

NORTH BAY WATERSHED ASSOCIATION

Minutes for the meeting of the North Bay Watershed Association (NBWA) Board of Directors.

Date: June 3, 2016  
Time: 9:30 a.m.  
Location: Novato Sanitary District  
500 Davidson Street  
Novato, CA 94945

Directors present included:

<u>Board Member</u>	<u>Agency/Organization</u>	<u>Board Member</u>	<u>Agency/Organization</u>
Jack Baker	North Marin Water District	Damon Connolly	County of Marin
Keith Caldwell	Napa Sanitation District	Brad Sherwood	County of Sonoma
Judy Schriebman	Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District	Paul Jensen	City of San Rafael
Mike Healy	City of Petaluma	Madolyn Agrimonti	City of Sonoma
Jack Gibson	Marin Municipal Water District	Pam Meigs	Ross Valley Sanitary District
Kathy Hartzell	Central Marin Sanitation Agency	Brant Miller	Novato Sanitary District
Pam Drew	City of Novato	Juliana Inman	Napa County FC&WCD

Directors present represented 14 out of the 18 agencies signatory to the Association MOU.

Board Actions:

1. **Call to Order.** Jack Gibson, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:45 a.m.
2. **Public Comment.** None.
3. **Approval of the Agenda.** (See Handout) The Board unanimously approved the agenda.
4. **Approval of the Minutes of the Board Meeting held May 6, 2016.** (See Handout) The Minutes of the Board Meeting held on May 6, 2016 were unanimously approved.
5. **Treasurer's Report.** (See Handout) The Treasurer's Report was accepted as presented by Judy Kelly.
6. **Proposed Budget for 2016-17.** Judy Kelly Executive Director of NBWA presented the proposed 2016-17 budget and noted much of the material is the same as was presented at the March meeting. She noted that if the Rural Road Rapid Assessment Method project approved, there will be \$39,000 left in unallocated project funds for the 2016-17 year. Ms. Kelly outlined the process for project selection: 1) Board and/or JTC members meet and project concepts are proposed and reviewed. 2) Projects are modified based on comments from the JTC and then brought to the Board to approve or deny funding. 3) If approved, MMWD staff oversees contract or MOU development, 4) Project updates are periodically brought to the Board until completion of the project. Members asked: How do projects get to JTC? [Sometimes JTC identifies needs; sometimes projects come from community members]. Does NBWA or JTC send out solicitations for projects? [No, mostly because of the small amount of money available a competitive process has not seemed warranted]. Does the Board provide the JTC with guidelines or goals for upcoming year or prioritize issues for the watershed? [There is an opportunity to do that, and some projects have been funded at the Board's request]. Are projects listed on the website? [Some summaries, yes, but there is room for improvement and the website is currently under reconstruction]. How many funding requests does NBWA get? [There has been no issue with the amount of money and the amount of projects; we have the right balance of outreach and requests. We could send JTC meeting minutes to the Board so there is more visibility into the project selection process]. Do we award funds to the same groups? [There have been a lot of projects funded for student education programs like the STRAW program and Friends of Petaluma River, but otherwise there has been a good variety]. Do Board members attend JTC meetings? Are they assigned? [No assignment, but Board members can attend whenever they like]. **ACTION:** Chris Choo to provide JTC meeting minutes and staff report to Judy for meeting packets so Board members can be more aware of projects and funding coming through the JTC meetings. Regarding overall budget proposal, there is no recommendation for increase in dues. \$12,500 will be set aside of each year's budget to cover the costs of member sponsorships to the Conference. Final question: is there a possible conflict of interest in asking contractors to make conference sponsorships? [Jack Gibson thought no]. **ACTION:** BUDGET APPROVED.

