FAAST Financial Assistance Application Submittal Tool

Logout

Proposal

PIN# 10758 - Santa Barbara Countywide IRWMP

RFP Title: IRWM Implementation Grant, Round 2, Step 1
Submitting Organization: CH2M HILL
Project Title: PIN# 10758 - Santa Barbara Countywide IRWMP
Project Description: The proposal is to implement the region's Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP), adopted June 19, 2007, by the region's Cooperating Partners and other stakeholders. The Cooperating Partners and stakeholders have selected 15 projects from the group of high priority projects described in Chapter 8 of the IRWMP that help the region address key issues, regional and state priorities, and objectives while utilizing appropriate water management strategies. The 15 projects focus on two overarching needs: (1) more effective water management in the northern and central portions of the county through improved water and wastewater treatment to meet standards; and to allow effluent reuse and improved quality of surface discharges and returns to groundwater; and (2) increased water reliability and efficiency through conjunctive use and system flexibility in the southern portion of the county.

Applicant Details

Applicant Organization: Santa Barbara County Water Agency
Applicant Address: 123 East Anapamu Street
Santa Barbara, CA - 93101

Project Budget

Funds Requested: $ 25,000,000
Cost Matching Funds: $ 44,150,000
Total Budget Funds: $ 69,150,000

Project Location

Latitude & Longitude: 37.4 ; -120.08
Watershed: Santa Ynez Watershed
County: Santa Barbara
Responsible RWQCB: 3 Central Coast RWQCB

Funding Program	Applied	Amount Recommended by SWRCB
IRWM Implementation Grant, Round 2, Step 1 Program	Yes	$0.00

Project Management Role	First Name	Last Name	Phone	Fax	Email
Project Director: Authorized Representative from Applicant Organization to execute funding agreement	Robert	Almy	805-568-3542	805-568-3434	ralmy@co.santa-barbara.ca.us
Project Manager: Day to day contact on this project from Applicant Organization	Robert	Almy	805-568-3542	805-568-3434	ralmy@co.santa-barbara.ca.us

Applicant Information

Name:Santa Barbara County Water Agency
Address:123 East Anapamu Street
Santa Barbara, CA - 93101
Federal Tax Id: 95-6002833

Person Submitting Application

Name: Laura Eckert
Phone No: 213-228-8242
Fax: 714-424-2231
Email: leckert@ch2m.com

Legislative District	Primary	Additional
Senate District	15	19
Assembly District	35	33
US Congressional District	23	24

Contact Agency	Contact Name	Phone	Email
Department of Water Resources, Sr. Engineering Geologist, Division of Planning and Local Assistance	Norman Shopay	916-651-9218	nshopay@water.ca.gov

Department of Water Resources, Research Program Specialist, Div. of Planning and Local Assistance	Anna Aljabiry	916-651-9292	aljabiry@water.ca.gov
Department of Water Resources, Environmental Scientist, Division of Planning and Local Assistance	Judy Colvin	916-651-9665	jcolvia@water.ca.gov
Department of Water Resources, Environmental Scientist, Division of Planning and Local Assistance	Brett Wyckoff	916-651-9283	bwyckoff@water.ca.gov
State Water Quality Control Board, Director, Water Recycling Funding Program	Shahla Farahnak	916-341-5735	sfarahnak@waterboards.ca.gov
USACE, Chief, Watershed Studies Group, Planning Division USACE, CESPL-PD-WW	Jim Hutchison	213-452-3826	james.d.hutchison@usace.army.mil
USACE, Environmental Specialists	Jack Malone	805-585-2146	john.c.malone@usace.army.mil
State Department of Fish and Game	Natasha Lohmus	805-684-6281	nlohmus@dfg.ca.gov
Department of Water Resources, Division of Planning and Local Assistance	Tracie Billington	916-651-9226	tracieb@water.ca.gov
State Water Quality Control Board, Manager, Division of Financial Assistance	Scott Couch	916-341-5658	scouch@waterboards.ca.gov
Department of Water Resources, Environmental Scientist, Division of Planning and Local Assistance	Natalia Deardorff	916-651-9214	ndeardor@water.ca.gov
State Water Quality Control Board, Engineering Geologist, Division of Financial Assistance	Jin-lu (Jim) Lin	916-341-5877	jlin@waterboards.ca.gov
Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board, Sanitary Engineering Associate	Corinne Huckaby	805-549-3504	Chuckaby@waterboards.ca.gov
State Water Quality Control Board, Environmental Scientist, Environmental Services	James Hockenberry	916-341-5700	JHockenberry@waterboards.ca.gov
Department of Water Resources, Environmental Scientist, Division of Planning and Local Assistance	Craig Cross	916-651-9204	ccross@water.ca.gov

Cooperating Entity	Role on Project	Contact Name	Phone	Email
City of Buellton	Cooperating Partner	Steve Thompson	805-686-0137	citymanager@cityofbuellton.com
City of Solvang	Cooperating Partner	Tully Clifford	805-688-5575 x 222	tclifford@cityofsolvang.com
Santa Ynez River Water Conservation District	Cooperating Partner	Bruce Wales	805-693-1156	bwales@syrwcd.com
Goleta Water District	Cooperating Partner	Kevin Walsh	805-964-6761	kdwalsh@goletawater.com
Goleta Sanitary District	Cooperating Partner	Kathleen Werner	805-967-4519	kwerner@goletasanitary.org
County of Santa Barbara Laguna Sanitation District	Cooperating Partner	Martin Wilder	805-739-8755	mwilder@cosbpw.net
Cuyama Community Services District	Cooperating Partner	U. S. Wilson	661-766-2780	ccsd@inreach.com
Santa Barbara County Water Agency	Applicant	Robert Almy	805-568-3542	ralmy@cosbpw.net
Santa Maria Valley Water Conservation District	Cooperating Partner	Debi Askew	805-925-5212	smv.waterconservation@verizon.net
Vandenberg Village Community Services District	Cooperating Partner	Joe Barget	805-733-3417	jbarget@vvcsd.org
Los Alamos Community Services District	Cooperating Partner	Kevin Barnard	805-344-4195	kbarnard@dock.net
Central Coast Water Authority	Cooperating Partner	Bill Brennan	805-688-2292, x 21	wjb@ccwa.com
Summerland Sanitary District	Cooperating Partner	Jerry Smith	805-969-4344	ssdwater@hughes.net
Santa Ynez WCD ID #1	Cooperating Partner	Chris Dahlstrom	805-688-6015	cdahlstrom@syrwd.org
La Cumbre Mutual	Cooperating Partner	Mike Alvarado	805-967-2376, x 17	MAlvarado@lacumbrewater.com

