**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

SGMA Compliance Advisor: Mike Martini

Legal Counsel: Richard Idell

Date: May 11, 2021

Time:  6:00 PM

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

**MEETING MINUTES**

1. **CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL**

Chair Mike Mulas called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm. Board Members Michael Sangiacomo, Matt Stornetta, Craig Jacobsen and Carolyn Wasem were present. Counselor Richard Idell, Advisor Martini, and Advisor Eugene Comozzi were also present.

1. **CLOSED SESSION**

There were no closed session items.

1. **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

There were no comments from the public.

1. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

Director Jacobsen made a motion to approve the February 2020 Minutes. Director Stornetta seconded the motion. The Minutes were unanimously approved.

1. **FINANCIAL REPORT**

Chair Mulas reported that the NBWD account had a balance of $ 586.00. Director Sangiacomo volunteered to get the plan put together for the election to raise funds. We have to identify what we have to offer. Advisor Martini suggested that Board members identify the landowners and discuss the need to support an assessment. Counselor Idell said that we need to discuss the funding needs for Sonoma Valley with the Vintners. Historically, we could not get any interest in Petaluma Valley. We need to raise at least $30K.

Counselor Idell shared that a conversation with Sonoma County Vintners needs to take place. Let’s see if we can get that Board as a jumping off point. He suggested that to discuss with the Vintners, that Director Sangiacomo, Director Wasem should attend the Vintner’s next meeting and discuss the need for additional funding. Counselor Idell shared that he believes a story that is compelling is that the newly created SGMA agency has jurisdiction over wells. Why is NBWD important, without their engagement, there is no one who can represent agriculture. The pitch for fundraising should be very straight-forward. Chair Mulas suggested that he Advisor Martini, and Director Sangiacomo should meet to strategize about process for assessment.

Director Stornetta made the motion to accept the Financial Report, and Director Jacobsen seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

1. **ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION**

**Item 1: Update from Counselor Richard Idell**

Counselor Idell informed the Board that the application for the Safe Harbor was signed today and mailed, registered USPS. All that is left for NBWD to do at this point is to have Sean Skaggs, the ESA attorney in touch with Ryan Olah of USFWS. Martini will follow up with Sean Skaggs on timing.

**Item 2: Report of Director Mike Sangiacomo on Sonoma Valley GSA**

Director Sangiacomo informed the Board that at the last meeting of the Sonoma Valley GSA, the Consent Calendar, showed that NBWD was in arrears. However, he confirmed that we are paid in full, with the next payment due in September 2021.

Jay Jasperse provided an update on the Sustainability Plan. The Introduction, Description of Plan Area, Basin Setting and Sustainable Management chapters are complete in draft form. The next chapters, monitoring networks and project and management actions will be drafted by the May and June meetings of the GSA. Staff indicated that as projects and actions are considered they will likely be placed in two categories: 1) those with identified potential funding or voluntary or incentive-based or are lower cost; and 2) new or expanded projects. The GSA was also presented with a PowerPoint on interconnected surface water depletion and the need for an adaptive management approach to sustainably manage groundwater. It was noted that there is not enough data to determine if surface water depletion is caused by ground water pumping, therefore, the GSP would include adaptive management as information became available and the goal of not exceeding historical levels of depletion. Chair Allenbauch discussed depletion of surface water and undesirable results: three options were available to establish the threshold that triggered. The Advisory Committee agreed that 4% of the wells and 10% of the wells in non-drought years was the least stringent of the 4 options.

The Board approved the Fiscal Budget for 2021-2022 as well as the Member Agency contributions and approved a rate and fee study. The final action we took was to renew the contract with Sonoma Water for continued administration of the GSA.

**Item 3: Report of Director Carolyn Wasem on Petaluma Valley GSA**

The last meeting of the Petaluma Valley GSA was held on April 22, 2021. The Board was provided an update on anticipated actions for May 2021. This update included the Board and Advisory Committee Action.

On May 27th the Board will discuss:

• Revisit SMCs (as needed)

• Project/Action Prioritization

• Introduction to Implementation Plan,

Schedule, Budget and Financing Mechanisms

On May 12th the Advisory Committee will discuss:

• Project/Action Scenario Modeling Results

• Revisit SMCs (as needed)

• Introduction to Implementation Plan,

Schedule, and Budget

The financials were approved and the rate schedule for all Member Agencies was discussed.

