

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: November 10, 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 6:04 p.m. Chair Mike Mulas, Director(s) Craig Jacobsen, Matt Stornetta, Mike Sangiacomo, and Carolyn Wasem were present.

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

2. CLOSED SESSION

There were no closed session items.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

There were no public comments.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

Approval of October Minutes: Director Jacobsen made a Motion to approve the October 2020 Minutes. Director Stornetta seconded the Motion. The Minutes were unanimously approved.

5. APPROVAL OF FINANCIALS

Chair Mulas shared that he did not have the most recent bank statement, however, the finances were depleted due to participation in the Groundwater Sustainability Agencies. Assessment of agriculture property owners in the District is critical to long term viability of the NBWD. Mr. Martini is going to share next steps regarding assessment.

The Financials will be approved at the next meeting in December 2020.

## 6.ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

Report 1. Report by NBWD Advisor Martini

Advisor Martini asked to move his report to the first item as he had a scheduling conflict that would preclude his participation for the entire meeting.

Advisor Martini shared with the Board a draft letter to agriculture landowners within the boundary of the NBWD. The draft letter is for the purpose of soliciting interest in participating in the NBWD January meeting to discuss the value of the District and the need for an assessment if the District is to continue its work.

Chair Mulas agreed with Advisor Martini that the address list for the letter needed to be limited to agriculture landowners within the District boundaries. The Chair was concerned that if the letter were to go to every landowner within the boundaries of the District, the discussion would become a debate as opposed to a demonstration of the need for an assessment.

Initially, Advisor Martini suggested that the letter's intent was to raise money. However, asking for money, minus an explanation of need, would likely result in more questions than agreement for an assessment. Advisor Martini further shared that he (along with Director Wasem and GinaLisa Tamayo) took the approach that the letter needed to talk about and build support for this effort.

Chair Mulas asked if we needed a motion to approve the letter. The Board concluded that no motion was required.

Director Stornetta asked if discussing stationary engine replacement was of value? One comment on the letter: Programs and issues that speak to Sonoma/Petaluma agriculture landowners should be highlighted.

Advisor Martini suggested that the drafting team would work to make changes to the letter and send to the Board Members for their review and input.

Chair Mulas shared his thoughts that landowners need to clearly relate water use, fees for water use and the benefits of supporting NBWD's efforts.

Advisor Martini indicated that the cost as addressed in the letter, and is pretty light. We will more clearly associate the costs for pumping water to the ask for participation. Let's demonstrate the cost on a per acre foot basis, that will be easiest for the ag community to understand.

The other issue that needs to be highlighted, or at least an understanding that we are aware of, is the frustration around "death by a thousand cuts". Sacramento is turning out regulation after regulation Most of the elected have abdicated to quasi-governmental agencies to develop plans to conform and unless you are a quasi-government or a governmental agency, you cannot have a seat at the table.

The attached document (to the letter) is specific to benefits associated with the District. The document stresses the issue of SGMA and then goes on to discuss the "meat" of the issue.

All the budget numbers are up for discussion. Bramfitt wanted a budget of \$100,000. So using the budget for the San Antonio Basin, we extrapolated a best guess as what would be needed and what would satisfy LAFCO.

Chair Mulas asked if we had a do second set of number that include LAFCO expenses associated with the application.

Advisor Martini responded \$10,000 will be required as a retainer and LAFCO will give back what they do not use to process the application.

Bramfitt does not want to this expansion to occur piecemeal. We should line up X numbers of properties as we apply for the expansion. The expansion will necessitate the development of bylaws, structures and legal fees.

Counselor Idell shared that at large vs. district elections are related to underserved communities.

Advisor Martini stated that the drafting team will change the letter, and will be sent to Board Members by Thursday.

Report 2. Director Carolyn Wasem

Our last GSA meeting was held on October 22<sup>nd</sup>. Jay Jasperse shared with the GSA the need to develop a water budget that incorporates baseline, projected demand and the impacts of climate change on water demands and changes in agriculture use and rural residential use.

The three primary users of groundwater include:

- Municipal and Industrial Users
- Rural Residential Users
- Agriculture Users

The future demand models were shared with the Advisory Committee members and the GSA. While the demand associated with growth of vineyards appeared high – it was not outside the realm of possible.

Specific to Criteria for Sustainable Management, staff shared the following items:

Groundwater Quality – Staff and Advisory committee recommend adopting a “do no harm” policy. That is based upon the variable water quality issues across the basin’s boundaries and suggested following the following seven steps.

1. Define level of groundwater quality management and coordination by establishing a process for routine consultation with regulatory agencies to discuss programs and groundwater quality
2. Determine type of metric to use – using minimum thresholds establish a well monitoring network
3. Determine/Identify Beneficial Users – Municipal supply, small water systems, domestic well, and agriculture uses
4. Determine Constituents of Concern for Beneficial Users: a) establish levels for MCL or SMCL; b) determine sub-basin constituents that are above levels of concern; and c) determine if there is extensive occurrence of the COCs throughout the basin NOTE: Arsenic, nitrate and salts should be considered COCs.

