

# NORTH BAY WATERSHED ASSOCIATION MINUTES

September 10, 2010

## MEETING MINUTES NORTH BAY WATERSHED ASSOCIATION

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

Friday, September 10, 2010  
9:30 a.m.  
Marin Community Foundation  
5 Hamilton Landing, Suite 200  
Novato, CA 94949

Directors Present: Directors present included:

Jack Baker, North Marin Water District  
Steve Barbose, City of Sonoma and Sonoma Valley County Sanitation District  
Megan Clark, Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District  
Mike DiGiorgio, Novato Sanitary District  
John Dupar, Central Marin Sanitation Agency  
Jack Gibson, Marin Municipal Water District  
James Krider, Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District  
Brad Sherwood, Sonoma County and Sonoma County Water Agency  
Madeline Thomas, Bel Marin Keys Community Services District

Directors present represented 11 out of the 16 agencies signatory to the Association MOU. Also Margaret Johnston represented Associate Member, Tomales Bay Watershed Council.

### Board Actions

1. Call to Order. Jack Gibson, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m. and introductions followed. The Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District is a new Member Agency to NBWA.
2. Public Comment. There was no public comment.
3. Approval of the Agenda. (See Handout) The Board unanimously approved the agenda.
4. Approval of Minutes of the Board Meeting held July 9, 2010. (See Handout) The Minutes of the Board Meeting held on July 9, 2010 were unanimously approved, with two abstentions by Steve Barbose, City of Sonoma and Sonoma Valley County Sanitation District and Mike DiGiorgio, Novato Sanitary District.
5. Treasurer's Report. (See Handout) The Treasurer's Reports for June (amended), July, and August were accepted as presented by Harry Seraydarian.
6. Watershed Monitoring in a Regional Context. Meg Sedlak, SFEI used a PowerPoint presentation to provide an overview of the Regional Monitoring Program (RMP). The RMP started in 1993 and is paid for by dischargers and dredgers with a 2010 budget of approximately \$3.2 million. Meg described the structure for the RMP which includes a Steering Committee, a Technical Review Committee, and four workgroups: sources, pathways, and loading; contaminants and fate; exposure and effects; and emerging contaminants. SFEI also has a distinguished advisory panel for the RMP. Meg then described some strategy documents such as Mercury, with two studies underway related to stormwater and TMDL targets, and a strategy for small tributary loading. Meg presented the RMP mission: to collect data and communicate information about water quality in the San Francisco Estuary that support management decisions. Meg then described other efforts regarding status and trends, special studies, and information dissemination, such as the

“pulse” which is focused on stormwater this year. In response to a question: Why are concentrations so different in the bay? Meg noted that it varies by contaminant and relates to sources, hydrology (flushing is higher in the North Bay than in the South Bay), and biology. Lester McKee then presented information on mass loads in stormwater and the highest priority contaminants. Lester used PCBs as an example and showed where sampling was taking place (no tributary sampling in the NBWA area). Lester illustrated the challenges concerning scale and the different sampling equipment used at various sites. Lester also explained the use of modeling and scaling to present the regional picture and the future use of a “spreadsheet” model. Lester described data for mercury and PCBs that illustrated the relative increase in percentage attributable to local sources from 2000 to 2008. Lester noted that for total metal mass, the North Bay is generally cleaner. Lester then summarized RMP priorities: of top priority are mercury and PCBs, and of high priority are PBDE, medium pesticides, dioxins, and selenium. Using PCBs as an example, Lester explained source control efforts including treatment and retrofit. In response to a comment that capturing and treating stormwater was “pie in the sky,” Lester said he agreed it was very difficult to treat stormwater in general and the focus is on patches of significant sources. Lester then provided a summary of next steps and noted the requirements in the Municipal Regional Permit (MRP for Phase I Stormwater) for PCBs and mercury that include assessments, pilots and the possibility of diversions to wastewater treatment plants. Lester also described the recent grant from the EPA to the Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association (BASMAA) that will include assessments for PCBs in five selected watersheds and some retrofits as part of a risk reduction program.

7. Local Napa River Monitoring. Jonathan Koehler, Napa County RCD, provided an overview of Napa River monitoring using a PowerPoint presentation. John provided a list of monitoring activities, which showed the time frame, frequency, and type of monitoring (steady or opportunistic). John described each monitoring activity and provided some commentary. Water quality monitoring (Dissolved Oxygen, temperature, conductivity), usually grab samples, engages volunteers, but may not be useful for assessing trends and may have data quality issues. Benthic Macro-Invertebrates sampling is more comprehensive, but costs ~ \$500/sample. Bird counts engage volunteers and are inexpensive. Smolt trapping (juvenile steelhead) is performed with a rotary screw trap, is very informative and more expensive. In response to questions, Jonathan noted there is a very minimal loss of fish using the rotary screw trap and that large numbers of fish may be attributable to a good food source. Jonathan went on to describe the Salmon Spawner surveys and noted that they are also informative and NMFS is performing DNA analysis for free. Jonathan also highlighted other sampling, including gravel permeability, streambed scour, water temperature, rainfall, stream flow, suspended sediment, stream channel surveys, and habitat surveys.

8. Stormwater Monitoring Requirements. Harry Seraydarian used a PowerPoint presentation to provide background on the proposed letter to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) on stormwater monitoring. Harry first described the efforts in the NBWA Watershed Stewardship Plan (2004) and the “GAP” project proposed for watershed monitoring at a cost \$1.95 million. Harry then summarized the policy developed in the NBWA IRWMP (December 2005) to support effective surface water monitoring. This policy and the action steps in the plan led to an SFEI study: Cost-Effective, Applicable Monitoring Approaches to Address the Resource Objectives of the NBWA (April 2007) that analyzed monitoring efforts in the North Bay and though costs for monitoring averaged \$3.5 million/year, the emphasis was more on projects than sustained multi-year activities. Harry noted the SFEI report also included a recommendation to identify how stormwater and TMDL programs could be adjusted in collaboration with the RWQCB to align with the Stewardship Plan and IRWMP. Harry then described the efforts at the recent Joint Technical Committee Meeting (June 15, 2010) and Habitat Floodplain Technical Committee Meetings to refine the proposed letter to the SWRCB. Harry also described the related NBWA report: Indicators and Performance Measures for North Bay Watersheds (January 2010) that made specific recommendations for watershed health indicators. In addition, Harry described the parallel effort that came from the June 15 Joint Technical Committee Meeting to organize a “Monitoring Workshop” that would include SWRCB speakers on policies and permits that affect North Bay watershed monitoring. The Board unanimously approved sending the proposed letter to the SWRCB.

#### 9. Items of Interest.

\* Mira Monte Marina Acquisition – Tidal Marsh to Gilded Age and Back Again. Habitat and History Tour of storied Marin Bayland in the heart of the Petaluma Marsh and Wildlife Preserve – Sunday, Sept. 26 – 2 to 4 p.m.

#### 10. Items for Next Agenda.

- \* Bay Area IRWMP Update
- \* DWR Perspective on Prop 84

Jack Gibson, Chair, adjourned the meeting at 11:10 a.m.

Submitted By: Elizabeth O. Preim-Rohtla

**NEXT MEETING INFORMATION**

October 1 – Petaluma (Lucchesi) Community Ctr., 320 N. McDowell Blvd., Petaluma, CA 94954—Conf. Rm. 2

November 5 – (Change in Location) Novato Sanitary District, 500 Davidson Street, Novato, CA 94945

December 3 – Petaluma (Lucchesi) Community Ctr., 320 N. McDowell Blvd., Petaluma, CA 94954— Conf. Rm. 2