements. Budget information that is required as part of Step 2 was reviewed. Scientific and technical merit was discussed and Kathy noted that during Round 1 many agencies scored low on this component. The Monitoring and Assessment section of the application was also reviewed.

Other Region's costs for step 2

Last year the State WRCB and DWR announced 16 regions to receive Prop 50 Round 1 grants. Kathy discussed the range of costs incurred by 6 of those 16 regions in preparing their Step 2 applications. The lowest cost was \$100K because of considerable in-kind support from the individual agencies & districts. The highest cost was \$300k.

Of the 16 regions slated to receive 50 Round 1 grants, none has yet signed a contract with the State, mainly due to concerns about accountability and liability for project implementation problems which could arise.

MOU for Step 2 and Grant Implementation

Subcommittee report on 7/24 meeting with the County

Kate Rees presented information from the 7/24 meeting with Tom Fayram, held to see if the County would stay in a lead role in the IRWMP process. Tom Fayram agreed that the Water Agency is the appropriate agency for the lead role for the Step 2 process. However, he emphasized that a new MOU will need to be created for the Step 2 process, stating that the project proponents will fund consultant costs to prepare the application. In addition, someone would be brought in from outside the County staff to take over the overall IRWMP/Prop 50 management responsibilities, i.e., much of the work that Len and Rob are doing for this process. Tom also expects the project proponents to pay for those overall project management costs. The County may continue paying 50% of the costs of general IRWMP coordination, but Tom didn't commit at this stage.

If the State awards a Prop 50 grant to the region, then Tom was agreeable to having the County sign a contract with the State if certain conditions can be met. Because there are liability issues related to project implementation, the County would like to create subcontracts with each project entity and/or language in the MOU to protect the County if implantation problems arise.

Bill Ferguson reviewed principles that he drafted that would be presented to County management on July 26. The Partners provided input and clarifications to items before it is presented to the County's Executive Office. The principles would be incorporated into a new MOU (MOU #2) for the step 2 process.

MOU #2 needs to be drafted ASAP and needs to go to the Boards in the August-September timeframe. Kate Rees and Teresa Reyburn will draft the MOU and provide Rob with the draft by the time he is back from vacation in Mid-August. The Cities of Santa Barbara and Santa Maria have volunteered their legal staff to review a draft MOU. The Cooperating Partners also need to schedule MOU #2 for approval by each of their boards or councils.

Kathy will prepare a workplan for the consultant role in the Step 2 process.

At some future date a 3rd MOU will have to be created to cover Prop 84 coordination and subsequent revisions to the IRWMP. Whatever is done for Prop 84 will hopefully cover any future propositions.

IRWMP “Roundtable of Regions”

Feedback from 7/16 Conf Call

We are awaiting summary notes from this call from the Santa Clara region, so we will defer discussion until a later date. Len will forward the meeting notes when they are available.

Status of pending legislation in Sacramento

Draft legislation pertinent to Prop 84 is very much in flux. Regarding the authorization of expenditures for Prop 84, it is still too early to tell where the authorizing legislation is going. Therefore, we deferred any discussion of this item until a later date.

DWR’s California Water Plan Update 2009

DWR’s workshop was held on 7/23. Rob Almy attended the workshop, as did some of the Cooperating Partners. Len distributed paper copies of handouts from the meeting for the Partners’ information. We don’t have electronic versions of the handouts.

Future Meetings for Cooperating Partners and/or Subcommittee

The Partners tentatively agreed to schedule monthly meetings, increasing the frequency if deemed necessary.

Next meeting will be held at COMB in Santa Barbara on August 22nd from 1 PM to 4 PM

Meeting adjourned at 12:55pm