

NORTH BAY WATER DISTRICT
22950 BROADWAY, SONOMA, CA 95476

Board of Directors

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

SVGSA Advisor: Jim Bundschu, PVGSA Advisor: Eugene Comozi
Legal Counsel: Richard Idell

MEETING MINUTES

Date: JANUARY14, 2020

Time: 6:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Director Mike Mulas, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. *Directors Mike Mulas, Carolyn Wasem, Matt Stornetta were present. Advisors Bundschu and Comozi were in attendance.*

Also present: Mike Martini, Executive Director of the Sonoma Alliance for Viticulture and the Environment (SAVE) and Counselor Richard Idell.

1. CLOSED SESSION

There were no closed session items.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

There were no public comments.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Chair Mulas noted that a quorum for the the December 10th, 2019 meeting was not convened. Therefore, no formal minutes were drafted.

4. FINANCIAL REPORT

The current balance in the NBWD bank account is \$14,937.47. We will need to get money in the account before the next payments are due the end of March for NBWD's participation in the Petaluma and Sonoma Valley GSA. Chair Mulas will confirm timing and fee totals going forward.

The last payments for participation in the GSA were made in September. The approximate fee for each, Petaluma and Sonoma Valley, was approximately \$3,000 each.

Three action items for follow up in soliciting vineyard: Carolyn Wasem will contact Brown-Foreman regarding participation. Mike Martini will reach out to the Farm Bureau and the SAVE Board to discuss the level of participation from those two entities. Richard Idell will try to identify a contact at Foley.

Director Wasem made a motion to approve the financial report. Director Stornetta seconded the motion. A vote was taken, and the Financial Report was unanimously approved.

ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

Item 1. Report by Director Sangiacomo

No Report

Item 2. Report by Director Wasem

The last meeting held was a meeting for all the basin GSA(s) in Sonoma County. A *Groundwater Recharge Workshop* was held on December 11th, 2019. The purpose of the meeting was to inform the public, and solicit feedback, regarding groundwater recharge and potential opportunities in Sonoma County. The presentation attempted to answer *What is recharge? How does it work? What are the different types of recharge?*

Jay Jaspers and Marcus Trotta of Sonoma Water discussed the Sonoma aquifer injection project. A representative from *California's Flood-MAR discuss the Managed Aquifer Recharge*. And Dr. Philip Bachand of *Bachand & Associates discussed local recharge efforts: What farmers are doing in Sonoma County to enhance recharge*.

Director Wasem felt that the presentation was informative, however did not attempt to answer the role of groundwater recharge in managing a local aquifer.

Item 3. Report by Advisors Jim Bundschu and Eugene Comozzi

Advisors Bundschu and Comozzi shared that the fundamentals of developing Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC) was discussed the last advisory meetings. The criteria was developed by the State of California and has several primary elements – i.e. the six deadly sins. These include:

1. Chronic **lowering of groundwater levels**
2. Significant and unreasonable **reduction of groundwater storage**
3. Significant and unreasonable **seawater intrusion**
4. Significant and unreasonable **degraded water quality**
5. Significant and unreasonable **land subsidence**

6. **Depletions of interconnected surface water** that have significant and unreasonable adverse impacts on beneficial uses of the surface water.

A plan that describes if the criteria is being addressed will include:

1. Representative monitoring site as part of a network that will describe conditions of the groundwater basin
2. Understanding sustainability goals and how the basin will achieve sustainability – those goals will be couched in the defining minimal thresholds and undesirable results.
3. Understanding undesirable results (or the quantitative worst-case scenario). This is a combination of minimum thresholds that define what it means to be sustainable for every sustainability indicator. Undesirable results, as defined in the GSP, are the sustainability metrics used to determine whether the basin complies with SGMA and is sustainable now and into the future. **Proof of sustainability is avoiding undesirable results.**
4. Measurable Objectives are specific, quantifiable goals at each representative monitoring site to maintain or achieve the sustainability goal for the basin. Measurable Objectives reflect the GSA’s desired groundwater conditions in the basin and guide the GSA to achieve its sustainability goal within 20 years. Measurable Objectives:
 - a) Operational flexibility to accommodate droughts, climate change, conjunctive use operations, or other groundwater management activities. **Example for groundwater levels**
 - b) **Interim milestones** five-year numerical targets that are set to guide the basin to its measurable objective. Interim milestones need to be set at each representative monitoring site using the same metrics as the measurable objectives and minimum thresholds. They are used to track progress toward meeting the sustainability goal.
 - c) Interim milestones should result in sustainability being achieved by 2042, and the plan must have a 50-year planning horizon (2072).
 - d) **Management areas** within the basin for which the plan may identify different minimum thresholds, measurable objectives, monitoring, or projects (from January Advisory Meeting provided by Sonoma Water).

Commented [GT1]: Are you missing an example?

Item 4. Report by Guest Mike Martini

Guest Mike Martini discussed the well owners- registration program associated with the Santa Rosa Plain GSA. The other GSA’s are expected to follow the lead of the Santa Rosa Plain GSA. The fees have been vetted with the Ag representatives on that GSA determining that the proposed fees are agreeable with the agriculture community. These fees are not expected to be applied until Phase 2 of the GSA process. Currently the fees have been covered by Sonoma Water, Sonoma County and participation fees by the local jurisdictions, the RCDs and the Ag Representatives. It is anticipated that in March/April of this year the Santa Rosa Plain GSA will be passing something related to Registration.

