

NORTH BAY WATER DISTRICT
22950 BROADWAY, SONOMA, CA 95476
Board of Directors

Mike Mulas, President and Chair (Sonoma Valley); Craig Jacobsen, Vice-President (Petaluma Valley); Carolyn Wasem, Secretary (Petaluma Valley); Matthew Stornetta, Treasurer (Sonoma Valley); and Mike Sangiacomo (Sonoma Valley)

PVGSA Advisor: Eugene Comozzi SVGSA Advisor: Jim Bundschu

MEETING MINUTES

Date: July 14, 2020

Time: 6:00 PM

Location: 22950 Broadway, Schell-Vista Station #1 (via Teleconference due to Covid-19 Shelter-in-Place Order)

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Chair, Mike Mulas, called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m. Chair Mike Mulas, Director(s) Craig Jacobsen, Mike Sangiacomo, and Carolyn Wasem were present.

Also, in attendance Counselor Richard Idell, guest Mike Martini, and Advisors Jim Bundschu and Eugene Comozzi.

2. CLOSED SESSION

There were no closed session items.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

There were no public comments.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Chair Mulas asked for approval of the June 2020 Minutes. Director Jacobsen made the motion to approve the June 2020 Minutes. Director Sangiacomo seconded the motion. The Minutes for the June 2020 meeting were unanimously approved.

5. FINANCIAL REPORT

Chair Mulas reported that the current bank balance is: \$ 1,553.25 However, there is a check for \$10,000 coming from SAVE. Director Wasem

made the motion to approve the Financial Report. Director Jacobsen seconded the motion. The Financial Report was unanimously approved.

6. ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

Item 1. Director Sangiacomo, reported that the last GSA meeting was held on June 1st. At that meeting, the GSA Board approved member agency contributions and the next fiscal year's budget. It was decided that North Bay Water District (NBWD) and Sonoma Resource Conservation District (SRCD) each would be required to provide \$10,000 annually. The City of Sonoma and the Valley of the Moon Water District each provide \$25,000 annually. Revenues, aside from participation fees for 202-2021, total \$622,500, of which \$387,500 from Prop 1 funding. Sonoma Water will provide \$125,000 annually. The Board also considered a facilitation services agreement to provide practitioner's working group facilitation services.

Jay Jasperse (Sonoma Water) informed the GSA that the rest of 2020 will be spent developing Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC). He will be providing regular updates on SMC. In addition, the GSA Board was provided an update on a water balance model. Sonoma Water also discussed the need for development of monitoring networks. New Projects funded by Prop 68 will include:

- Deep well installation
- Geophysical survey to assess methods for saline water character
- Rural residential outreach
- Practitioner workgroups to support the FSP
- Database improvements

Sonoma Water staff has been fully engaged on developing draft SMCs for three undesirable results: 1) chronic lowering of groundwater, 2) land subsidence; and 3) seawater intrusion. The other three undesirable results will be addressed in the future.

As part of the chronic lowering of groundwater discussion, estimated root depth and other ground-water dependent vegetation will be considered. For areas that are stable, a plan will be required to maintain groundwater

levels within, or near, historical ranges and will take into consideration the impacts of climate change. These two items provide opportunities for agriculture to push for a Farm Plan. The shallow aquifer seems to be stable. The deeper aquifers are two areas of concern.

In terms of groundwater subsidence, the GSA is looking at two factors: tectonic impacts and groundwater pumping and land use impacts. One of the key points that developers of the GSP are asked to consider: is data available to indicate if subsidence is related to groundwater pumping?

The other big issue that Sonoma Valley must contend with its seawater intrusion. There are indications of seawater intrusion only where basin aquifers are connected to saline surface waters, i.e., San Pablo Bay. This area of connection applies to the Sonoma Valley sub-basin.

Major considerations specific to seawater intrusion: monitoring network, connate water (water trapped in the pores of sedimentary rock with mineral deposited trapped as well), minimum thresholds (defined by chloride concentration isocontours), and understanding of levels of chloride.

The next Sonoma Valley GSA meeting will be July 27, 2020.

Item 2. Director Carolyn Wasem shared that the last Petaluma Valley GSA meeting was held on June 25th. At that time, Ann Dubay shared that the Advisory Committee meeting in May focused on developing a regional monitoring network for groundwater levels, seawater intrusion and land subsidence. Aside from the general house-keeping tasks, include financial report and approving the member agency contributions. At that meeting it was noted that there was a final payment from NBWD due in the amount of \$3,166. The remainder of the meeting focused on the Groundwater Sustainability Plan.