Water Co.				
City of Santa Barbara, Water Resources	Cooperating Partner	Bill Ferguson	805-564-5571	BFerguson@SantaBarbaraCa.gov
City of Santa Barbara, Creeks Division	Associated Div. of City of SB	Autumn Malanca	805-897-2688	amalanca@santabarbara.ca.gov
Carpinteria Valley Water District	Cooperating Partner	Charles Hamilton	805-964-2816	charles@cvwd.net
City of Carpinteria	Cooperating Partner	Dale Lipp	805-684-5405 x 402	dalel@ci.carpinteria.ca.us
Goleta West Sanitary District	Cooperating Partner	Gary McFarland	805-968-2617	glmcfarland@goletawater.com
Golden State Water Company	Cooperating Partner	William Woodard	805-349-7407 x 102	wwoodard@gswater.com
Carpinteria Sanitary District	Cooperating Partner	Craig Murray	805-684-7214	CraigM@carpsan.com
City of Guadalupe - Public Works	Cooperating Partner	Mike Pena	559-449-0400	mpena@ci.guadalupe.ca.us
City of Lompoc	Cooperating Partner	Susan Segovia	805-875-8297	S_SEGOVIA@ci.lompoc.ca.us
Cachuma Operation and Maintenance Board/Cachuma Conservation and Release Board	Cooperating Partner	Kate Rees	805-569-1391	KRees@cachuma-board.org
City of Santa Maria	Cooperating Partner	Teresa Reyburn	805-925-0951 x 7219	treyburn@ci.santa-maria.ca.us
Mission Hills Community Services District	Cooperating Partner	Michael Riley	805-733-4366	mwriley_mhcsd@verizon.net
Montecito Water District	Cooperating Partner	Bob Roebuck	805-969-7261	bob@montecitowater.com
Casmalia Community Services District	Cooperating Partner	Terry Stricklin	805-937-6151	terri2@ix.netcom.com

Q# Application Question

1. **Based on the region's location, what is the applicable DWR district (Northern, Central, San Joaquin, or Southern)? To view each district's boundaries, click here.**

   Answer: Southern

2. **What are the names and numbers of the groundwater basins underlying the region? For information on groundwater basin names and numbers, click here.**

   Answer: The names and numbers of groundwater basins in Santa Barbara County are: Santa Maria (3-12), Cuyama Valley (3-13), San Antonio Creek Valley (3-14), Santa Ynez River Valley (3-15), Goleta (3-16), Santa Barbara (3-17), Carpinteria (3-18), Montecito (3-49), and Foothill (3-53). Santa Ynez River Valley (3-15) includes four subbasins: Lompoc Uplands, Lompoc Plain, Buellton Uplands, and Santa Ynez Uplands.

3. **For a region that encompasses multiple watersheds, list the names of the watersheds other than the primary watershed.**

   Answer: The region's watersheds are (1) Santa Maria Watershed, (2) San Antonio Creek Watershed, and (3) South Coast Watersheds (approximately 50 watersheds ranging from 50 acres to 30,572 acres, with an average size of 3,209 acres).

4. **For a region that encompasses multiple counties, list the name of each county.**

   Answer: Not applicable; the entire region is within Santa Barbara County.

5. **For a region that encompasses more than one Regional Water Board boundary, list the name of each Regional Water Board.**

   Answer: Not applicable; the entire region is within the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board boundary.

6. **Does the agency or organization have an adopted Plan? Yes or No. If the answer is yes, please enter the adoption date. If the answer is no, please enter the anticipated adoption date. The Plan must be adopted before submittal of a Step 2 application to be eligible for IRWM grant funding.**

   Answer: Yes

   Answer: Yes. The County of Santa Barbara adopted the IRWM Plan on June 19, 2007. In addition, the IRWMP was adopted by 21 other Cooperating Partners prior to the submittal of the Step 1 application on August 1. Copies of the resolutions are included in Attachment 1.

7. **For a Proposal that includes projects located in both Northern California and Southern California, please provide the amount of grant funds requested for projects located in Northern California and the amount of grant funds requested for projects located in Southern California.**

   Answer: Not applicable; all projects are located in southern California.

8. Major Water Issues: Briefly describe the major water related issues within the region.

Answer: The issues vary considerably between watersheds and include (1) the need to replace, rehabilitate, or upgrade aging infrastructure, especially in Disadvantaged Communities (DACs); (2) risk of illness from inadequate drinking water and pollution from wastewater, especially in DACs; (3) water supply reliability, stemming from the variable reliability of State Water Project, loss of storage capacity in the major reservoirs, and the need for supplies to serve a growing population; (4) the need to operate and maintain water and wastewater systems in a manner that minimizes impacts to sensitive habitats and species and complies with federal, state, and local regulatory requirements; (5) overdrafted groundwater basins in North County; (6) water quality impairments in both groundwater and surface water, including pollution of creeks and ocean water; (7) potential flooding; (8) potential impacts to water and wastewater facilities from floods, earthquakes, and fires, and periodic droughts.

9. Objectives: Briefly describe the objectives for the Plan.

Answer: The following objectives reflect those required by the state, augmented by two reflecting regional needs: protect, conserve, and augment water supplies; protect current and future groundwater supplies; protect and restore habitat and ecosystems; protect and improve groundwater, freshwater, brackish water, ocean water, and drinking water quality; ensure secure water supplies by helping local water purveying districts address the impacts of future droughts, other water shortages, and emergencies such as earthquakes, floods, and fires; and maintain and enhance water and wastewater infrastructure efficiency and reliability. The Cooperating Partners determined that IRWMP implementation should focus on (1) meeting water quality objectives in the central and northern parts of the County by increasing effluent reuse and improving quality of groundwater return flows and surface discharges; and (2) meeting water supply efficiency and reliability objectives in the southern part of the County.

