

**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 Camozzi      SVGSA Advisor: Jim Bundschu  
SGMA Compliance Advisor: Mike Martini  
Legal Counsel: Richard Idell

Date: December 14, 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 Mike Sangiacomo, Matt Stornetta, Craig Jacobsen, and Carolyn Wasem were present. Counselor Richard Idell and Advisor Martini were present.

**CLOSED SESSION**

There were no closed session items.

**2. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

There were on public comments.

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

Director Stornetta made a motion to approve the November 2021 Minutes. Director Wasem seconded the motion. The Minutes were unanimously approved.

**4. FINANCIAL REPORT**

Chair Mulas reported that NBWD recently paid the Sonoma Valley and Petaluma Valley GSA participation fees. After those payments, NBWD has \$69,139.34 in the account. Director Wasem made a motion to approve the Financials. Director Sangiacomo seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

## 5. ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

### Item 1: Update from Counselor Richard Idell

The California Tiger Salamander Safe Harbor, between USFWS and North Bay Water District was published in the Federal Register. The public comment period for the FR Notice will close on December 17<sup>th</sup>. The USFWS will likely respond to any comments to the SHA. Once those are posted, the SHA will be available for growers.

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

The Sonoma Valley GSA last met on December 6th. The biggest news was that the GSP was unanimously approved. We moved very quickly past regular business to the Public Hearing session where the GSP was discussed in detail.

The staff presented the timeline for the GSA and GSP, with GSA meetings commencing in 2-17. Over the last two years the GSP has been under development. Once initiated, the goal is that the GSP will achieve sustainability over the next 20 years. Basins that fail to comply with SGMA will be subject to state control and applicable fees. The Sonoma Valley Basin is designated as a high priority basin.

Three key elements of the GSA include monitoring, project implementation, and management actions to achieve sustainability.

The key components of the first 5 years of GSP implementation include:

- GSA Administration
- Communication and Engagement
- Monitoring and Data Evaluation
- Addressing Data Gaps
- Maintaining, updating and improving models
- Refining, study and implementation of potential projects and management actions
- Coordination with local/state/federal resource and water quality agencies
- Annual reports and 5-year updates to GSP

The GSP was approved and the Department of Water Resources (DWR) has two years to assess and approve the Plan, or alternately issue a letter of deficiency.

The GSA Board discussed payments for participation. The last installment from NBWD will be due the end of March 2022.

The next Advisory Committee meeting will be held on January 11<sup>th</sup>.

Agriculture will be expected to voluntarily reduce water by 10%. This is expected to occur upon implementation onset.

The next Board Meeting will be February 28<sup>th</sup>.

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

The last Petaluma Valley GSA was held on December 8<sup>th</sup>. The vast majority of the meeting was dedicated to review of the GSP and public comment.

Staff set the stage for how management actions and projects were determined. A great deal of data has been collected and examined to develop the GSP. Sources included:

USGS  
NOAA/NMFS  
CDWR  
NCRWQCB and SFBRWQCB  
UC Cooperative Extension  
Sonoma County Farm Bureau  
Sonoma Alliance for Vineyards and the Environment

In terms of the GSP, staff detailed that the efforts for the first five years will focus on

**A. Groundwater monitoring:**

1. Three dedicated monitoring wells
2. Five inactive municipal wells
3. Thirteen volunteer program wells

**B. Surface Water monitoring:**

1. One USGS stream gauge
2. Thirteen City of Petaluma stream gauges
3. Three high frequency monitoring wells adjacent to streams

**C. Seawater Intrusion monitoring:**

1. Eight existing supply wells

**D. Chronic Lowering of groundwater levels:**

1. Three high frequency monitoring wells
2. Three inactive municipal wells
3. Five voluntary wells

**E. Degraded Water Quality Wells**

1. One for arsenic
2. Twenty-four for nitrates (overlap with TDS)
3. Twelve for TDS (total dissolved solids)

**Management Actions and Projects included in GSP:**

Some ideas provided by the Advisory Committee and community members submitted for consideration include:

- recharge
- net-metering programs
- water markets
- zero-net water use requirements for new development
- reductions in water use for existing water users
- aquifer storage recovery (ASR)

Management actions the GSA has under its authority, including mandatory conservation or pumping reductions, will also be studied and considered during the first 5 years of GSP implementation.

Projects ideas Include:

- use of imported surface water by the City of Petaluma in lieu of local groundwater supplies
- development and use of recycled water supplies for meeting agricultural and landscape irrigation demands
- implementation of water-use efficiency technologies and conservation programs within the urban water use sector
- studies and implementation of water-use efficiency measures within the agricultural sector
- studies and initial planning for managed aquifer recharge, including studies, data collection, and pilot testing for stormwater recharge projects

While some of these initiatives and activities have historically been developed and planned specifically to address groundwater conditions within the Basin, many have been developed and implemented to achieve other benefits, objectives and purposes.

