

NORTH BAY WATERSHED ASSOCIATION

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

Date: November 6, 2015
Time: 9:30 a.m.
Location: Novato Sanitary District
500 Davidson Street
Novato, CA 94945

Directors Present: Directors present included:

<u>Board Member</u>	<u>Agency/Organization</u>	<u>Board Member</u>	<u>Agency/Organization</u>
Madolyn Agrimonti	City of Sonoma and Sonoma Valley County Sanitation District	Kathy Hartzell	Central Marin Sanitation Agency
Jack Baker	North Marin Water District	Juliana Inman	Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District
Keith Caldwell	Napa Sanitation District	Eric Lucan	City of Novato
Megan Clark	Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District	Pamela Meigs	Ross Valley Sanitary District
Jack Gibson	Marin Municipal Water District	Brant Miller	Novato Sanitary District

Directors present represented 11 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 9:36 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 October 2, 2015.** (See Handout) The Minutes of the Board Meeting held on October 2, 2015 were unanimously approved.
5. **Treasurer's Report.** (See Handout) The Treasurer's Report was accepted as presented by Harry Seraydarian.
6. **Flood 2.0 Update.** Caitlin Sweeney, San Francisco Estuary Partnership, provided a PowerPoint entitled: "Flood Control 2.0: Rebuilding Habitat and Shoreline Resilience through a New Generation of Flood Control Channel Design and Management. Caitlin began by explaining why the project was needed – Due to the increasing risks and economic costs of climate change and sea level rise, the significance to the Bay Ecosystem of flood control channels at the bay tidal fluvial interface, and the need to manage sediment and address aging infrastructure. She presented the goal of Flood 2.0 – Develop tools and a process for helping integrate habitat restoration and creation elements into flood risk management at the bay interface. Caitlin highlighted all the partners in the project and then displayed a visual of the project components. She then presented one of the components – a historic ecology synthesis and the categorization of interfaces between creeks and the bay with a comparison showing that many streams are now gone. Caitlin then explained another component – assessing the current dynamics of channel sediment. She then explained how the project is integrating historical information with channel typology to better manage sediment. This leads to SediMatch – a website to link sediment with beneficial reuse sites. Caitlin moved on to regulatory and economic analyses that will also be part of the project to answer the questions – How much will it cost and can it be permitted? Caitlin presented the implementation projects that are part of Flood 2.0 and focused on Novato Creek. She described the development of a long term conceptual vision with Marin County and science advisors and the recently completed historic ecology report. Caitlin described the "Regional Implementation Toolbox" (Fall 2016) which will include many of the components described. She ended with a summary of next steps for Flood 2.0 and a schedule for deliverables and highlighted a website with podcasts including Novato Creek – www.yourwetlands.org. The NBWA Board Members had several questions. How do you volunteer as a sediment donor? (There will be a public information campaign on the matching site and we will have a person respond.) How does this effort influence regulatory agencies? (Agencies looking at data needs or mitigation as additional efforts.) What is the URL for your website? (<http://www.sfestuary.org/our-projects/watershed-management/floodcontrol/>.) When will Novato Creek report be available? (http://www.sfei.org/sites/default/files/biblio_files/Flood%20Control_NovatoCreek%20073115_highres.pdf.)
7. **Watershed Health.** Dyan Whyte, Regional Water Quality Control Board, provided a PowerPoint entitled "Protecting Aquatic Ecosystem Function and Value" and began by presenting a visual describing the three components of monitoring and assessment: chemical (most collected), biological (second most collected) and physical (equally important). She then described the Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP) goals and examples of types of monitoring and