Jay Jasperse and Marcus Trotta (Sonoma Water) summarized activities on the GSP. The GSP is due January 31, 2022. The updates on the plan include the following:

Sustainable Management Criteria – This focuses on primarily, the chronic lowering of groundwater levels

- Measuring and Monitoring Networks (wells) throughout the basin
- Data that details estimated rooting depths of vegetation and crops

For those areas where groundwater is stable: maintain while incorporating measures to address droughts and climate change

For those areas where decline is documented: protect beneficial users and reverse declining trend.

Land Subsidence – There needs to be data collected to understand if groundwater pumping is contributing to land subsidence concerns, or if other causes contribute, such as tectonic forces.

Note: Available data does not indicate that subsidence in the basin is a result of groundwater pumping.

Seawater Intrusion - Since the Petaluma Valley Basin is connected to San Pablo Bay, the need to manage for this impact applies.

Note: The GSP will need to address seawater intrusion caused by declining groundwater levels. The presence of connate waters needs to be better understood.

On July 15th, 2020 the GSA will host a virtual workshop on Petaluma Valley GSP and Basin Conditions

Some questions that need to be answered by the Advisory Committees:

- 1) Were groundwater levels unreasonably low in the basin at end of the 2015 drought?
- 2) Where groundwater levels are declining, should we allow continued pumping until GSP is finished?
- 3) Rooting depth and crop impacts to groundwater
- 4) Well Depths across the region
- 5) Historical Groundwater Conditions
- 6) Projected Groundwater Conditions
- 7) Land Surface Subsidence

Finally, the GSA contracted with two entities. First for facilitation services with California State University, Sacramento (\$75K) for the development and adoption of the GSP

- Advisory Committee Facilitation
- Public Meeting Facilitation
- Practitioner’s Work Group (informing GSP development across all three sub-basins)

Second Entity: SCI, Inc. (\$120K) for the purpose of providing Rural Community Engagement – their charge is three-fold:

- Research - Identify major themes of concerns and questions from rural community
- Development and implementation of engagement campaign- Development of a program to educate and engage rural residents about GSA and groundwater issues
- Funding Analysis: Provide an analysis of rural residents’ concern and ideas regarding future funding sources

Item 3. Petaluma Advisor Eugene Comozzi reported that the last Advisory meeting was held on June 10th. The items that the Advisory Board focused on included the Review of *Sustainable Groundwater Management Criteria*, which included:

In terms of water quality and saltwater intrusion they (Sonoma water)

- Groundwater Levels
 - Chronic Lower
 - Measuring and Monitoring Groundwater Levels
 - Draft Methodology for understanding Patterns
 - 1) Well depth
 - 2) Historical groundwater levels
 - 3) Project future levels
 - 4) The Groundwater dependent ecosystem
 - Seawater Intrusion

Remaining Questions and Issues:

What will range of options for establishing “undesirable results” look like?

1. Review crop tolerance for chloride
2. Assess option for responding to future sea level rise
3. Develop approach to collect the data and information needed to inform SMC during implementation of the GSP

Item 4. Advisor Jim Bundschu reported that the Advisory Committee had just met. Much of the meeting was devoted to reviewing the Sustainable Management Criteria Proposal target areas. These include:

- 1) Land Subsidence due to groundwater extraction (How did they dovetail the statement from the GSA that data did not support subsidence due to groundwater pumping?)
- 2) Seawater Intrusion – Again the entire sub-basin is considered an area of sea-water intrusion because of its connectivity to San Pablo Bay.
- 3) Project Concepts - Management actions to measure and maintain description sustainable ground waters for the fifty-year horizon and discussion of the criteria that would trigger management/actions

Additionally, the administrative and operational activities will need to be included in the GSP. Those activities will include:

- Managing periodic meetings and implementing policy
- Ensure proper financing of GSP
- Preparing annual reports, including monitoring, conducting studies, identifying additional monitoring needs
- Preparing 5-year progress reports
- Directing management actions
- Item 5. Advisor Eugene Comozzi shared that the Advisory Committee had met that day. The major topics included:
 - 1) Land Subsidence from Groundwater Extraction
 - 2) Seawater Intrusion
 - 3) Project Concepts and Management

Of importance to note is that the Historical/Current Water Budget is expected to be complete by Summer 2020.

Sonoma Water covered land subsidence and saltwater intrusion. The next step is to review sustainable management criteria. Substantial data is lacking in the

southern Sonoma Valley before Sonoma Water can make threshold recommendations.

