

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: October 13, 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 August Minutes: Director Jacobsen made a Motion to approve the August 2020 Minutes. Director Stornetta seconded the Motion. The Minutes were unanimously approved.

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

5. FINANCIAL REPORT

Chair Mulas reported the NMWD Bank account August Balance: \$5,443.81
Director Wasem made a Motion to approve the August Financial Report.
Director Stornetta seconded the Motion. The August Financial Report was unanimously approved.

Chair Mulas reported the NBWD Bank account September Balance: \$1,557.01. Director Jacobsen made a Motion to approve the September Financial Report. Director Stornetta seconded the Motion. The September Financial Report was unanimously approved.

The Directors discussed the best opportunities to raise additional funds. The Sonoma Vintners and Growers Alliance were briefly discussed. However, Counselor Idell suggested that these organization are hurting post-pandemic, so they are not likely to participate in the fundraising effort.

Advisor Martini suggested that NBWD send a letter asking for contribution. The request will have to be followed up by a phone call. Advisor Martini will work with Director Wasem to draft a letter.

Counselor Idell suggested that we create a “Friends of North Bay Water District” to solicit funds. It could be structured as an ad hoc committee.

Chair Mulas asked if a Board Member from North Bay Water District would be willing to sign on to the solicitation letter?

6. ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

Item 1. Counselor Richard Idell

Bylaws were approved by the Board of Supervisors. The Board of Supervisors also approved appointment of Directors. Chair Mulas needs to administer the Oath of Office. The Oath of Office can be administered and returned to the Elections Officer by December 4th. Next month we should hold the meeting in person. The next meeting is November 10th. We can administer the Oath of Office at that time.

Item 2. Director Mike Sangiacomo

Director Sangiacomo shared that the last meeting was canceled; however, the agenda detailed the following:

- Decisions about the model that will be used to determine climate change on groundwater impacts will be voted on. Staff is recommending the most draconian model.
- Pete Parkinson, an outside consultant for the GSA, will present his findings on rural residential and projections for growth and groundwater use.
- Jay Jaspers will present to the GSA projected agricultural land uses and future demands on groundwater associated with those uses.
- Marcus Trotta will discuss the need and methodology for mapping groundwater dependent ecosystems.
- Staff will discuss the Development of Sustainable Management Criteria for Depletion and Interconnected Surface Water.
- Staff will provide an update on the GSP which is due January 31, 2022 focusing on the following areas:
 - 1) Inelastic subsidence caused by groundwater pumping
 - 2) Seawater intrusion and need to address in GSP
 - 3) Use of an adaptive approach will be used to manage groundwater
 - 4) Prop 68 and the Rural Community engagement project focusing on:
 - a) Research
 - b) Engagement Campaign
 - c) Funding Analysis and appetite for funding among rural residential landowners

In the report on the activities of the GSA Advisory Committee it seems clear that there is no consensus on Measurable Objectives – the recommendations and level of support are as follows:

- Same location and concentration e.g., 250 mg/l inland of baseline isocontour– 3 supported

- Same location and concentration as 250 mf/l maintaining existing isocountour line – 4 supported
- Same location and lower concentration, e.g., 150 mg/l – No support
- Other with flexibility amongst all three – 2 supported

Also, the interest-based position on the Advisory Board will be open. Mr. Bundschu can place his name in contention.

Item 3. Director Carolyn Wasem

Director Wasem reported that the last GSA meeting was held on August 27th. No new updates. The next meeting will be October 26th. However, reading through the meeting packet she agreed with Director Sangiacomo’s summarization.

Item 4. Advisor Eugene Comozzi

Advisor Comozzi shared that the Advisory Committee met last on September 9th. The next meeting will be on November 9th.

Item 5. Advisor Jim Bundschu and Director Matt Stornetta

Both Advisors commented that the agenda on October 13th was “complicated”. Most of the time was devoted to the predictive climate change model and its impact on groundwater. The Advisory committee was asked to select an emissions scenario represented by Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP). Assumption of this model include:

- Simulated future conditions through 2072
- Established Baseline of 2018
- Nonagricultural pumping will hold steady
- Recycled water delivery to farms will be held constant
- Land use is held constant

Input changes include:

- Gridded precipitation and reference ET inputs based on HadGEM2-ES with RCP 4.5 and RCP 8.5
- Surface water inflow into the basin
- These will be used to create 50-year projected water budget

The staff did not have a good explanation of the varying impacts of the models.

The water budget for the GSP is projected out for 50 years). Below are the following assumptions/needs:

- Water Demand for Rural Residential and Agriculture (will review every 5 years).
- GSP will address Climate Change. The most optimistic RCP is the 4.5 The less optimistic RCP is 8.5. No consensus on which factor to use. However, Staff recommends RCP of 8.5.
- To determine rural residential demand, they are relying on traffic zones. Staff is projecting 1% growth of per year.
- Identifying an agriculture future parcel development number
- Further build assumptions around impacts of arsenic, boron, nitrates and salts. The goal of the GSP is to do no more damage.
- No more impairment to groundwater

Director Stornetta shared that there is no consensus on the Advisory Committee. Today's votes on using 4.5 or 8.5 RCP was split down the middle.

Advisor Bundschu said that he was fairly discouraged by the process.

Director Stornetta also shared that the Staff had discussed omitting cannabis from the agriculture water demand projections.

Item 7. NBWD Advisor Mike Martini

Advisor Martini shared with NBWD Board member the reports from the San Antonio Creek District. The real intent of this Basin Agency formation was to address SGMA. We can use a great deal of their information in describing the benefits of NBWD to secure our expansion process. Their "benefits" section clearly outlines what is needed to satisfy LAFCO.

The other item that we need to adequately address is a budget. The second thing that will be important is the Budget. The Total budget to operate the San Antonio Creek District is \$623,200. Keep in mind that budget covers all the cost of ground water studies, management studies and long-term implementation and administration. Some of the delineated items include: a part time general manager of \$40K w/14K for benefits, a contract administrator for \$25K, Insurance \$8K, and legal fees of \$30K.

In terms of assessment, the San Antonio Creek District assesses \$60 per acre for irrigated lands and \$.50 for non-irrigated lands. The Executive for LAFCO suggested that we need a budget of \$100,000 to pass the credibility test. The question is, can we operate under a budget of a \$100,000?

We could aim for \$80K if \$100K is too steep. The goal is to make this a District for agriculture representation only. The vote is based on the valuation of the property.

Chair Mulas agreed that Mike is on task and recommended the Directors send comments to Mike to better discuss our vision in preparation for next month's meeting.

Chair Mulas asked to agendaize review of benefits and budget for the District at the beginning of next month's meeting.

Item 8. Adjournment

Director Mulas asked for other business. Seeing no other Business, Director Wasem made the motion for adjournment. Director Stornetta second the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 7:28 pm.

The next meeting is scheduled for November 10th.