10. Stakeholders: List any major stakeholders that will participate in the Plan that were not identified in Item 6, above.

Answer: The Cooperating partners are the principal public agency stakeholders in this IRWMP and Prop 50 process. Other stakeholders include Heal the Ocean, Southern San Luis Obispo and Santa Barbara Counties Agricultural Watershed Coalition, Community Environmental Council, Santa Barbara Channelkeeper, Surfrider Foundation, Santa Barbara City Creeks Committee, Santa Barbara County Special District Association, Southern California Wetlands Recovery Project, Environmental Defense Center, The Dunes Center at Guadalupe, Vandenberg Air Force Base, University of California (Santa Barbara, Donald Bren School of Environmental Science and Management), Goleta Slough Management Committee, Goleta Valley Chamber of Commerce, Sanitation Agency Managers' Association, Citizen's Planning Association of Santa Barbara County, League of Women Voters of Santa Barbara County, Santa Maria League of Women Voters, and Groundwater Resources Association-Central Coast Branch.

11. Exceptions to Maximum Grant Amount: List the applicable Exception(s) to the Maximum Grant Amount.

Answer: Not applicable; there are no exceptions to the maximum grant amount.

12. Completeness: Have all of the fields in the application been completed? If no, please explain.

Answer: Yes

Answer:

Attachment Title	Date
Att1_10758_IRWMPlan_1of5	7/31/2007 10:58:40 AM
Att1_10758_IRWMPlan_2of5	7/31/2007 11:01:54 AM
Att1_10758_IRWMPlan_3of5	7/31/2007 11:03:29 AM
Att1_10758_IRWMPlan_4of5-ProofOfAdoption	7/31/2007 12:21:29 PM
Att1_10758_IRWMPlan_5of5-Map	7/31/2007 12:22:16 PM
Att2_10758_MinStd_1of1	7/31/2007 10:51:25 AM
Att3_10758_ConsisStand_1of1	7/31/2007 10:50:56 AM
Att4_10758_DACEJ_1of1	7/31/2007 10:50:09 AM

Certification

I certify under penalty of perjury that the information I have entered on this application is true and complete to the best of my knowledge and that I am an employee of the applicant authorized to submit the application on behalf of the applicant. I further understand that any false, incomplete or incorrect statements may result in the disqualification of this application. By signing this application, I waive and and all rights to privacy and confidentiality of the proposal on behalf of the applicant, to the extent provided in this RFP.

Submitted by: leckert **Submitter initials** lpe **Submitted date:** 7/31/2007 12:56:09 PM

If you have any questions, please contact us.

IRWMP Consistency with Minimum Standards

For Implementation Grant applications to be considered for funding, the proposed or adopted Plans must meet all of the following minimum standards:

Must be adopted prior to submittal of the Step 2 application

The Santa Barbara Countywide IRWM Plan was adopted by the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors on June 19, 2007, on behalf of the County Water Agency as the lead agency for coordinating development of the Plan. The IRWM Plan was adopted by 21 other Cooperating Partners prior to the submittal of the Step 1 application on August 1. Attachment 1 includes copies of the Board resolutions demonstrating approval of the IRWMP.

Participation of at least three agencies, two of which have statutory authority over water management, which may include water supply, water quality, flood control, or storm water management

The IRWMP was prepared by a broadly based group, referred to as the "Cooperating Partners," including all but one of the entities with statutory authority over water management in Santa Barbara County. The Cooperating Partners comprise 29 water districts, sanitary districts, community service districts, water conservation districts, private water companies, cities (large, medium, and small), Santa Barbara County, and joint powers agencies. Each disadvantaged community (DAC) in Santa Barbara County is a member, as is every water purveyor ("retail water supplier"); only one very small community services district is not actively involved. The Cooperating Partners represent all watersheds and geographic regions of the county, and the high level of participation engendered by the development of the IRWMP marks a new, more intensive level of cooperation regarding the management of water resources within the countywide region. The Cooperating Partners are listed in Section 1.2 (page 1-5) of the IRWMP, and their roles are described in Sections 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3, pages 4-1 to 4-9. As noted on pages 4-5 and 5-6, the Santa Barbara County Water Agency has taken the lead on administering the development of the IRWMP. The Water Agency is a dependent special district with countywide authorities and was created by state statutory authority to address water resources within the county.

Provides a map of the region showing the local agencies in the area covered by the Plan and the location of the proposed implementation projects

IRWMP Figure 4-1 (page 4-3) shows the locations of water purveyors in Santa Barbara County, Figure 4-2 (page 4-7) shows the locations of the county's wastewater providers, and Figure 8-1 (page 8-9) shows the locations of the highest priority (Tier 1) projects.

Contains one or more regional objectives

Regional objectives are described in Section 7.2 (pages 7-4 to 7-6). The four objectives minimally required by the state (water supply, groundwater management, ecosystem restoration, and water quality) were refined to more specifically describe how the objectives should be met in light of regional issues and were augmented to reflect regional needs. Emergency preparedness was added to reflect ongoing risks to the county from droughts, other water shortages, and emergencies such as earthquakes, floods, and fires. The Cooperating Partners' interest in emergency response also has been heightened by awareness of the Hurricane Katrina experience in New Orleans. Infrastructure efficiency and reliability also was added to address the need for the replacement and rehabilitation of water and wastewater infrastructure to increase its reliability and use water resources more efficiently. Such activities are essential to the delivery of adequate water and wastewater services within the county and often result in benefits to areas targeted by the state, including water supply, groundwater management, ecosystem restoration, and water quality.

The Cooperating Partners determined that IRWMP implementation should focus on (1) meeting water quality objectives in the central and northern parts of the County by increasing effluent reuse and improving quality of groundwater return flows and surface discharges; and (2) meeting water supply efficiency and reliability objectives in the southern part of the County.

