

**Santa Barbara Countywide  
Integrated Regional Water Management Plan  
Cooperating Partners Meeting  
February 27, 2007  
9:00 am – 12:00 noon  
Meeting Location  
City of Santa Barbara  
Granada Garage Conference Room  
1221 Anacapa Street, Santa Barbara  
Final Minutes**

## **Attendees**

### **Cooperating Partners**

Robert Almy, Santa Barbara County Water Agency; Jeff Dameron, La Cumbre Mutual Water Company ; Bill Ferguson, City of Santa Barbara Water Resources Division; Len Fleckenstein, SB County Water Agency; Bob McDonald, CVWD Gary McFarland, GWD; Autumn Malanca, City of Santa Barbara Creeks Division; Chris Dahlstrom, SYRWCD, ID #1; Craig Murray, Carpinteria Sanitary District; Kate Rees, CCRB and COMB; Teresa Reyburn, City of Santa Maria; Susan Segovia, City of Lompoc; Bruce Wales, Santa Ynez RWCD; Kathleen Werner, Goleta Sanitary District; Joe Barget, Vandenberg Village CSD;

### **Others Present**

Shruti Chandra, Santa Barbara County Water Agency/Dudek; Kathy Caldwell, CH2M HILL

## **Proceedings**

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

No public comments for items not on the agenda were received.

The minutes of the February 1, 2007 Cooperating Partners meeting were approved unanimously as written.

### **DWR and SWRCB Decisions on Prop 50 Process**

**Rob Almy-** There has been a series of meetings on Prop 50 and 84 recently. Things have been moving very fast and the process has been dynamic. The State has proposed to modify the Prop 50 process to divert \$175 million dollars to only those grant applicants who were highly ranked in last year's Round 1 funding process. The "near winners" in Round 1 applications made a case that they should receive funding because their applications scored close to those regions who did receive grant monies as part of Round 1. This change would preclude Santa Barbara County Partners from seeking any of those funds, and would effectively reduce Prop 50 funding available to \$33 million from DWR for Southern California and \$31 million from the SWRCB.

The Partners should have received summaries of the state's proposal from DWR's 1/31 workshop held in Los Angeles. The County (Rob Almy) provided testimony in opposition to the proposed change to the Prop 50 funding process. The County also sent a letter in opposition to the proposed Prop 50 changes for the February 20<sup>th</sup> hearing at the SWRCB, where Rob Almy summarized both the City's and County's testimony at the hearing.

Among the Central Coast IRWMP planning regions, there are several planning regions that are affected either positively or negatively by the State's proposed change in Prop 50 funding. Some of these planning regions are part of the same region as Santa Barbara for Prop 84 funding. All of the Central Coast planning regions have started to engage in discussions regarding an equitable distribution of Prop 50 and Prop 84 funds with the Central Coast.

Lester Snow of DWR has directed his staff to take a look at a truncated version of Round 2 which would then transition quickly into Prop 84.

**Chris Dahlstrom** mentioned what an attorney indicated to him regarding an expedited Round 2 and the politics with the San Diego interests. This attorney is recommending not to move forward on IRWMP until the State makes a decision on the future of Prop 50 monies.

### **The Future Prop 84 Process**

**Rob Almy** - The Santa Barbara Countywide IRMWP is attempting to incorporate the expected requirements of the future Prop 84 grant process, based on preliminary input from DWR staff even though the guidelines have not been released yet.

So far, interactions with the regions north of us that are in our same funding region for Prop 84 have gone well. They believe that there should be an equitable share of money and agree that Prop 84 should be performance-based which allows the region to decide how to divide up the grant money internally.

The State wants to hear about how Prop 84 guidelines should be structured. The next SWRCB hearing will be on March 20, 2007, in which a decision will be made based on guidance from DWR as to how their portion of Prop 50 monies will be spent. SWRCB is requesting written comments by March 9<sup>th</sup>.

DWR has requested input on the future in planning the guidelines for Prop 84. The County sent comment forms to request input from the Partners which will be synthesized into a set of comments to be sent to DWR.