7. **Proposed Rural Road RAM Project.** Executive Director Judy Kelly made the summary presentation on the proposed project. Erosion from rural roads is an issue for our streams. This proposal is to fund a road Rapid assessment method [RAM]. The Rural Road RAM is an online tool that allows for data to be collected by mobile devices. The RAM tool looks for erosion factors and other data to assess the rural roads and determine which roads are in need of repair. It is being piloted in Santa Cruz and Napa with good results. NBWA is being asked to provide \$25k for a pilot project in the North Bay region. The RAM tool will work on both paved and dirt roads. The consultant, Second Nature (2n) will receive the funds. 2n's tool will expand the mapping and logging capabilities to include the North Bay. Questions from the Board included: Have the 14 people to be trained been selected? [Not yet, but JTC will be involved in the selection]. Will this only track sediment? [Yes, for now due to limited funds]. Are competing software systems available? Why did we pick Second Nature? [There are not a lot of tools around for road assessments and while the tool being done by Second Nature is proprietary, the information will export to other data management systems as they are developed so we are not locked in long term]. How was the Santa Cruz project funded? [EPA grant, public agencies matching]. Jeff Sharp, Napa RCD who is helping with this project, stated that upon completion 2n will ask for a \$20k per county to keep the system running in each county. This would be manageable if there are several partners per county] Q: Is the mapping exclusive to the county? Marin has incomplete roads in the rural areas. Will unincorporated areas be included? [Yes, the tool will incorporate them into the mapping]. **ACTION: PROJECT APPROVED with one no vote.**

8. **The Case for the Bay.** Gary Bobker from The Bay Institute presented on the importance of freshwater inflows to the San Francisco Bay. What does freshwater flow do to the bay? Runoff from watersheds impacts everything else: salinity, sediment/nutrients, water quality, shaping the food web, every ecological process and habitat is impacted by freshwater flow. Numerous bay and estuary species have their abundance closely correlated with freshwater flow conditions. Graphics presented depicted how inflows have reached the bay historically and how much is currently inflow. In the last 40 years, a little over half of the flow is captured before it reaches the bay. We have made major changes to the natural flow with dam construction and movement of water out of the watershed. Flow reduction impacts salinity gradients in the estuary and as a result, impacts fresh and brackish water species and their habitats. Sediment has been greatly reduced due to being captured by dams and by reduced flow regimes. The Board asked: How do tides impact sediments? [Tides generally move material in and out at a somewhat constant rate and are not the biggest issue – we are losing the total amount of sediment replenishing habitat/shorelines/beaches because it is being choked off in the upper watershed. There is a difference between sediment runoff into local streams and the inflow into the bay; they are two different issues. Water quality is being affected by increased clarity [diminished sediment] causing algae blooms which are becoming more common as we're creating better conditions for toxins to form. We are seeing a collapse of species across multiple trophic levels. It's not just the numbers of fish declining; it's their diversity and their productivity. When fish stay upstream, they are closer to the Delta pumps, where they are more likely to be pulled into the pumps. Fishing industry impacts due to the health of the Bay have had a major impact to the local economy. What can be done? 1) Adopt stronger water quality standards for the estuary now; 2) require all water diverters to contribute their fair share, 3) reduce reliance on the Delta as a water supply source for exported water, and 4) integrate flow management with wetland and beach restoration to battle climate change. If you care about the future of the Bay, you need to make your voice heard on this issue in Sacramento and the State Water Quality Control Board. Bay interests need to speak up to counteract the loud voices they hear from competing interests. The Board asked: How do we address the need to replenish groundwater and flow into the bay? [This is a big issue and we have to figure out a way to look at wet conditions with more nuance than we do now to allow water to be moved only after the needs of the estuary are addressed]

9. **Items of Interest.** There were no items of interest discussed.

10. **Items for Next Agenda.**

- \* MMWD Staff Presentation – Bay Area Water Reliability Report
- \* Board discussion on results of 2016 Member Surveys

Jack Gibson, Chair, adjourned the meeting at 11:30 a.m.

SUBJECT TO BOARD APPROVAL  
Submitted By: Judy Kelly,  
Executive Director

**NEXT MEETING INFORMATION**

July 8 – Marin Community Foundation, 5 Hamilton Landing Suite 200, Novato, CA 94949