

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

April 24, 2007
1 PM – 4 PM

Meeting Location:
Central Coast Water Authority, 255 Industrial Way, Buellton

Attendees

Cooperating Partners

Robert Almy, Santa Barbara County Water Agency; Jeff Dameron, La Cumbre Mutual Water Company; Len Fleckenstein, SB County Water Agency; Gary McFarland, GWD; Autumn Malanca, City of Santa Barbara Creeks Division; Chris Dahlstrom, SYRWCD, ID #1; Kate Rees, CCRB and COMB; Susan Segovia, City of Lompoc; Bruce Wales, Santa Ynez RWCD; Joe Barget, Vandenberg Village CSD; Bill Brennan, CCWA; Teresa Reyburn, City of Santa Maria; Tully Clifford, City of Solvang; Kevin Walsh, Goleta Water District; Kathleen Werner, Goleta Sanitary District; Marty Wilder, Laguna Sanitation District

On the Conference Call

Robert Almy, Santa Barbara County Water Agency; Craig Murray, Carpinteria Sanitary District, Lars Nilson, City of Carpinteria; Bill Ferguson, City of Santa Barbara Water Resources Division;

Others Present

Shruti Chandra, Santa Barbara County Water Agency/Dudek

Proceedings

The meeting was called to order at 1:10 by Len Fleckenstein

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

The minutes of the April 12, 2007 Cooperating Partners meeting were approved unanimously as written.

Discussion regarding an Executive Summary

This issue of an executive summary was raised at the last meeting on 4/12 and the Partners asked the Water Agency staff to prepare one. Len sent a draft to the Partners last Friday, although he noted that it is longer than what was anticipated. Discussion focused on the need to shorten the summary so it can be included at the beginning of the IRWMP. Partners agreed the summary should contain highlights from the Plan, and

not be shortened so much that it becomes too much like a table of contents for the Plan. All agreed that the summary should not include any table or project-specific information.

Bruce Wales- suggested the Partners should review the next draft of the summary at the same time as they review the final IRWMP.

Teresa Reyburn- I think that we should trust Len to summarize the Plan, so we don't spend too much time on the process for reviewing the Summary.

Len Fleckenstein - Will ensure that an Executive Summary is included in the final draft IRWMP which will be sent out via E-mail after we receive it from the consultant on the evening of 4/30, comments are due approximately a week later: on May 7th.

State's Draft Guidelines for Prop 50 Grant Applications

The Draft Prop 50 Guidelines were sent out to Partners yesterday via email. We are eligible to apply for up to \$25 million. Guidelines are very similar to Round 1, and will require 2 steps. Step 1 applications are due on August 1st. This surprised us, since we were hoping for a September deadline. The State is soliciting comments on the guidelines. Do we want to comment on the guidelines?

Kate Rees - Why does it need to be 2 steps if it is supposed to be expedited? Maybe we should comment on that and on the deadline.

Teresa Reyburn- We should thank the State for making the funds available.

Rob Almy - Main comment is that we need more time. The 1st deadline should be Sept 1st or 15th for 2 steps. Or it should be a single step process with a deadline of Oct. 15th. If we had an MOU in place to prepare the grant application, we could make the 8/1 date, but we don't have a new MOU. If we would conclude that we need more time then we should talk to Antelope Valley and San Diego about their position on the proposed timeline.

Gary McFarland - Is there an option of discussing with the 2 others on splitting the money with other likely Southern California applicants, that is" San Diego County, Antelope Valley and any other regions, if there are any others? This would be a one step process and may be an option.

Kate Rees - Who is really eligible for the funds? Let's pose this question to CH2M Hill staff who are attending the hearing in Sacramento.

Issues and Discussion regarding Grant Application Process

Len Fleckenstein - How are we going to move forward to develop the grant application? We've identified some of the key issues but we don't have an MOU. One of the key issues is do we prepare a MOU only for Prop 50 or for both Prop 50 & 84?

Teresa Reyburn - - How about taking the MOU and the final IRWMP to our Boards to be approved at the same time in June?

Len Fleckenstein - - Our sub-committee met last week and recommends that an MOU be prepared for Prop 50 only - - or one that can possibly be amended later for Prop 84 work.

Rob Almy - Another possibility is that we can work under the existing MOU for Prop 50 for ranking projects. It can be read to include the ranking first and then we would need a new MOU for grant application.