The Advisory Committee voted on a definition of undesirable results. Chloride concentration minimum threshold of 250 ml p liter for three years (find in notes from Advisory meeting) was identified. Sonoma Water will put many more monitoring wells along the rail line by Shellville/Sonoma to better understand saltwater intrusion impacts. The Advisory Committee members posed the questions: What if the saltwater line is considerably south of where the monitoring wells are located?

Director Sangiacomo asked about the 250 ml p liter threshold. Advisor Bundschu responded that Marcus (Trotta) said they (Sonoma Water) want to remain vague as they do not have a great deal of data.

Advisor Comozzi asked what if a well is already at 250/300 ml and you don't have a problem? If they say you are too high – but that has been the case for years - what is their recommendation if that is the case?

An interesting observation was given by a member of public. Seawater is heavier in groundwater. In areas where seawater intrusion occurs, water levels may be rising due ground water rising to the top.

A determination was made that .2 feet will be the threshold that can not be exceeded, specific to land subsidence. Staff is going to look at Petaluma's option to determine land subsidence. They want to use 25 acres and have some structures on the land. Marcus is meeting with ag groups to discuss crops. He has grants in place for monitoring wells to be installed next week.

Sonoma Water also discussed their concerns that money for funding the GSAs and GSPs may dry up.

Chair Mulas asked about the depth of wells. Advisor Bundschu said that was not mentioned.

Guest Martini asked what they (Sonoma Water) are using for baseline, specific to salt-water intrusion. Advisor Bundschu said that Sonoma Water admits that they do not have data – only 8 wells are currently used for data collection.

Director Jacobsen asked for a recommendation of a lab to test the contents of his wells.

Item 5. Guest Mike Martini informed that Directors that Dr. Boulton has provided his water budget analysis to Andy Rogers and Sonoma Water. All participants were polite during the discussion. Marcus (Sonoma Water) shared the ag model, currently embedded in a draft GSP with Dr. Boulton. Dr. Boulton pointed out some concerns re: rooting depth and the need to adapt the model to reflect different crops and express his concerns that Sonoma Water is using the wrong ET and root depth numbers.

Martini reported that he had talked subsequently with Supervisors Hopkins and Rabbitt to express that our (Ag's) voice is not being heard. Bob Anderson, head of the Advisory Committee for Santa Rosa GSA wants Boulton to present at the Advisory Committee meeting. He further expressed that it is imperative that we collectively work to get Boulton's presentation on the agenda with the Santa Rosa GSA and follow up with other GSA/Advisory Committee members to get on all three agendas.

In the previous meetings, he (Martini) had expressed that it might be easier to get on the Advisory Committee agenda than the GSA. Chair Mulas suggested that may be the best place to start. But, from Chair Mulas's perspective, we need to hit on all fronts.

Advisor Bundschu has a question about timing. Our agendas are set between now and January 2021. What would I ask the person who establishes the agenda, what we want to address in our presentation? Who would say what?

Martini suggested that we let the drafters of the Agenda know that Dr. Boulton would like to discuss a water budget, based on real time/real vineyard.

Advisor Bundschu asked if Martini knew who Marcus Trotta is referencing for an ag demands committee that they have formed? Martini shared that

members of the committee included Nick Frey, Brittany Jensen, Andy Casaraz, Keith Abeles, Tawny Tesconi, and Rhonda Smith.

In terms of getting on the agenda for the Advisory Committees and the GSA, Martini suggested that he draft a letter between all the members that represent agriculture (NBWD, Sonoma County Farm Bureau and SAVE). You, Advisors Bundschu and Comozzi should suggest that we (the Advisory Committee) needs to get additional information. Martini said that he would work with Dr. Boulton to provide schedules for participating in GSA discussion.

Finally, Martini shared that the Farm Bureau is ready to go to work. They are willing to provide services to augment NBWD's efforts. Once we get through the election, the Board should initiate expansion of the NBWD boundary.

Item 6. Counselor Richard Idell

Counselor Idell shared the status of election issues. He informed the Board that he is not aware of anyone who is interested in challenging existing Board Members. NBWD has a date in August for the Board of Supervisors to approve NBWD Bylaws. A draft Resolution needs to be considered. This would set voting at one vote per acre. The Resolution would basically memorialize that one vote allocated for each dollars' worth of land. The Board will further adopt that the District shall vote by mail.

Director Jacobsen made a motion to adopt the Resolution. Director Wasem seconded the motion. Chair Mulas asked for a roll call vote.

Director Jacobsen – Aye

Chair Mulas – Aye

Director Sangiacomo – Aye

Director Wasem – Aye

Director Stornetta - Absent

Item 7. ADJOURNMENT

Seeing no other business, Director Wasem made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Director Sangiacomo seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 6:50 pm.

The next meeting is scheduled for August 11th.