

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

April 12, 2007
9:15 am – 12:15 pm

Meeting Location:
Goleta Water District, 4699 Hollister Avenue, Santa Barbara

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; Gary McFarland, GWD; Autumn Malanca, City of Santa Barbara Creeks Division; Craig Murray, CSD; 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; Brad Hageman, City of Santa Maria

On the Conference Call

Bob McDonald, CVWD

Others Present

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

Proceedings

The meeting was called to order at 9:15 by Rob Almy.

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

The minutes of the March 13, 2007 Cooperating Partners meeting were approved unanimously as written.

SWRCB & DWR Decisions on the Proposition 50 Grant Process

Rob Almy – Rob Almy presented the Cooperating Partner's position regarding the disposition of remaining Prop 50 funds at a State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) meeting in Sacramento on March 20. The SWRCB adopted a resolution that supported reallocation of Prop 50 funds; the approach conformed to the Department of Water Resources (DWR's) position. \$33 million will be available from DWR; \$31 million will be available from the SWRCB. The SWRCB did not reallocate those monies for coastal projects. The split between Northern and Southern California has been

preserved; \$33 million will be available to Southern California. The State agreed to an accelerated Prop 50 process – those who did not receive full allocations (i.e., \$25million grant) before would be eligible to compete for the remaining funds if they have an approved IRWMP by August, 2007. This favors continued development of the Santa Barbara grant application process – there is a smaller pot of money, but fewer agencies are competing. These are expected to include San Diego and Antelope Valley.

New Prop 50 guidelines are due out this month or the next. There may be a workshop on April 25 to discuss these. The application form should be in hand in early June; it will be due in August. DWR also is working on Prop 84 – it's probably three months behind Prop 50.

Prop 84/Area Plan

Rob Almy – There is agreement in principle to cooperate on an Area Plan. The six regional plans will be knit together, although there may be a need to adjust some boundaries, particularly in the San Luis Obispo/Monterey County area. The document will need to bring the more localized plans together to meet the spirit and letter of Prop 84. The process can't proceed too far until the State guidelines are released. It is expected that the regions will set the priorities. The Area Plan probably won't be as detailed as the IRWMP.

San Luis Obispo and Santa Barbara need to discuss how to consistently address the Santa Maria adjudication; it should be respected as the management structure for the affected water resources.

Rob has conference call on Tuesday with the area interests. There may be a need for some of the Cooperating Partners to become involved in this effort, but for now the County will take the lead.

The County has submitted comments to the State regarding the Prop 84 process. The Cooperating Partners were sent a copy of those comments via email.

Governance

DWR is getting a lot of feedback regarding the need to have one agency govern the Prop 50 grant award process for a group of counties/entities. The grant contracts will be for the region, not individual agencies or districts. In Ventura County, the County agency administers the entire Prop 50 grant award contract, but details are still being worked out.

There will be a meeting at CCWA from 1-4 on April 24 to discuss governance and grant applications. There may be a two-step process like before. The County's role needs to be clearly defined; the County is a coordinator, not a decision maker. Even if some entities choose not to be involved in grant applications, they should be involved in the overall process, which will shift from Prop 50 to Prop 84.

Summary of Comments from Public and Partners

Comments received from the public did not question the fundamental adequacy of the document. The County has a meeting with Channelkeeper tomorrow to discuss their comments. Responses to public comments will not be included in the IRWMP, but they

will be kept on file. The Cooperating Partners need to discuss conflicting comments among themselves and provide revised text to CH2M HILL.

RWQCB Comments

The Cooperating Partners should look at RWQCB's specific comments on their projects and make changes to project descriptions if possible. The descriptions also should emphasize whether their projects could help address specific water quality issues, including TMDLs. Please see Corinne Huckaby's (RWQCB) comments which were forwarded to Cooperating Partners by Shruti Chandra.

Planning for Each Board's Approval of the IRWMP

Approvals will be required from the Board of each Cooperating Partner during late May or June. The County needs to send briefing memo to the Board of Supervisors; this needs to go through the Administrative Office so there is sufficient time on the agenda. The Cooperating Partners may wish to look at the City of Santa Barbara's memo to the City Council as an example – it is on the City's Web site, under the City Council agenda for April 3rd. Many of the Cooperating Partners regularly include the IRWMP as a Board agenda item so they are kept informed and the public has an opportunity to provide comments.

Executive Summary

Len Fleckenstein will prepare an Executive Summary of the IRWMP. The suggestion was made that it should be limited to approximately five pages of text. The internal review will be via email and will need to be done as soon as possible.

Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for Prop 50 Grant Process

This topic will be discussed at the Cooperating Partners meeting on April 24. Bruce Wales, Bill Ferguson, Kate Rees, Teresa Reyburn, Gary McFarland, will form a subcommittee to discuss this issue and prepare the 4/24 agenda. The MOU should be in place around June 1. Some may wish to take the MOU to their Board at the same time as the IRWMP. The process for how grant applications will be funded should be addressed, along with the need for ongoing funds to keep the IRWMP process moving forward. Many regions have found that they don't have funds for administration costs.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:15.