A report was provided re: actions of the Advisory Committee.

The critical item discussed was the SMC for the Depletion Interconnected Surface Water. Staff provided background and options for condsideration. The option selected by the Advisory Committee regarding allowances for exceedance in depletions: two exceedances in dry years or one exceedance in normal/wet years.

The Committee also discussed projects and management actions. The item that the Advisory Committee believed was most lacking included a dollar amount associated with projects needed to manage the groundwater sustainably.

Jay Jaspers presented an action item to the Board to approve the preliminary SMC for the depletion of interconnected surface water. The Board approved the Advisory Committee’s recommend SMC. Councilmember Healy and I raised the concern about committing to future actions to manage depletions of interconnected surface waters with a) the lack of monitoring data; and b) the determination by staff that the vast majority of challenges associated with the Petaluma Valley groundwater basin are a result of natural occurrences. Healy noted that we need additional data and to recognize that costly management actions may not be necessary. Jay suggested that they will expand the monitoring network to address data gaps, and will implement actions using an adaptive management approach.

Note the working group for SMC development includes:

• Rick Rogers, National Marine Fisheries Service

• Jessie Maxfield, California Department of Fish and Wildlife

• Natalie Stork, State Water Resources Control Board

• Val Zimmer, State Water Resources Control Board

• Sam Boland-Brien, State Water Resources Control Board

• Maurice Hall, Environmental Defense Fund

• Melissa Rhodes, The Nature Conservancy

• Andrew Renshaw, California Department of Water Resources

After that discussion and consensus by the Board, the SMC for Depletion of Interconnected Surface Water was approved.

**JPA Funding**

The second action item for consideration by the Board included the Payments to the Agency.

The JPA requires that the cost of the Agency will be borne by assessments to member agencies. At the August 2018 meeting the Board approved the following schedule for FY 2021-2022:

1. North Bay Water District and Sonoma Resource Conservation District each provide $10,000 annually;

2. The City of Petaluma provides $25,000 annually;

3. Sonoma Water provides $125,000 annually; and

4. The County of Sonoma covers the remaining Agency costs (with a minimum contribution of

$25,000).

The Board approved the schedule of fees for the upcoming fiscal year.

**Rate and Fee Study**

The third action item was the approval of a Rate and Fee Study. The reasoning behind the study include:

• Member agency contribution commitment ends on June 30, 2022, and the GSA does not have an alternative funding source;

• The original fee study was based on a five-year budget that included development and submission of the GSP. A budget based on the first five years of GSP implementation could be significantly different;

• A fee study is legally required if the Board opts to fund GSP implementation with a property-based fee, as described by Proposition 218 and subsequent court cases; and

• A fee study will describe and recommend the legal and financial options available to the GSA

The same consultant was chosen to conduct studies for all three basins. Using one consultant helped reduce duplicative meetings and staff work. Assuming that, the three Boards agree on a consultant choice, it would again be beneficial to engage one consultant to conduct the studies in all three basins.

**Technical, Outreach and Grant Administration**

The fourth action item was an amendment to the Agreement for Technical, Outreach and Grant Administration Service for Sonoma Water.

The agreement for services included the following activities:

1. GSP development
2. Financing options study, and other optional technical tasks
3. Outreach and communication activities for the GSA in general and for the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP);
4. Management of the Proposition 1 grant and future grants, monitoring grant opportunities, and developing grant applications

The contract would add $1,000,000 for execution of projects funded through Proposition 68 grant **and $50,000 for increased costs of grant administration due to the Proposition 68 grant**. The Board unanimously approved the increase to the budget.

**Sonoma Water’s Urban Water Management Plan**

Jay Jaspers reported on Sonoma Water’s update to its Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) andassociated Water Shortage Contingency Plan (WSCP). That updated plan will include the following elements:

• An analysis of the next five years water supply and demand

• Existing water supplies and transmission system facilities

• Projected water demands in Sonoma Water’s service area over the next 25 years

• Projected water supplies available to Sonoma Water over the next 25 years, the reliability of that supply

• Climate change impacts to water supply

• Energy intensity

• Current and planned water conservation activities

• An updated and separately adopted Water Shortage Contingency Plan

• A comparison of water supply and water demand over the next 25 years under different

hydrological assumptions (normal year, single dry year, multiple dry years)

The final plan will be submitted to California Department of Water Resources by July 1, 2021.

