

Minutes

Santa Barbara Countywide IRWMP Cooperating Partners Meeting
Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisor's Conference Room
105 E. Anapamu St., Santa Barbara
September 28, 2006, 9 A.M. – 11:30 A.M.

Attendees

Cooperating Partners

Cynthia Allen, Vandenberg Village CSD; Robert Almy, Santa Barbara County Water Agency; Bill Brennan, CCWA; Chris Dahlstrom, SYRWCD, ID #1; Jeff Dameron, La Cumbre Water District; Eric Erland, City of Lompoc; Len Fleckenstein, Santa Barbara County Water Agency; Bill Ferguson, City of Santa Barbara Water Resources Division; Susie Indorato, SYRWCD, ID#1; Gary McFarland, GWD; Gene Margheim, City of Lompoc; Autumn McKee, City of Santa Barbara Creeks Division; Ruben Moreno, City of Guadalupe; Warren Morgan, LCSD; Craig Murray, Carpinteria Sanitary District; Kate Rees, CCRB and COMB; Teresa Reyburn, City of Santa Maria; Mike Riley, MHCSO; Matt van der Linden, GWD; Bruce Wales, Santa Ynez RWCD; Kathleen Werner, Goleta Sanitary District; Martin Wilder, LCSD; Helena Wiley von Rueden, Santa Barbara County Water Agency; Eileen Wyckoff, Vandenberg Village Community Services District; Robert Wyckoff, Vandenberg Village CSD; Jill Zachary, City of Santa Barbara Creeks Division

Others Present

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

Proceedings

Welcome and Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m. by Rob Almy, who indicated that IRWMP Cooperating Partners' meetings would be treated as if subject to the Brown Act. He introduced key IRWMP staff, including: Len Fleckenstein and Helen Wiley van Rueden who are County staff working on the IRWMP; Shruti Chandra, who will act as an extension of County staff; and CH2M HILL consultants, Kathy Caldwell and Lorraine Woodman, who will lead the IRWMP preparation.

MOU Commitments & Funding Status

Len Fleckenstein described who approved the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Helena Wiley van Rueden distributed the list of those who signed via email on September 25, and it is posted on the IRWMP website.

Kay Rees asked if the County would pick up the allocated share for those agencies that opted out. Chris Dahlstrom noted that ID #1 picked up CSD costs. Rob Almy indicated that the County has the ability to be flexible in cost-sharing, so there won't be any shortfall in funding. Additionally, he noted that if the IRWMP is under budget, proportional refunds will be issued to participants.

Presentation on IRWMP Background and Process

Kathy Caldwell gave a PowerPoint presentation addressing:

- IRWMP Background and Organization
- Why prepare an IRWMP
- State IRWMP requirements
- Scope of Work
- Public outreach
- Cooperating Partners' responsibilities
- Keys to success

The following discussion focused on a number of issues, including:

- DWR has emphasized the quality of the IRWMP; it is not just a listing of projects.
- The Cooperating Partners need to present themselves as one entity, not a group of entities doing a regional plan. They need to recognize the importance of each others' projects.
- Countywide agencies typically haven't done integrated planning.
- Projects may include those that would be funded in the future; participants should take advantage of talking together to develop ideas for future planning. Projects need a nexus with water.
- State won't second guess results of plan as long as we address the State's priorities. State is looking at local groups to establish their own priorities. This is an opportunity to retain local/regional control over how priorities are set and how projects are structured.
- It is important that projects address as many of the State's Water Management Strategies, as possible.
- Both the Department of Water Resources and State Water Resources Control Board have to buy off on the IRWMP.
- State agencies could start looking at the IRWMP to see how projects fit with other State programs.
- All participating entities will have to approve the IRWMP at some level if they want to seek funding.
- Projects could be merged to address multiple objectives. Projects that benefit more than one agency are good.
- The IRWMP could involve three groups of projects: for example, (1) projects that are ready for implementation; (2) important projects, but not quite as ready; and (3) conceptual potential future projects. The IRWMP should anticipate these projects and help them move through the process.
- The IRWMP may be viable for years, but the project list may change. There is a high probability that the plan will be reviewed on a regular basis and revised as necessary.
- Need willingness to compromise, understand the big picture, then we will have a successful group.

- Vandenberg Air Force Base should be at table; it uses State Water Project water, supplied through CCWA.

Plans and Documents for Integration

Rob Almy noted that existing planning documents form the basis of the IRWMP; they need to be integrated within the plan. Plans should be uploaded to the CH2M HILL FTP site if possible – or hard copies sent. Approximately half of the Cooperating Partners have posted plans to the FTP site. The deadline is tonight. If hard copies are sent, Partners should send an e-mail indicating that they have been sent. Plans can be given to the County if they need to be scanned. Partners should indicate if they need hard copies returned. If plans are being updated, Partners should provide what is currently in effect, along with information regarding the update.

Schedule

Lorraine Woodman presented the detailed and generalized versions of the schedule and noted the items requiring input from the Cooperating Partners., i.e., submittal of planning documents, submittal of Project Information Forms, feedback on the Draft IRWMP and Final IRWMP, and participation in meetings and workshops.

Project Description Information

Lorraine Woodman reviewed the information requested on the Project Information Form, which will be used to obtain information for the projects to be included in the IRWMP. They are due to CH2M HILL on October 10.

Public Involvement and Outreach

Kathy Caldwell noted that public involvement is important and not optional for an IRWMP. Cooperating Partners are encouraged to participate in the public workshops. Information will be provided to stakeholders by letter, email, and the website. Three sets of workshops are needed to obtain public input at key points in the IRWMP process. Cooperating Partners are to provide information regarding other stakeholders they think are important to include in the IRWMP process.

Projects need to have a Cooperating Partner as a sponsor. Projects suggested by other interested parties, such as non-profits, would have to meet State objectives, not conflict with other projects, go through a screening process just like other projects, and be co-sponsored by a Cooperating Partner.

The public involvement process is not intended to reopen issues that have been previously decided or are being reviewed or debated in other forums. Workshop locations are to be determined, but they will occur back-to-back in both north and south county. Cooperating Partners should let CH2M HILL know ahead of time if they are aware of constituent concerns.

COMB will provide Shruti Chandra with its extensive mailing list, comprising 700 entities. Other Cooperating Partners also need to identify people they think should be included.

The Steering Committee consists of those who choose to actively participate. Those Partners who start on the Steering Committee need commit to continuing participation. During the

IRWMP process, all Partners need to share information with decision makers and key constituents to keep them informed.

By the term “Cooperating Partners”, we mean all agencies, districts or other entities who executed the MOU. When we refer to “Stakeholders”, we are including Cooperating Partners and other interested parties, such as non-profits who choose to participate. Appropriate constituencies should be encouraged to participate.

The County Water Agency will take the lead on coordinating with the County’s Agricultural Advisory Committee. Other agencies and districts may wish to play a similar role with other groups.

Public Comment Period

No public comments were received.

The meeting was adjourned by Rob Almy at 11:30 A.M.