Documents that the following water management strategies were considered (CWC §§ 79562.5 and 79564) when formulating the IRWM Plan:

Water supply reliability

Groundwater management

Water quality protection and improvement

Water recycling

Water conservation

Storm water capture and management

Flood management

Recreation and public access

Ecosystem restoration

Wetlands enhancement and creation

Environmental and habitat protection and improvement

Water management strategies are described in Section 7.4 (pages 7-8 to 7-13). The required water management strategies were considered by the Cooperating Partners, as were the 25 resource management strategies identified in the State of California Department of Water Resources (DWR) California Water Plan Update 2005. Regional objectives and water management strategies also were the focus of stakeholder workshops held in October and December 2006 to obtain public input into the development of the IRWMP (refer to IRWMP Figure 6-2 on page 6-5). Those water management strategies determined to be most applicable to Santa Barbara County needs, including those that are mandatory are: environmental and habitat protection and improvement (including ecosystem restoration and wetlands enhancement and creation); surface water management (including flood protection and management and urban runoff [storm water] management), groundwater management, imported water, water supply reliability, drinking water treatment and distribution, water quality protection and improvement, matching water quality to water use; water recycling–treatment and distribution, desalination; recreational opportunities, water and wastewater treatment; and economic incentives (used to encourage water conservation).

Table 7-1, pages 7-15 to 7-20, shows how water management strategies can be used to meet regional priorities and IRWMP objectives.

Integrates two or more water management strategies listed above

The IRWMP uses the strategies developed by the Cooperating Partners to link objectives with projects, and this link to state strategies was one factor in evaluating proposed projects. Figures 8-2 and 8-3 (pages 8-13 and 8-15) illustrate the process that was used to identify projects and ensure that they were integrated, using a mix of plan objectives and water management strategies. As shown in Table 8-4 (page 8-12) and Tables D-1 through D-5 in Appendix D, the highest priority projects and the entire suite of projects included in the IRWMP use a wide range of water management strategies to achieve the plan objectives and meet regional priorities. Forty of the top tier projects and 97 of the total projects use one or more water management strategies.

Presents project prioritization and a schedule for project implementation to meet regional needs

As described in Section 8.1, page 8-1, place-specific issues were linked to regional objectives, priorities, and strategies in order to identify projects needed to resolve the most pressing issues facing the region and each watershed, including those facing DACs. Section 8.2 (pages 8-2 to 8-11) presents the methods used to prioritize projects. All projects were evaluated and prioritized according to eight criteria. The highest scoring projects, with scores of 7 or above, were considered to be the highest priority projects for the near-term (Tier I projects) and are shown in Table 8-3 and Figure 8-1; the corresponding project descriptions are shown in Appendix C-1. These include four projects are urgently required to serve the needs of the county's three DACs. Further prioritization of these projects is being conducted by the Cooperating Partners as they consider which projects are appropriate candidates for grant funding. Descriptions of the projects with scores below 7 are included in Appendix C-2, and tables showing the consistency of all projects with the regional objectives, regional priorities, water management strategies, and statewide priorities are included in

Appendix D-6. Add information from Sec 8.1 on the “Strategic Approach” used to identify projects for each watershed based on the most pressing issues/problems in those watersheds.

A schedule for the implementation of the highest priority projects is shown in Table 8-5 on page 8-18. “Readiness to proceed” was one of the criteria used to evaluate projects.

IRWMP Consistency with Plan Standards

A. Regional Agency or Regional Water Management Group

All agencies and organizations that were necessary to address the objectives and water management strategies of the Plan were involved in the planning process. The Plan was prepared by a broadly based group, referred to as the "Cooperating Partners," comprising all but one of the entities with statutory authority over water management in Santa Barbara County; every water purveyor ("retail water supplier") and all sewage treatment agencies within Santa Barbara County is a member; only one very small community services district is not actively involved. The Cooperating Partners include 29 water districts, sanitary districts, community service districts, water conservation districts, private water companies, cities (large, medium, and small), Santa Barbara County, and joint powers agencies. These entities are listed in Section 1.2 (page 1-5) of the Plan, and their roles are described in Sections 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3, pages 4-1 to 4-9. All 29 Cooperating Partners signed a Memorandum of Understanding for development of the Plan that was approved by their Boards, thus demonstrating broad interest and involvement. Cooperating Partners (except some DACs) also contributed funds to develop the Plan, thus demonstrating a strong commitment to the task and the objectives of the MOU. Cooperating Partners also participated actively in the preparation of the Plan, including attending numerous meetings and public workshops held to obtain input from other stakeholders into Plan development (refer to Section N below). There have been 22 resolutions of support received from the Cooperating Partners.

B. Region Description

The reasons why Santa Barbara County is an appropriate region for integrated planning are delineated in Section 2 on page 2-1. As noted, different subregions within the county share water supplies and infrastructure, and water is managed as an interconnected system within the county boundaries (refer to Section 3); water and wastewater management entities must address issues and challenges that are specific to the region and that would benefit from an integrated management approach (refer to Sections 2 and 3); from an institutional perspective, many of the Cooperating Partners have a long history of working together to resolve water issues, and a framework already exists for addressing key issues related to water resource management (refer to Section 3); and the county is largely geographically separate from neighboring counties. Internal boundaries are described in Section 2; specific section, figure, and page numbers for the description of each key regional element are shown below.