**Item 4: Report by Advisor Jim Bundschu**

The Sonoma Valley Advisory Committee met earlier that day on 5/11 and the following was discussed:

● Project/Action Scenario Modeling Results

● Introduction to Implementation Plan, Schedule, and Budget

The following indicators were discussed w/actions:

1. Chronic lowering of groundwater levels will be measured on a monthly or monthly-averaged groundwater levels at monitoring wells. For declining wells take actions to recover to pre 2010 median levels.
2. Reduction in groundwater storage will be measured by collecting data on changes in contoured groundwater elevations.
3. Degraded groundwater quality will be addressed if there is an increase in the concentration of constituents of concern that impact beneficial uses. The impact will be determined by minimum thresholds associated with several affected public water supply wells.
4. Inelastic subsidence caused by groundwater pumping is unreasonable as measured by DWR’s inSAR datasets.
5. Inland seawater intrusion that affect beneficial uses will be measured by the chloride isocontour based on chloride concentrations.
6. Depletion of interconnected surface waters based on monthly average monitoring wells.

Additionally, following up on some Advisory Committee members shared concerns around calculating the preliminary Minimum Threshold (MT) using years with the highest estimated streamflow depletion, the staff reviewed that concerned and determined that at this point, they do not recommend changing it.

We also had a robust conversation re: undesirable results criteria for depletion of interconnected surface water. Staff provided the Advisory Committee with three options for determining Undesirable Results.

* 25% of RMPs (3 wells)
* 25% of RMPs (3 wells) for two consecutive years
* 25% of RMPs (3 wells) during drought years and 10% of RMPs (1 well) during non-drought years
* 40% of RMPs (4 wells) and 10% of RMPs (1 well) during non-drought years

The Advisory Committee preferred Option 3.

**Item 5: Report by Advisor Eugene Comozzi**

At our last meeting, we went over some working incentives for conservation. Staff indicated that they want rural residential to cut back groundwater use by 10% and agriculture to cut back groundwater use by 5%. The other working draft incorporated expansion of recycling water and offset of potable water use.

We will have an interesting conversation tomorrow. The 20% reduction in water during drought – will be discussed - and we will explore how this will impact the Petaluma basin.

We (agriculture) needs to ask the Supervisors re: who will pay for this? Why doesn’t the water agency assess the costs?

**Item 6: Report by Advisor Matt Stornetta**

Director Stornetta shared that at today’s meeting there was a lot of summarizing and much less data. An interesting projection that were shared – models for groundwater show increase in upper aquifers over the next 40 years and depletions in the lower aquifer.

We discussed some of the projects. It appears that the Sonoma Valley basin is expanding the recycled water system. The GSA action plans will justify the expansion of the system. The recycled water system of Sonoma Valley does not have anywhere close to the water to reach capacity of the pipeline. Tonight, was a summary – nothing in real detail or consequences of breaching thresholds. One of the challenges to serving on the Advisory Committee is that staff will include additional options, post meetings, and ask for consideration of more restrictive options, post vote.

Chair Mulas suggested that expansion of the wastewater is going to create challenges. They are out pursuing new contracts for additional infrastructure. They are shipping water to the high school to water an infield – at $700 an acre foot.

**Item 7: Report of Compliance Advisor Mike Martini**

I have nothing to report. I will follow up re: new action items for District assessment.

**Item 8. Report by GinaLisa Tamayo on Website Development**

I purchased NorthBayWaterDistrict.org. I purchased a one-year subscription to Microsoft for email. I sent out the letter approved at the last meeting to try to get people to subscribers. I have already added all ten new subscribers. A little bit of success there. Next steps: creation of a logo and then putting together the story of why NBWD matters and how it benefits landowners. I am putting together the story and will help inform you as you spread the word at meeting with local landowners. I should set up some time to discuss what you as Board Members do – your history with the region.

**ADJOURNMENT** Next scheduled meeting is June 8th at 6:00 pm.

Director Stornetta made a motion to adjourn. Director Sangiacomo seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 7:18 pm.

Board meeting documents are available to review prior to the meeting at the Shell-Vista Station, 22950 Broadway, Sonoma California. Please call or contact Mike Mulas for an appointment to obtain a copy.