5. Determine limits, concentration for each COC
6. Identify existing water quality monitoring programs
7. Develop SMC

Staff shared discussions around Significant and Unreasonable Conditions and suggested the following:

Significant and unreasonable water quality conditions occur if an increase in the concentration of constituents of concern in groundwater leads to adverse impacts on beneficial users or uses of groundwater, due to:

1. Direct actions by Petaluma Valley GSP projects or management activities;  
OR
2. Undesirable results occurring for other sustainability indicators

Adverse impacts include diminished supply due to water quality impacts, such as non-compliance with drinking water standards or undue costs for mitigating negative impacts.

Staff discussed Minimum Thresholds and shared the following:

Minimum thresholds are based on degradation of groundwater quality. The MTs are based on not increasing the number of supply wells that exceed maximum contaminant levels for arsenic, nitrate or salts, as shown in the table below:

<b>Constituent of Concern</b>	<b>Minimum Threshold Based on Number of Supply Wells</b>
<b>Arsenic</b>	<b>Zero</b> additional supply wells that are in the GSP monitoring area shall exceed the arsenic <b>MCL of 0.010 mg/L.</b>
<b>Nitrate</b>	<b>Zero</b> additional supply wells that are in the GSP monitoring program shall exceed the nitrate measured as nitrogen <b>MCL of 10 mg/L.</b>
<b>TDS</b>	<b>Zero</b> additional supply wells that are in the GSP monitoring program shall exceed the TDS recommended <b>SMCL of 500 mg/L.</b>

Staff discussed Measurable Objectives as represented by target groundwater quality distribution in the sub-basin. Minimum thresholds will serve as the measurable objectives.

Finally, Staff shared thoughts around Undesirable Results which is defined as groundwater quality minimum threshold exceedances and those are defined as:

1. If during two consecutive years, a single groundwater quality minimum threshold is exceeded when computing annual averages at the same well, as a direct result of projects or management actions taken as part of the GSP program

Ann Dubay provided an update on rural community outreach. A form survey has been sent to 7,000 users in the three sub-basins. The goal is to understand the concerns of groundwater users and their appetite for fees to manage groundwater.

Report 3. Director Mike Sangiacomo

The same issues were addressed at the Sonoma Valley GSA meeting as discussed at the Petaluma Valley GSA.

There was dissent among the Board re: which climate model RCP should be adopted. Director Sangiacomo voted for the 4.5 RCP, however, the full Board, based upon the recommendation of staff, adopted the 8.5 RCP model.

Report 4. Advisor Eugene Comozi

Advisor Comozi stated the Petaluma Valley advisory committee wrestled with the same climate change model issue as the GSAs and discussed the SMC for water quality specifically as it relates to climate change and changes in rural residential demand and growth. The staff provided two scenarios for climate change modeling: RCP 4.5 and RCP 8.5. Support for RCP 8.5 was expressed as concerns re: the emissions continue to climb. It is best, in staff's opinion to work from the worst case scenario.

Support for the 4.5 RCP model was based upon impacts to groundwater users and the ability to adjust upward if needed. Although, most of the advisors (43%)

opted for using the 4.5 RCP model, after much discussion, the majority of the advisors (+1) settled on supporting the 8.5 RCP model use.

The Advisory Committee was then asked to consider exceedances for minimum thresholds. The Advisory Committee settled on two additional exceedances. Committee members were asked to provide written comment on the minimum thresholds and options.

There is a general feeling among many of the Advisory Committee members that they are being directed to make decisions on issues where they don't have all the facts and/or are provided very limited options. It is frustrating.

#### Report 5. Advisor Jim Bundschu

Similar to what has already been shared, we were asked to vote on the climate change model for projecting future water supply and demand. The question was asked what will change – the models or the data....and how quickly can the GSAs change the model? Staff responded that every five years is when the model can be changed. This model will be used to create a water budget for the next 50 years.

We got into projects and actions to mitigate. In terms of the zero net use concept, the Advisory Committee will be discussing new projects and their impact on groundwater pumping.

Capital will be used to focus on groundwater banking and stormwater capture, increased recycle water use and conversation/water use efficiency programs. Projects will be screened using the following criteria:

1. Technical and legal feasibility
2. Sufficient information available to evaluate and model the projects and their ability to help avoid minimum thresholds or enhance objectives
3. Does the project increase sustainable yield or reduce groundwater demand/
4. Project will be implemented within 20 years
5. Project meets Sub-article 5 Projects and Management Actions GSP Emergency Regulations
6. The GSA is a proponent of the project
7. Funding for the project is identified

Management Actions may also include:

- Mandatory Conservation Measures
- Groundwater Demand Management
- Mandatory Metering
- Zero net use for future development areas

Then the conversation moved to interconnected systems – streams and groundwater. One of the things the staff will be looking at in stream side evaluation. The staff wants to bring the streams back to a 2015 baseline condition. They are going to utilize species maps to determine impacts, including oak woodlands and oaks on either side of the stream.

Director Stornetta noted that Ken Johnson, a geologist made a couple of comments regarding the use of too many environmental cues as indicators.

Advisor Bundschu referenced the discussion to bring back fish populations based on 1919-1933 timelines. It is important to make the point that agriculture is not responsible for the disappearance of fish populations in our streams.

#### Item 8. Adjournment

Chair Mulas noted that with no additional items for discussion, a call for adjournment was in order. Director Wasem mad the motion for adjournment. Director Stornetta seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned a 7:20 pm.

The next meeting is scheduled for December 8, 2020.