Requirement	Section, Figure, and Page No.
Internal boundaries	Section 2
City and community boundaries	Figure 2-1 (p. 2-3)
Boundaries of federally owned, state or University of California-owned, and County-owned lands	Figure 2-2 (page 2-5)
Boundaries of incorporated cities and unincorporated areas.	Figure 2-2 (page 2-5)
Water service providers and their service Areas	Section 4.1 (pages 4-1 to 4-3); Figure 4-1 (p. 4-3)
Other water management agencies	Section 4.2 (pages 4-5 to 4-6)
Wastewater service providers and their service areas	Section 4.3 (pages 4-6 to 4-9); Figure 4-2 (p. 4-7)
Watershed boundaries	Section 2.5 (pages 2-8 – 2-17)
Groundwater basins	Section 2.6 (pages 2-18 to 2-22)
Major water-related infrastructure	Section 4.4 (p. 4-6 to 4-16); Figure 4-3 (p. 4-13)
Water quality, including Critical Coastal Areas, Section 303(d) impaired water bodies, groundwater, surface water, ocean water, agricultural water, drinking water	Section 2-8 (p. 2-26 to 2-35)
Water demand and adequacy of water supplies up to the year 2040	Section 2.9 (p. 2-35 to 2-39)
Quantity of water resources within the region, including groundwater, surface waters, imported water, water conservation, recycled water, desalted water, conjunctive use, and cloud seeding	Section 4.5 (p. 4-16 to 4-20)
Important ecological processes and environmental resources within the regional boundaries and the associated water demands to support environmental needs	Section 7 (p. 2-22 to 2-26)
Social and cultural makeup of the regional community, including important cultural or social values	Section 2.4 (page 2-8)

Requirement	Section, Figure, and Page No.
Economic conditions and important economic trends within the region	Section 2.3 (p. 2-7 to 2-8)

C. Objectives

The Plan objectives and the manner in which they were determined are described in Section 7.2, pages 7-4 to 7-6. The four objectives required by the state (water supply, groundwater management, ecosystem restoration, and water quality) were refined to more specifically address how the objectives should be met in light of regional issues and were augmented to reflect regional needs. Emergency preparedness was added to reflect ongoing risks to the county from droughts, other water shortages, and emergencies such as earthquakes, floods, and fires. The Cooperating Partners' interest in emergency response also has been heightened by awareness of the Hurricane Katrina experience in New Orleans. Infrastructure efficiency and reliability also was added to address the need for the replacement and rehabilitation of water and wastewater infrastructure to increase its reliability and use water resources more efficiently. Such activities are essential to the delivery of adequate water and wastewater services within the county and often result in benefits to areas targeted by the state, including water supply, groundwater management, ecosystem restoration, and water quality.

The Cooperating Partners determined that IRWMP implementation should focus on (1) meeting water quality objectives in the central and northern parts of the County by increasing effluent reuse and improving quality of groundwater return flows and surface discharges; and (2) meeting water supply efficiency and reliability objectives in the southern part of the County.

D. Water Management Strategies

Water management strategies are described in Section 7.4 (pages 7-8 – 7-13). The required water management strategies were considered by the Cooperating Partners, as were the 25 resource management strategies identified in the State of California Department of Water Resources California Water Plan Update 2005. Those most applicable to Santa Barbara County needs, including those that are mandatory are: environmental and habitat protection and improvement; surface water management, groundwater management, imported water, water supply reliability, drinking water treatment and distribution, water quality protection and improvement, matching water quality to water use; water recycling–treatment and distribution, desalination; recreational opportunities, water and wastewater treatment; and economic incentives. These represent strategies that are already being implemented through local planning processes, such as General Plans, Urban Water Management Plans, Capital Improvement Plans/Master Plans, Groundwater Management Plans, Drought/Conservation Plans, Storm Water Management Plans, and Operational Agreements, and those that will continue to be implemented through specific projects identified in Section 8 and Appendix C.

E. Integration

Modified to emphasize integration, water management strategies that are included in the plan are identified in Section 7.4, and the integrated benefits from the implementation of each are described in pages 7-9 to 7-13. Section 7.5, pages 7-13 to 7-20, describes how the use of multiple water management strategies can be used to address short-term and long-term regional priorities and meet multiple Plan objectives. Specific linkages between regional priorities, water management strategies, and regional objectives are shown in Tables 7-1 and 7-2. The benefits of included integrated projects with multiple benefits, achieved through the use of multiple water management strategies, is included in Section 9.2.2, pages 9-6 to 9-8.

F. Regional Priorities

Short-term and long-term priorities for implementation of the Plan are described in Sections 7.3.1 (page 7-7) and 7.3.2 (pages 7-7 to 7-8), respectively. The process used by the Cooperating Partners to determine the regional priorities is described on page 7-6; additionally, they were discussed at public workshops to obtain stakeholder input. Input from the State, particularly the Regional Water Quality Control Board, also helped define regional priorities. Short-term and long-term regional priorities were defined by the Cooperating Partners in order to provide more specific direction regarding the types of projects and programs that should be implemented to meet Plan objectives. Short-term priorities are those that are expected to be implemented within 5 years. Long-term priorities are those expected to be implemented after 5 years, but the short-term priorities will continue to be important in the more distant future, as well; thus, there is overlap between short-term and long-term priorities. The regional priorities are inherently integrative because they help meet regional objectives. For example, reducing the potential for flooding can involve water supplies, groundwater management, ecosystem restoration, water quality, emergency preparedness, and infrastructure efficiency and reliability, depending on the methods used.

These priorities are based on identified needs and anticipated future challenges. For example, some major facilities such as levees and regional distribution systems are over 50 years old and need to be upgraded or rebuilt. Other facilities are believed to be susceptible to substantial damage in seismic events, potentially leaving the area without adequate water supplies during the key emergency response period. These priorities reflect the need for "new" projects/initiatives. These do not reflect the substantial effort being made to meet ongoing public needs and protect the local environment. Those efforts are briefly described in Sections 2 through 5 and are assumed to continue. The short-term and long term priorities described below are not listed in order of importance.

The process for modifying regional priorities in response to regional changes is described in Section 10.1 on pages 10-1 and 10-2. This Plan incorporates an adaptive management approach intended to allow it to stay current in light of evolving needs, local and statewide priorities, management strategies, technology, and funding requirements.

G. Implementation

The means through which the Plan will be implemented are described in Section 8. The strategic approach used to relate place-specific issues to regional objectives, priorities, and strategies in order to identify projects needed to resolve these issues is described in Section 8.1 on pages 8-1 to 8-6. Linkages between projects needed to address specific region wide and watershed-specific issues are shown in Tables 8-1 and 8-2, respectively (pages 8-3 to 8-6). Agencies responsible for implementing the highest priority projects are shown in Table 8-3 (page 8-7). Economic and technical feasibility is demonstrated in Section 8-3 on page 8-17. The current status of each of the highest priority projects is implicit in the project descriptions included in pages 8-19 to 8-59. Estimated start and end dates also are included in each project description, and the timeline for all high priority projects is presented in Table 8-5 on page 8-18.

