

**Santa Barbara Countywide  
Integrated Regional Water Management Plan  
Cooperating Partners Meeting  
February 1, 2007  
9:00 am – 12:00 noon  
Meeting Location  
Santa Barbara County Public Works Building  
620 W. Foster Road, Santa Maria  
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 (telephone); Gary McFarland, GWD; George Johnson, 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; Susan Warnstrom, 4<sup>th</sup> District Office; Kathleen Werner, Goleta Sanitary District; Martin Wilder, LCSD

**Others Present**

Corinne Huckaby, RWQCB; Norman Shopay, DWR; Natalia Deardorff, DWR; Jack Malone, USASCE (telephone); Shruti Chandra, Santa Barbara County Water Agency/Dudek; Lorraine Woodman, 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 January 17, 2007 Cooperating Partners meeting were approved unanimously.

**January 30, 2007 Meeting with DWR Staff at CH2M HILL's Los Angeles Office**

Len Fleckenstein gave a summary of the meeting held in Los Angeles on January 30<sup>th</sup> with DWR's Tracie Billington, Joe Yun, and Brett Wyckoff. Cooperating Partners attending the meeting included Len Fleckenstein, Kate Rees, Gary McFarland, Teresa Reyburn, Bill Ferguson, and Autumn McKee. The relationship between the Santa Barbara IRMWP and the proposed changes to the Proposition 50 funding process were discussed, and a comparison of the 2004 draft IRMWP with the current draft plan was presented. General guidance was

requested to make sure that the Santa Barbara IRWMP is headed in a direction that is acceptable to DWR/SWRCB.

Rob Almy – based on the new direction given by the State, there is to be more emphasis on planning – the IRWMP is to be something that is useful to the Cooperating Partners in the long-term, not just a vehicle to ask for money. Governance also needs to be addressed. Infrastructure projects are acceptable as long as they are not routine maintenance. Some prioritization of projects is needed, and readiness to proceed is important, but not the main ranking criterion. Integration is important, although the State also finds this a difficult concept to define. There are multiple ways to achieve integration; projects should work together to achieve similar goals.

Natalia Deardorff – the “high note” of the plan should not be the projects, which could change, although they should be an important part of the plan. The “high note” should be how the plan will be sustained beyond individual projects – how it will continue to be useful once projects are implemented.

Norman Shopay – under Proposition 84, the plan will need to identify goals and objectives and how the projects meet them. Natalia Deardorff is the project manager for the Santa Barbara IRWMP – it is important that she participates as much as possible. Natalia’s comments on the Preliminary Draft IRWMP took Proposition 84 requirements into consideration.

Corinne Huckaby works in the Non-Point Source Program, and many of the IRWMP’s projects deal with related issues – she will have comments on the projects.

Chris Dahlstrom – the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation has federal funding for some projects – they will look at whether Santa Barbara has an IRWMP in determining how to fund projects.

### **January 31, 2007 DWR Meeting in Los Angeles**

The January 31 meeting was held by DWR to receive input regarding potential changes in the way Proposition 50 funds will be administered. Gary McFarland gave testimony regarding preserving the Round 1/Round 2 approach, as did others. Others (from other regions) felt it was appropriate to collapse the two rounds and provide funding to project proponents more quickly.

In 2005, DWR/SWRCB received Round 1 grant applications from many regions (including Santa Barbara region), but invited only 16 regions to come back with final implementation grant applications and IRWMPs. Of these 16 regions, only seven were funded for implementation grants. The State is now proposing to limit Round 2 funds to only those nine regions (of the 16) that did not receive funding. This would be a change in DWR/SWRCB policy. Two issues now to be considered are (1) whether Round 2 grant funding should be awarded only to those nine regions, and (2) if funding is awarded in this manner, how should remaining Prop 50 (beyond the Round 2 funds) be disbursed.

Cooperating Partners expressed concern that Santa Barbara would lose out on the opportunity to compete for the Prop 50 funds allocated for Southern California if remaining Prop 50 money is rolled into Prop 84 funds. Norman Shopay indicated that DWR’s remaining funds (\$33 million) would not be combined with the Proposition 84 funds, but that the funding processes would be combined. SWRCB would likely roll its remaining

money (\$16 million) into coastal programs. Under Proposition 50, the remaining funds would be allocated for Southern California, of which Santa Barbara is a part, because DWR has already awarded all of the funds allocated under Prop 50 for Northern California. Under Proposition 84, Santa Barbara is a part of the Central Coast Region, which corresponds with the Central Coast RWQCB district. There may be funding through Prop 84 for further development of the IRWMP, but it won't help with the current effort.

Written comments on the proposed revised process are due to the State on February 8. Santa Barbara has commented twice (in December and January) that it is not appropriate to change directions in the middle of the process. DWR will make an Administrative Decision ; while SWRCB will hold a public hearing on February 20 to take comments on the change. The Cooperating Partners were encouraged to attend this meeting if they wish to express opinions about the proposed change. Those other regions who were originally unsuccessful, but who now stand to receive funding under the new process went directly to the State as a group to present their point of view.