Advisors Bundschu and Comozzi informed the Directors that the Wilson Grove was moved back to low priority. The intent is that Petaluma will annex the Wilson Grove area that overlays the city's jurisdictional map. Sonoma Water is drilling monitoring wells along Sonoma Creek and in Glen Ellen. All well monitoring is occurring along surface streams. The information provided by this monitoring is meant to understand the extent of challenge related to one of the "six deadly sins" identified in the Groundwater Sustainability Act.

The sustainable management criteria were discussed: this will become part of the overall plan in the absence of a water budget. Baseline year should be established, however, there has not been a decision as to the year that would be used. Currently, there are 119 monitoring wells – in Sonoma Valley. However, the information presented doesn't include location and/or depth of wells.

Chair Mulas asked if there are any results from last year, post heavy rain season?

Advisor Comozzi responded that one well will not provide that information. A series of wells will be needed to adequately inform interaction between surface and ground water as well as ground water levels.

Director Stornetta shared that the management criteria that requires understanding trends in water levels, however, does not provide what is appropriate levels and/or trends to maintain aquifer health. One of the methodologies that will be used is wetland dependent hydrology. An example of this is observing the health of oak trees, who are beneficiaries of adequate ground water levels and are indicators of ecosystem health.

Advisor Comozzi indicated that the Advisory Committee would like for us to reach out to discuss. The first question is how much is it going to cost to develop and implement management criteria?

One suggestion was made at the last Advisory Committee meeting: the GSA should develop a program for management for drought years. Many on the Committee feel that the only way out of this: construction of more reservoirs.

Advisor Bundschu also referenced that the Sonoma Valley Advisory committee discuss domestic well users. The question was asked: Is it acceptable if those wells go dry?

Guest Martini asked that the NBWD give him direction of participating as an overarching "body" for implementing regulatory and voluntary programs that will help agriculture meet compliance and groundwater management goals. The program in need of an appropriate body such as the NBWD, currently include the following:

- 1) Compliance with Frost Protection Program for viticulture (assuming the current housing group wants to abdicate oversight of the program)

- 2) Documenting voluntary activities consistent with a Safe Harbor Agreement for release of agriculture reservoir water to enhance stream stage for salmonids (to address two of the “six deadly sins” identified in the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act.)
- 3) Documenting voluntary activities associated with the viticulture management practices consistent with a Safe Harbor Agreement for replanting vineyards and ongoing management of vineyards on the Santa Rosa Plain that are within the footprint of California tiger salamander (CTS) habitat
- 4) Compliance with the stationery diesel engine program (Bay Area Air Quality Management District) for all agriculture
- 5) Compliance with the waste discharge requirements for irrigated ag lands program (Region I and Region II of the Water Resources Control Boards)
- 6) Farm Plan to comply with the future requirements of the three Sonoma County Groundwater Sustainability Agencies
- 7) Groundwater recharge programs for the three Sonoma County Groundwater Sub-basins and the Alexander Valley (planning for outcomes associated with Potter Valley project)

It is anticipated that additional programs will be administered/permits held by the NBWD. Agreeing to house these programs provides NBWD with credibility and provides the agriculture community with a much-needed entity that has authority with the weight of a public approved “District” structure. The NBWD does not act as an advocacy group, providing it with additional credibility with the regulatory agencies.

While the NBWD would be the over-arching administrative body, the actual elements of the programs, the contact with land-owners, managing data, providing reports, hiring outside consultants, bookkeeping, etc. would be contracted out to the Sonoma County Farm Bureau, who recently hired a compliance manager.

Chair Mulas indicated that the Board wanted to get through the election before the boundary expansion discussion. Expanding the sphere of influence and/or the boundaries will mean that we need to pursue a LAFCO process. All the activities referenced in the earlier discussion will make the process with LAFCO easier.

Chair Mulas and Counselor Idell stated that we need to have an election. The County cannot tell that they are unable to do this. However, the estimated cost associated with the election could prove cost prohibitive. The Board will need to decide as to whether we want to pursue hiring an outside firm. We need to understand the process. What happens if no one runs against existing Board members – is an election required? Additionally, we will need to produce a timeline with action items and deadlines.

Director Stornetta queried as to why we are required to go through this process. Is it because we are a special district?

Chair Mulas stated that once we have our election, we can immediately start housing these compliance programs. That is assuming that Counselor Idell provides the go ahead.

Chair Mulas asked for a motion from the Board to approve that NBWD act as Compliance Authority for agriculture programs throughout Sonoma County. Further, the NBWD would contract with an outside group to implement the programs – currently, that would be the Sonoma County Farm Bureau.

Director Stornetta made the motion. The motion was seconded by Director Wasem. A vote was taken, and the motion was unanimously approved.

Director Wasem informed the Board that she would arrange a meeting with Chair Mulas, the Sonoma County Farm Bureau, SAVE Director, Mike Martini and herself for a discussion as to how NBWD and the Sonoma County Farm Bureau would coordinate a compliance program.

Item 5. Adjournment

Director Stornetta made the motion to adjourn at 7:25 pm. Director Wasem seconded the motion and the meeting was adjourned.

Next scheduled meeting is February 11th at 6:00 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.