The governance structure that will ensure that the Plan is implemented is outlined in Section 1.3, pages 1-6 to 1-8. The County Water Agency has historically played a lead role as the contract holder and as an intermediary between local government and state or federal agencies for purposes of regional water planning and major water projects, whether for water supply (e.g., with USBOR for the Cachuma Project and later for Twitchell Dam) or with the State/Regional Board for water quality programs. As a special district created by state legislation, the County Water Agency cooperates closely and in some cases relies on local agencies to deliver certain services. For inter-agency water planning and coordination work, the Water Agency likewise is dependent, at least in part, on other cooperating partners for funding assistance as well as in-kind support.

As objectives and expectations regarding management of grants have become clearer over time, the Cooperating Partners have developed an approach to track management of the projects that will be funded. Moreover, the Cooperating Partners are still identifying the lessons being learned from Prop 50 Round 1 grantees, and from our own experience in developing the IRWM Plan and in prioritizing and selecting projects for Prop 50 grant applications.

The Cooperating Partners and Santa Barbara County agree that the County Water Agency should continue to serve as the lead agency with outside consultant support to manage project administration and on-going IRWM coordination. The Cooperating Partners would contribute funds on a pro-rata basis, based on percent of grant funds to each project proponent, or based on each project's total cost as a percent of total costs of all projects in the Round 2 grant application from the Santa Barbara region. If invited by the State to proceed to Step 2, the County Water Agency will submit the Step 2 grant application on behalf of the Cooperating Partners.

The Cooperating Partners have formed a Subcommittee on Governance to develop a new MOU or other inter-agency agreements and consider relevant issues and options associated with details of decision making and financial management. Given the larger regional scale of the funding areas under Prop 84, the Cooperating Partners are still exploring alternatives for Prop 84 and the longer-term IRWM efforts. Their decisions will be influenced by experiences in the Prop 50 Round 2 process, as well as by the State's pending Prop 84 Guidelines.

H. Impacts and Benefits

The advantages of a regional plan are described in several sections of the Plan. As noted in Section 1.1, page 1-2, the water resources managers in the Santa Barbara County region have a long history of working cooperatively to resolve issues, but a number of issues remain, and the Plan will serve as a mechanism to increase the level of cooperation between the agencies and districts responsible for water and wastewater management, nongovernmental organizations, and interested members of the public. This will facilitate the optimal management of water resources within the county over the next 20 years. Section 8.1, page 8-2 also acknowledges that some regionwide issues, such as addressing the developing Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs), the need for more conservation, and the need for continued integrated regional water management planning, will require cooperative efforts by regionwide entities. Other regionwide issues will be addressed by individual agencies developing projects that collectively will work together to resolve issues that are important to the county as a whole. The linkages between the key issues requiring regionwide solutions and projects are shown in Table 8-1 and the watershed-specific projects are shown in Table 8-2, pages 8-3 to 8-6, respectively.

Benefits of the regional plan are described in Section 9.2 on pages 9-6 to 9-10. The Plan includes multiple projects that would address the key issues and challenges facing the Santa Barbara region, described in section Q8 of the checklist. It also includes projects that are consistent with the State of California Program Preferences, including involving integrated projects with multiple benefits, supporting and improving local and regional water supply reliability, contributing expeditiously and measurably to the long-term attainment and maintenance of water quality standards, eliminating or significantly reducing pollution in impaired waters and sensitive habitat areas, and including safe drinking water and water quality projects that serve disadvantaged communities (DACs) and groundwater management and recharge projects. A screening-level overview of resource-specific impacts from the Plan implementation is discussed in Section 9.3, on pages 9-10 to 9-13, although each project will be required to undergo an appropriate level of environmental review that will identify specific impacts from its implementation.

The Plan will result in beneficial impacts to environmental justice/DACs. As discussed in Section 9.3.6 on pages 9-11 to 9-12, the Plan includes four high priority projects that will improve much-needed water and wastewater treatment services in the three DACs present in Santa Barbara County, thereby addressing environmental justice concerns. The City of Guadalupe has inferior water and wastewater systems that are in need of upgrading. The City of Guadalupe Wastewater Treatment Plant Reuse Improvements Project will improve the quality of wastewater discharge, benefiting the health and safety of community members, and allowing the treated water to be used for a wetland enhancement project. The community of Casmalia has a critical need for the water system improvements that will ensure that it has a safe, secure water supply. In December 2006, bacterial contamination of its drinking water resulted in a “boil water” order. The Casmalia Water System Improvements Project will replace deficient infrastructure such as water pipelines and tank facilities, update buildings and facilities to comply with design and code requirements, and make improvements to the existing well facility. Two essential projects also will also improve water quality and drinking water in Cuyama. The Wastewater Treatment Plant Effluent Disposal Project will allow Cuyama to avoid mandatory penalties and have its National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit renewed. Additionally, if Cuyama’s 50-year-old water tower is not repaired, it will soon reach the point where it will not function.

I. Technical Analysis and Plan Performance

Technical analysis and plan performance are discussed in Section 10.1, pages 10-1 and 10-1. Local agencies and organizations have conducted numerous studies and developed a considerable amount of information related to water management within Santa Barbara County that serves as the foundation of this Plan. This Plan incorporates an adaptive management approach intended to allow it to stay current in light of evolving needs, local and statewide priorities, management strategies, technology, and funding requirements. Adaptive management is a planning and implementation framework in which ongoing monitoring is used to evaluate implementation and change course to optimize results when necessary. It is based on an iterative feedback loop of plan adjustment, implementation, and monitoring. Resource managers learn from experience and adjust appropriately as new knowledge, priorities, and issues come to light. Through adaptive management, the Plan will be a dynamic document that may redefine regional objectives, priorities, water management strategies, and projects as needed to respond to changing conditions. It also will allow for the continuing development of solutions to ongoing issues.