Preliminary cost estimates to test, permit and construct project facilities for aquifer storage recovery (ASR) is estimated to range from \$300,000 to \$3,600,000 depending upon the complexity of each project. The lower cost estimates represent the use of existing wells that have the necessary monitoring infrastructure (GEI Consultants, Inc. et al. 2013).

**Future Efforts to be Considered:**

A collaboration between the GSA Board, local land-use agencies, GSA member agencies, and stakeholders to assess future policy options may be appropriate for the GSA to consider. Adopting or recommending for adoption by other agencies will be necessary.

The following initial list of policy options has been developed for potential inclusion:

- Water conservation plan requirements for new development

- Discretionary review of well permits for any special areas
- Low-impact development or water efficient landscape plan requirements expansion
- Well construction and permitting recommendations
- Well metering program
- Study of water markets
- Permitting and accounting of water hauling

There were very few public comments. Of those, the focus was on controlling growth and development.

The GSA Board unanimously voted to adopt the GSP. Director Wasem provided input that the Farm Plan should be available for staff review by the end of December. Further, the agriculture community was anticipating that if the Farm Plan is approved and implemented, a tiering of rates for water would allow for reductions in costs associated with water use for Farm Plan participants.

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

Advisor Bundschu was not present.

**Item 5: Report of Advisor Eugene Camozzi**

Advisor Camozzi was not present.

**Item 6: Report of Compliance Advisor Mike Martini**

Director Wasem introduced Peter Kiel, a local water rights attorney. Advisor Martini introduced the needs of the Alexander Valley farmers. In recent conversations we want float some ideas past the Board.

Peter Kiel has been working with a number of growers over 10 + years to develop management of water in Alexander Valley. As we progress throughout the years we have seen an additional focus on ground water in that region as base flows have declined. Sonoma Water and Ag have very different needs. The AV landowners need their own water management district.

Landowners in AV could contract with NBWD to use your experience and expertise to address the groundwater/surface water needs throughout the two basins in Alexander Valley. This would largely be a paper exercise, where you would join us in meetings, but collaborate on strategy and planning. Further, this could result in actual projects. An example: a groundwater recharge project across thousands of acres of vineyards.

We are not necessarily proposing to get LAFCO approval to do this.

Advisor Martini thought that this approach is very intriguing. One is it demonstrates the value and viability of the District. Being able to contract out to out-of-district sends a clear message

as to the value that NBWD can bring. And it also demonstrates the need for expansion of the sphere of services for NBWD.

In Alexander Valley a partnership with the District provides the benefit of addressing groundwater and water rights curtailments. This is clearly a baby step – trying to move forward. However, this approach gives validity and demonstrates the need for formation of an actual District in that region.

Counselor Iddell asked: How does NBWD have standing for landowners outside the District?

Guest Peter Kiel responded that Districts have standing in certain cases. You can use this approach in states of emergency, via LAFCO. We are talking about advice, not providing water services. There is a question of: is it legally permitted, OR, whether someone can stop this approach?

There is a provision in the Water Code that allows Districts to contract with other areas to provide services.

Director Stornetta asked if there would need to be an indemnity agreement between provider and receiver?

Chair Mulas asked if we should contemplate insurance? The insurance that SAVE pays for indemnification purposes is approximately \$800 a year.

Counselor Iddell asked if there was an agreement that he has seen representing a similar arrangement?

Guest Kiel stated that he will provide info on insurance for Water Districts.

A Straw Vote was Conducted to discuss the desire to move forward and Develop a Contract and/Resolution.

Director Sangiacomo: Supportive (let's get the details ironed out and make sure our standing with LAFCO is not impacted)

Director Stornetta: I think that this could help with our larger goals. I think better defining the scope and liabilities are is needed.

Director Jacobson: Anything to help the Ag community I am in favor of.

Chair Mulas: Supportive

Director Wasem: Supportive

Advisor Martini suggested that NBWD could have a draft of the scope available at the first of the year. NBWD can contract with property owners. A number of Russian River Property Owners Association may be the contracting party. They have expressed some interest. This approach validates both sets of efforts.

Director Wasem was directed to place on the agenda for the next meeting.

Advisor Martini discussed that in terms of grant letters of support for the Alexander Valley recharge project – all Board member received a letter.

Advisor Martini thanked all the Board members for their support.

**Item 7. Report by Ginalisa Tamayo on Website Development**

Advisor Tamayo was not present.

**6. ADJOURNMENT**

With no other business to discuss, Director Sangiacomo made a motion to adjourn. Director Stornetta seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 4:53 pm.

The Next scheduled meeting is scheduled for January 11<sup>th</sup> at 4:00 pm. Again, those who wish to attend in person will be able to do so. There will be a zoom option for those that cannot make the meeting in person.

*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.*