a map of SWAMP sites in the Bay Area. Dyan focused on the North Bay and used the Petaluma River as an example of the type of monitoring done for nutrients and pathogens. She presented some sampling results for bacteria and described some of the monitoring challenges. Dyan then shifted to sediment and explained how sediment is both a pollutant and a resource and then presented the stream regulatory framework to protect beneficial uses. Dyan explained the importance of sediment size and also presented some of the tools available to address sediment (policies, permits, funding support). She provided several visuals to illustrate impaired stream areas (floodplain reduction, channel incision, dams and culverts) and then introduced the concept of sediment targets and how that relates to stream maintenance, briefly explaining substrate composition, spawning gravel permeability, streambed scour depth and pool filling. She highlighted some of the approaches to address channel capacity, hydraulic constriction, and roughness and the use of data to influence maintenance actions. Dyan then handed out the Baylands Goals Report summary and noted the importance of sediment for modern levee systems that anticipate sea level rise and allow for more habitat. Dyan ended by emphasizing the importance of collaboration with Bay Area flood control agencies and noted there would be a sediment matching workshop in the near future. The NBWA Board Members had a number of questions. Is five years the maximum for a permit? (Typically, yes, though reissuance is now easier.) What is the major regulatory impediment for Bahia? (Endangered Species Act, habitat for clapper rail complicates resolution.) Do you work with CA Dept. Fish & Wildlife? (Yes, coordinate on all permits; they defer to RWQCB on engineering issues; now have regional general permits.) Who is typical applicant? (Flood, water and open space districts, non-profits doing restoration.) Are there flood control districts moving sediment from one place to another? (Santa Clara Valley Water District and salt ponds.) Can you test surface water from landfill as a source of pollutants for Petaluma River affecting fish and mussels? (Groundwater wells are best indicators; pollutants not the issue with fish and mussels testing - testing flawed; TMDL will require looking at all sources.)

8. **NBWRA Update.** Keith Caldwell, Napa Supervisor provided a PowerPoint entitled “Update on the North Bay Water Reuse Program” and emphasized that the North Bay Water Reuse Authority has been funded for over five years and includes three counties and multiple agencies. He presented a list of members and noted that Petaluma and American Canyon had recently become members for Phase 2. He described the NBWRA “Approach” which includes Economies of Scale (cost share and agencies incrementally contribute) through a “regional” perspective and an emphasis on Multiple Benefits. Keith provided a summary of funding to date (over \$100m) and partners in addition to member agencies – US Bureau of Reclamation and Dept. of Water Resources. He then shifted to Phase 2 and emphasized the addition of seasonal storage and groundwater management. Keith then described proposed legislation: SB 1894 (Reclamation Efficiency Act of 2015 – “RE-Act”) which would include grants for integrated projects for small scale storage. He also highlighted outreach efforts to generate support for RE-Act 2015. Keith ended with a list of “Study Sessions” that will look beyond Phase 2. The NBWA Board Members had several questions. Does the federal government like the North Bay partnership? (Yes, especially considering the steady burn rate with multiple projects.) Will storage be man-made? (Yes, including flood ponds-wetlands.) How do you assure shovel ready projects? (A master schedule used by the NBWRA Board and TAC.)

9. **San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority Request.** Harry Seraydarian referred to the request letter in the Board package and provided a PowerPoint. Harry provided some background on the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority (SFBRA) and described the purpose – provide local match funds for projects to enhance shoreline habitat and provide flood protection. Harry explained the minimum request: \$1,000 and the use of funds: pre-election (non-campaign) costs for a 2016 regional ballot initiative and short term post passage costs. Harry highlighted the benefits of a local match under Prop 1 and noted the specific reference to SFBRA (with \$200m targeted with a 50% match) in a 2016 Bond proposal. Harry then presented options and recommended NBWA support at the \$1,000 level with the clarification that funds should only go for pre-election (non-campaign costs) – education. The NBWA Board unanimously approved the recommendation.

10. **Items of Interest.** None.

11. **Items for Next Agenda.**

- * Game of Floods Preview, Chris Choo, Marin County
- * Russian River Watershed Association Update, Andy Rogers, Russian River Watershed Association
- * 2016 Conference Update

Jack Gibson, Chair, adjourned the meeting at 11:28 a.m.

Submitted By: Elizabeth O. Preim-Rohtla
Assistant to the Executive Director

NEXT MEETING INFORMATION:

December 4 – Petaluma (Lucchesi) Community Ctr., 320 N. McDowell Blvd., Petaluma, CA 94954-Conf. Rm. 2
January 8 – Marin Community Foundation, 5 Hamilton Landing, Suite 200, Novato, CA 94949