Individual elements of the Plan already include adaptive management, and changes to those elements will be coordinated with the overall Plan adaptive management strategy. For example, several other planning procedures have regular review and re-evaluation, including the Urban Water Management

Plans and Santa Barbara County's Groundwater Report, which summarizes monitoring information described in Section 3. As required by the Urban Water Management Planning Act, California Water Code, Section 10610 et seq., Urban Water Management Plans must be updated every 5 years, in years ending in zero and five. Additionally, Santa Barbara County's Groundwater Conditions Report is updated biennially. Summary reports on these activities will be coordinated with the IRWM Plan management process.

J. Data Management

Data management is described in Section 10.2, pages 10-2 and 10-3. The Santa Barbara IRWM Plan has three major goals relating to data management: (1) to facilitate timely sharing of information to stakeholders as well as state and federal databases; (2) to provide for consistent monitoring techniques and data quality; and (3) to identify where data gaps exist. Information from the Santa Barbara IRWM Plan will be available to stakeholders through the use of a Web site, which will be supported by the Santa Barbara County Water Agency, stakeholder meetings and workshops, e-mail subscription lists, and monthly e-mail newsletters. Santa Barbara County will maintain existing water resources-related and IRWM Plan-related data and will make it available to the public on the Santa Barbara County Water Agency Web site. The County will track, review, manage, and report on pertinent issues related to the IRWM Plan, as well as report and track project progress. The management of existing data will be incorporated into the County Geographic Information System (GIS) system. The relevant data will be revised and updated as part of future IRWM Plan efforts. In addition, where appropriate, data management will be coordinated with state and federal databases in a format consistent with the Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP) and Groundwater Ambient Monitoring Assessment (GAMA). The process of identifying data gaps will continue throughout the IRWM Plan process. Once data gaps have been identified, recommendations regarding how best to address them will be developed. The Cooperating Partners also will compile and develop consistent procedures for data collection and monitoring.

K. Financing

Beneficiaries of IRWM Plan implementation are described in Section 9.2.3 and include the residents of Santa Barbara County as a whole, as well as those residing in specific watersheds. The three DACs in the county also would benefit from the implementation of projects that would allow water and wastewater services to be provided to them in a manner that meets regulatory requirements and protects public health. Potential sources of financing for each high priority project are described in Chapter 8, pages 8-19 to 8-59. Ongoing support and financing is addressed in Section 9.5, page 9-14. Each implementing agency will be responsible for obtaining funding for its own projects, including funding for operation and maintenance of those projects requiring construction. Projects that do not require construction, such as studies and working groups, will not require ongoing operation or maintenance. However, recommendations and related work flowing from these studies will be the responsibility of the agencies identified through the studies.

L. Statewide Priorities

The State agency priorities identified in the State's Proposition 50 Guidelines that will be met or contributed to by implementation of the Plan are addressed in Section 9.1, pages 9-1 to 9-6. In some cases, compliance is occurring through established programs or agreements described in the Plan; in others, compliance will occur through the implementation of specific projects. As discussed in Section 8.2, page 8-2 to 8-15, the ability to address one or more statewide priorities was one of the 8 criteria used to evaluate and prioritize projects. Statewide priorities that are addressed by each of the highest priority projects are shown in the project descriptions included in Section 8.3, pages 8-19 to 8-59.

M. Relation to Local Planning

Coordination with local land use planning decision-makers is discussed in Section 10.3, page 10-3. As previously described, the County of Santa Barbara, water and wastewater entities, and all cities within Santa Barbara County, except one, are Cooperating Partners; additionally, local planning decision makers have been involved in the preparation of this IRWM plan through regular communications through the Cooperating Partners and periodic reviews of the Plan. Water supply and wastewater treatment are an inherent part of land use planning in the Santa Barbara region. The ability to serve new development is considered in the approval process, and water supplies and water and wastewater treatment facilities must be upgraded to accommodate increasing demands. Land use planning decision makers will continue to be involved in the IRWM Plan process, particularly through review, approval, and permitting of individual projects as they are developed and implemented. The existing planning framework and the relationship between the IRWM Plan and planning documents and programs established by local agencies are addressed in Section 5, pages 5-1 to 5-15. A preliminary evaluation of consistency with city and county General Plans was performed on all projects included in the Plan. The results are reflected in Section 8.

N. Stakeholder Involvement

The Cooperating Partners are the public agency stakeholders and were actively involved in the development and funding of the Plan. Additionally, an intensive outreach program was conducted in order to obtain public input into all aspects of Plan development, including the identification of specific projects through which the Plan will be implemented. This process is described in Section 6, pages 6-1 to 6-11. Interested stakeholders participated in the development of the Plan and influenced decisions by attending stakeholder workshops and Cooperating Partner meetings. The stakeholders reviewed and commented on the development of objectives, water management strategies, regional priorities, key issues and challenges, the project evaluation process, as well as on the draft and final Plans. The public stakeholders represent the general public, the business community, DACs, the media, and the agricultural, environmental groups, and academic institutions.

The methods by which stakeholders were identified, how they participated in planning and implementation efforts, and how they influenced decisions made regarding water management are described in Section 6.3, pages 6-2 to 6-8. The schedule for Plan implementation showing the dates of stakeholder workshops and Cooperating Partners' meetings, to which stakeholders were invited, is included in Appendix B, Outreach Materials. The Outreach and Public Involvement Plan, which is ongoing, also is included in this appendix, as are samples of flyers and emails distributed to the public to notify them of public meetings.

These same mechanisms are being used to encourage public involvement in the selection of specific projects to be included in grant applications. As noted on page 9-3, the Cooperating Partners hope to further increase public participation as the IRWM Plan process grows and matures. Partnerships developed during the planning process include those among the Cooperating Partners (Section 6.1, pages 6-1 and 6-2), and the planning process served as a catalyst for outreach to neighboring regions, described in Section 6.3.6, page 6-10.

Three DACs were involved in development of the IRWMP throughout the process although they were not always able to participate as fully as other Cooperating Partners. Representatives from each DAC attended at least one Cooperating Partners meeting and/or workshop. The largest DAC contributed to Plan development costs. All three DACs submitted resolutions of support for the IRWMP which underscores the support from within the community for the IRWMP and DAC project selection process.