There should be a cost sharing component for the grant application process. This would require a great deal of detail.

Len - - Who would be the decision makers and how would voting work? Options would include: (1) only the entities that have projects in the application; (2) any agency desiring to be among the decision makers; (3) all 29 Partners.

The actual criteria for project selection would need to be re-visited. In particular, what would be the role of the public? Would the public be invited to Partners meetings to discuss the project selection? Public process is part of the guidelines. Stakeholder involvement needs to be further worked out.

Can we move ahead with the project selection under the current MOU? Our reading of the existing MOU will allow us to make project selection decisions for the grant application.

How do we decide on funding a consultant? Who will be involved and how in funding and in contracting?

Should our process include selecting projects through a watershed approach? Ventura County took a watershed approach and set up watershed working groups. This may be an option for us.

Kate Rees We talked about the group pulling together the criteria and the project proponents paying for the consultant costs for the implementation grant application.

Len Fleckenstein- Ventura has buy-in in different ways. The 11 finalists are paying for the grant application preparation. The broader group is paying for the on-going coordination for Prop 84.

Bruce Wales- Working under the existing MOU will make it easier for us time-wise. This seems appropriate since we have a long list of projects and time is of the essence.

Rob Almy - County will take a stab at a 1st draft of the MOU.

Chris Dahlstrom- Why can't we just amend the existing the MOU? Or how about an addendum to the current MOU to cover only project selection tasks? The Old MOU can cover on-going coordination.

Len Fleckenstein – One issue is: Would the Water Agency be the administrative lead? The subcommittee suggested that SBCWA be the lead agency for Prop 50, but we'd revisit the issue for Prop 84. Need SBCWA to stay in lead role now, because we are going to need to do a lot of work in a short term.

Bruce Wales- - Major management of water infrastructure goes to County Water Agency, since it is a dependent special district - - and not to the County of Santa Barbara. The County needs to keep these two entities (ie., SBCWA and County Gov't) separate.

Craig Murray- Do we need more money (for a consultant's help) to go through the grant selection process?

Bill Ferguson - We don't need a consultant to do project selection. We can do that task ourselves.

Gary McFarland – We have multiple agencies proposing projects and all agencies responsible should be involved. Do we need a 2nd MOU for criteria? Need clarification.

Teresa Reyburn- - Are all of us comfortable working thru the existing MOU for project selection?

Bruce Wales- Should we follow a watershed approach? Should we allocate funding among the watersheds?

Kate Rees - We need to figure out principles and not criteria yet. How does this get reflected in the new MOU? Cost-sharing, opting in, opting out, decision making, voting, recognition of other issues that will be addressed and signatories will agree that this will move forward to Prop 84 and subject to future agreements.

Susan Segovia Lompoc does not have projects and at this point and we don't see the benefit to be a part of MOU #2.

Bill Ferguson – There should be zero cost participation for those who don't have projects

Rob Almy – Also need to consider that there may be a time that the Partners reimburse the County for a portion of the administrative costs. There has been a significant involvement of County staff. The Partners need to be prepared to discuss how the costs will be covered.

Bill Ferguson- We should formalize the compensation for administrative costs once successful grant monies have been received.

Teresa Reyburn- In summary: (1) Water agency should take the lead on Prop 50 grant application process; (2) we should use the existing MOU to pick projects for inclusion in the grant application; (3) those Partners who will have projects in the grant application should bear the financial responsibility for grant application costs, and their responsibility should be part of MOU #2

Rob Almy - The MOU may need to allow for Partners to cover administrative costs for the actual grant process - - as incurred by the County. On-going planning in near term can be coordinated by County staff not by a consultant, since we don't have time or funding for consultant help over the next two months. We don't have the luxury of time to set up a contract, so we need to identify principles for an MOU and project selection without the aid of a consultant. There's a considerable lead time for MOU and for bringing in a contractor; it takes several weeks.

Gary McFarland - Consider alternatives for getting a consultant on-board quickly, e.g. a "time & materials contract" for the grant application process.

Bruce Wales- In figuring out the project selection criteria we need to have a public process.

Rob Almy - - We need to set-up 2 more meetings for follow-on discussion for MOU and Project Selection. Shruti will send out an email with potential meeting dates to set up these 2 meetings; the first meeting might be May 3rd.

Meeting adourned by Rob Almy at 3:50 pm.