**Rob Almy** - San Luis Obispo would be happy if they received 10 million dollars out of the Coastal monies that would be set aside by the SWRCB as part of the proposed funding changes to Prop 50. If this happens, then Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo need to be "made whole" with respect to Prop 50 and Prop 84 dollar amounts. If we can achieve an agreement on initial distribution of Prop 84 funds, then we would be establishing a good relationship with the other Prop 84 planning regions in the Central Coast, which includes Santa Barbara County, San Luis Obispo County, Monterey Peninsula, Monterey-Salinas, Pajaro River Watershed and Northern Santa Cruz County.

**Kate Rees-** Sonoma County is “greening” its IRMWP by addressing not only water but also land use and energy, which they believe will increase the possibility of federal dollars for projects in their plans.

**Kate Rees and Gary McFarland-** This is a good opportunity to network with neighboring counties and the State.

**Rob Almy-** The Partners need to tell him how the process is going to work

**Chris Dahlstrom-** The DWR funding area meetings are very important to attend and to bring everyone to the table to influence DWR.

**Rob Almy-** At DWR’s meeting on 2/26 in San Luis Obispo regarding Prop 84 funding, everyone from all the Central Coast counties agreed on how the Prop 84 process should move forward, and the level of agreement was unrehearsed and therefore surprising.

**Rob Almy-** The following items were discussed at DWR’s 2/26 meeting:

1. It was not necessary to make 1 umbrella plan
2. We have to recognize the differences and overlaps which leads to performance-based decisions on funding
3. When we do work it out internally, DWR should not 2<sup>nd</sup> guess the local funding region’s decisions.
4. Prioritization of Projects
5. Financial Side- pacing the funding over 4 years
  - a. 1<sup>st</sup> allocation would occur in 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 fiscal years
  - b. 2<sup>nd</sup> allocation would occur in the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 fiscal years

This would allow for some flexibility with deadlines

Prop 1E monies will go to Flood Control projects with a stormwater component. Flood management projects should not be inconsistent with the Basin Plans with don not really deal with flood control projects anyhow, but there should be a sentence in there about consistency with the Basin Plan.

Overall, we need to send our comments in early.

The partners then engaged in wide ranging discussion regarding options for Prop 50 funding and what their collective opinion might be, and when and how it should be conveyed to DWR and SWRCB.

**Rob Almy** clarified that there will be a conference call today at 3pm among the Central Coast agencies to discuss the following:

1. Background on Prop 50 and 84
2. That we are better off if we work together
3. That there should be an equitable distribution of funds

4. There needs to be an independence for the original IRMWP's that can be knit together and will allow us to go after Prop 84 and other funding opportunities
5. The grant process should be performance-based and not competitive.

Rob Almy will draft a letter/testimony points and get these out to the Partners as preparation for SWRCB's hearing on March 20<sup>th</sup>.

### **IRWMP Governance**

Len Fleckenstein passed out a list of "Potential Future Prop 50/84 tasks"

**Gary McFarland-** asked how would funding work once the region has been selected for an implementation grant? Rob Almy responded that the State has indicated that they will want to deal with only 1 entity and grant funding would get allocated over a few years and generally not as a lump sum.

The Ventura IRMWP effort expended \$135,000 for pursuing the implementation grants

When Santa Barbara gets to the implementation grant stage, the Partners will have to agree on a group of projects and this will involve trying different criteria to come to an agreement. This process may require hiring a mediator.

The partners will need to have a meeting after the Plan has been prepared in order to come up with a group of projects that can qualify for implementation grants.

**Bruce Wales-** The project list needs to reflect a watershed sort and there is still a lot of work that remains on Chapter 6.

**Rob Almy** responded saying we still have a little ways to go but that it will be good document. There are 2 audiences who will be on the receiving end of the document; the local public and DWR.

**Chris Dahlstrom-** The state priorities are not necessarily addressed by the proposed list of projects. There is a water code 1053.1 that relates to state priorities and needs to be addressed in our Plan

**Rob Almy-** Agreed that our projects need to show that they are tied to the State priorities.

We also need to know what planning tasks are complete and we need to start working on our task list for the future. Comments on the task list that Len passed out are due on March 8<sup>th</sup>.

The Partners agreed to have another Partners meeting on March 13<sup>th</sup>, probably in Santa Ynez Valley.

Rob Almy adjourned the meeting at 12:20pm.