If DWR proceeds with its policy change, all regions in Southern California, including regions who were already awarded funding under Prop 50, would be eligible to reapply for the left-over funds (\$33 million).

Rob Almy – as a matter of equity, the State should consider maximizing public benefit, including consideration of how are funds distributed geographically. Norman Shopay – most funds have been awarded to Northern California – the remaining funds would go to Southern California.

Prop 84 guidelines are still being developed. It is not known if an applicant would have to state under which proposition funds were being requested. Prop 84 funds would be allocated to the larger Central Coast region, including Monterey, Santa Cruz, and San Luis Obispo counties, as well as Santa Barbara. There may be a change in statewide priorities through the Prop 84 process.

Rob Almy – The Cooperating Partners will have to decide whether to stop the IRWMP process now given the change that could occur in February. Santa Barbara agencies have funding constraints – they didn't get planning grants, which may have gone to regions who were further along in the process and didn't need them as much as Santa Barbara did.

Norman Shopay – The State plans on issuing more planning grants earlier.

Chris Dahlstrom – The Cooperating Partners have to look at what criteria they have to meet before continuing with this process.

Gary McFarland – DWR said that they always anticipated that the Prop 50 guidelines would have to change, but later on they said that if Prop 84 hadn't been successful, they wouldn't have changed the process. If DWR can change these things arbitrarily, how do we know whether we can have assurance about whether we can successfully compete for grants?

Kate Rees – many comments were made at DWR's 1/31 meeting yesterday indicating that this process is unfair. She feels that when we started the IRWMP process we didn't know whether we would be successful – but the prospect of Round 2 grants has stimulated cooperative effort here in the Santa Barbara County Region, which has been very beneficial.

Under Prop 84, we need to have discussions with other counties – Rob has started these. Santa Barbara can't stay out of the process.

### **Conference Call with Other Central Coast Water Agencies on January 30, 2007**

The meeting/conference call was held between Monterey (preparing two IRWMPs), Santa Cruz and Pajaro River Watershed, and Santa Barbara to discuss future grant funding under Prop 84, which would allocate \$52 million for the Central Coast. Much time was spent discussing where Ventura County would fit in because a small part of Ventura County near Cuyama is in the Central Coast region, but it is essentially undeveloped. Rob Almy will contact Ventura County to determine if they are interested in participating in future discussions. A small part of Kern County could also be included.

The two options for obtaining Prop 84 funds are (1) competitive basis and (2) performance-based. The various sub-regions in the Central Coast Region could compete against each other for the \$52 million and then the State would determine who would receive funds, or the sub-regions could agree on how funds should be allocated. There could be multiple IRWMPs, or they could be knit together.

A questionnaire related to the Prop 84 process has been prepared by the State addressing how affected parties would like Prop 84 funds distributed and the IRWMP process. The questionnaire will be sent to all Cooperating Partners and is on the DWR website. The County would like to see how the Cooperating Partners wish to respond and then will shape a consolidated response. The forms are due in the next few weeks. The County will coordinate with the Cooperating Partners and submit one form.

DWR will oversee the Prop 84 process, but will rely on other agencies (e.g., DFG, SWRCB) for technical support.

DWR will schedule a funding scoping meeting for the Central Coast Region after February 20.

### **Corinne Huckaby's Comments on the IRWMP**

The IRWMP needs more information regarding environmental impacts and benefits – we need to look at the environmental impacts the projects would address. Clearly spell out the environmental benefits of each project.

Corinne will verify whether matching funds refer to a dollar for dollar match in grant fund or percentage of total funds.

We need to make sure that regional water quality impairments are addressed – i.e., section 303(d) listed water bodies and the relationship between projects that help meet these.

Rob Almy--No TMDLs are currently in place, so we can't address TMDLs yet.

Corinne will review the whole plan as soon as possible. She has issues with some projects and may wish to identify additional projects that should be included.

Corinne will obtain more information about Integrated Coastal Plans, focusing on timing and process.

### **Other Comments on the Preliminary Draft IRWMP**

Based on the meetings with DWR on 1/30 and 1/31, the Cooperating Partners heard that the State wants to know how we will operate differently as a result of this plan – the plan needs to drive projects, and not vice versa.

The plan needs to identify needs, then address how need will be met, then identify a project to fill the need.

We need a new section in the IRWMP that basically says *this is the plan* – here are our strategies and priorities, here is the plan for achieving our objectives.

The plan needs to have more specificity – e.g., spell out more specifically what we will do to prepare for emergencies (for example, water system facility projects, which are transferable between different entities, more storage, etc).

If there is a water shortage in one part of the county, how will we fill these needs?

There is a gap in the draft IRWMP in terms of explaining how our strategies and projects allow us to address our issues and needs, and thereby attain our objectives.