Each DAC submitted projects that were proposed, advocated, and sponsored by the disadvantaged communities themselves. All four projects proposed by the DACs were selected as high priority projects. These projects address public health and water quality issues and will improve much-needed water and wastewater treatment services. DAC projects are sited in locations that avoid impacts to residences, town centers, or other community services. DAC projects have been designed to provide services only for their respective communities and not other areas.

Regional DACs and their involvement in the planning process are discussed in Section 6.3.7, as well as in Section 2.4, page 2-8. Efforts to identify and address environmental justice needs and issues within the region are addressed in these sections, as well. Possible obstacles to Plan implementation are included in Section 9.4, pages 9-13 and 9-14.

O. Coordination

Coordination with State, federal, and local agencies is described in Section 6.3.5, page 6-9 and Section 10.3, page 10-3. Additionally, the need for a State Water Resources Control Board decision on Cachuma Project water rights is identified as a key issue in the Santa Ynez River Watershed (Section 7.1.3, page 7-3). Also refer to Item No. 5 in the Step 1 Checklist for more detail regarding agency contacts for specific projects.

Disadvantaged Communities and Environmental Justice

Disadvantaged Communities

Within Santa Barbara County, there are three Disadvantaged Communities (DACs) including the City of Guadalupe, New Cuyama, and Casmalia. A DAC is a community with an annual Median Household Income (MHI) that is less than 80 percent of the statewide annual MHI. Using Census 2000 data, 80 percent of the statewide annual MHI is $37,994. Using US Census Bureau data for 2003, 80 percent of the statewide annual MHI is $38,752.

The MHI in these three communities, using both 2000 and 2003 US Census Bureau data, falls below 80 percent of the statewide annual MHI. The MHI for Guadalupe is $30,864. The MHI for Casmalia is $37,574. The MHI for New Cuyama is $36,500. These calculations were made by reviewing median household income data from the 2000 US Census for all zip codes within Santa Barbara County and identifying those that were 80 percent or less of the statewide MHI based on the 2000 Census.

The specific critical water-related needs of DACs were identified by the DAC communities throughout the IRWMP process. Some DACs were able to participate in the IRWMP process by attending some of the regularly scheduled meetings; however, participation was not consistent due to the DAC's lack of staff or other internal resources. These communities often lack the resources to attend meetings or complete requisite studies for grant applications. To compensate for this, those DACs that were not able to participate were contacted by members of the Cooperating Partners. The Cooperating Partners worked with the DACs to ensure that they received up-to-date information on the progress of the IRWMP. With this information, the DACs proposed projects for consideration by the Cooperating Partners. The projects were recommended by the communities to meet critical local needs and subsequently were placed on the high priority project list. All DACs submitted formal resolutions indicating their strong support for the IRWMP and the project selection process.

The City of Guadalupe has inferior water and wastewater systems that are in need of upgrading. The City of Guadalupe Wastewater Treatment Plant Reuse Improvements Project will improve the quality of wastewater discharge, benefiting the health and safety of community members, and allowing the treated water to be used for a wetland enhancement project. The community of Casmalia has a critical need for the water system improvements that will ensure that it has a safe, secure water supply. In December 2006, bacterial contamination of its drinking water resulted in a “boil water” order. The Casmalia Water System Improvements Project will replace deficient infrastructure such as water pipelines and tank facilities, update buildings and facilities to comply with design and code requirements, and make improvements to the existing well facility. Two essential projects also will also improve water quality and drinking water in Cuyama. The Wastewater Treatment Plant Effluent Disposal Project will allow Cuyama to avoid mandatory penalties and have its NPDES permit renewed. Additionally, if Cuyama's 50-year-old water tower is not repaired, it will soon reach the point where it will not function. Two of the DACs, Cuyama and Casmalia, are located in small, isolated communities. The Cooperating Partners will work with the DACs to endure they can provide the information necessary for the Prop 50 Step 2 application. DACs are discussed in sections 2.4 (page 2-8), 6.3.7 (page 6-11) and 9.3.6 (pages 9-11 to 9-12) of the IRWMP.

Disadvantaged Communities and Environmental Justice

Projects from the DACs all address compelling health issues including providing safe drinking water to their communities. The DAC projects are all sited in distant areas that do not impact the populations of the communities in any manner. The DAC projects serve only the disadvantaged communities themselves and do not benefit other cities or locations.

Environmental justice issues pertinent to the IRWMP can exist where a subset of the population, in spite of its desires and efforts, has been unable to obtain a certain level of water quality services (such as provision of safe drinking water or appropriate treatment of wastewater) consistent with accepted standards or practices. Within Santa Barbara County, environmental justice issues related to water quality are found only in those areas of the County that also fit the state's definition of a DAC.

In Santa Barbara County, DACs are generally populated by older or retired people and/or by a lower-income population. It is not unusual for DACs in rural areas to lack consistent high quality drinking water. An older population is more susceptible to waterborne pathogens and impurities that can cause illness or aggravate existing health issues. Water treatment facilities that are aging and prone to periodic system failure create environmental justice issues for the Santa Barbara County DACs.

Many of the treatment facilities in the Santa Barbara DACs have difficulty financing the needed repairs or updates to their systems or raising water rates to cover such costs. These communities cannot afford to hire staff or consultants needed to complete the required studies or the often complicated grant or loan applications.

Each of the three DACs in the region has a project on the high priority list, with two projects in one DAC. As previously stated, all of these projects have been sited in locations that avoid adverse or negative impacts to residences, town centers, or other community services. The DAC projects have been designed to provide services only for their respective communities and not other areas. The projects address public health and water quality issues and will improve much-needed water and wastewater treatment services.

The DAC projects all have been proposed, advocated, and sponsored by the disadvantaged communities themselves. No outside agency or group imposed projects on DACs nor were any outside groups involved in developing the projects. DACs presented projects to the Cooperating Partners that demonstrated a compelling community needs and thus became a high priority within the IRWMP.