

# North Bay Watershed Association

## Board of Directors Meeting - Summary

June 4, 2021 | 9:30 - 11:30 a.m.

IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE GOVERNOR'S EXECUTIVE ORDERS N-25-20 AND N-29-20 WHICH SUSPENDS CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS OF THE BROWN ACT, THIS MEETING WILL BE HELD VIRTUALLY VIA REMOTE CONFERENCING SERVICE — NO PHYSICAL MEETING LOCATION

Zoom Meeting

[www.nbwatershed.org](http://www.nbwatershed.org)

### 1. **Welcome and Call to Order—Directors or Member Representatives Present Included:**

Michael Boorstein – Central Marin Sanitation Agency	Elizabeth Patterson – Solano County Water Agency
Leon Garcia—City of American Canyon	Andy Rodgers – NBWA
Cory Bytof – City of San Rafael	Sabrina Marson – NBWA
Gustavo Goncalves – County of Marin	Ann Thomas
Chris Choo – County of Marin	Stephen Keese
Megan Clark – Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District	Scott Dusterhoff - SFEI
Jack Gibson – Marin Municipal Water District	Cheryl Howlett - Marin Municipal Water District
Ryan Gregory – Napa Sanitation District	Minona Heaviland - SEC
Rick Fraites – North Marin Water District	Patti D'Angelo Juachon
Jean Mariani – Novato Sanitary District	Kate Powers
Pamela Meigs – Ross Valley Sanitation District	Susan Stompe - Marin Conservation League

Eleven NBWA board members attended the meeting comprised of 22 agency staff, stakeholders, partners, and interested members of the public.

Call to Order – Director Jack Gibson called the meeting to order at 9:32 am via Zoom.

### 2. **General Public Comment** - None.

### 3. **Agenda Review and Approve Past Meeting Minutes**– Director Gibson asked for any Board members to speak up if there were requested changes to the agenda.

Director Fraites moved to approve meeting summary. Director Patterson seconded. Unanimously approved.

Director Gregory moved to accept the Treasure's Report - Director Patterson seconded. Unanimously accepted.

### 4. **Treasurer's Report**

### 5. **Consider Proposed 2020/2021 NBWA Workplan and Budget**

Director Gibson noted that this item is a carryover from the last meeting where it was inadvertently overlooked for formal approval. There were no comments or questions.

Director Gregory moved to approve the Workplan and Budget - Director Patterson seconded. Unanimously accepted.

**6. Guest Presentation - Sediment for Survival: A Strategy for the Resilience of Bay Wetlands in the Lower San Francisco Estuary**

*Scott Dusterhoff, Senior Scientist & Lead Geomorphologist,  
San Francisco Estuary Institute*

Scott provided an overview of the April 13, 2021 released SFEI report on the future of bayland sediment demand and sediment supply under a rising sea level, and management recommendations for supporting bayland resilience.

Funded by San Francisco Bay Water Quality Improvement Fund, EPA Region IX and the Regional Monitoring Program for Water Quality in San Francisco Bay

High-level reporting of findings included:

- Tidal Marsh Restoration
- Global Sea Level Change since 1800
- Key Sediment Questions covered in the report:
  - How much sediment is needed?
  - How much is available?
  - How can we get more?
- Scenarios Considered
- North Bay Baylands
  - Some baylands have a high resilience potential due to
    - High local watershed sediment supply
    - High organic matter accumulation rates in brackish marshes
  - Resilience potential increases with
    - Directing sediment onto baylands
    - Addition of outside sediment
- Integrated Watershed-Baylands Management

There are a lot of known issues regarding dredged/excavated sediment from reservoirs moved to the bay. There needs to be advances in technology for how to do this. There's a pilot project coming together in the east bay for Don Pedro reservoir looking at slurring reservoir sediment downstream. The conversation needs to be advancing efforts in the region.

Questions:

Gibson: (in regard to the map presented on the "Key Sediment Questions" page of the presentation) The tidal flat and the tidal marshes are voluminous the further you get from the mouth of the bay. is that scientifically the norm?

Dusterhoff : Yes, that is because in the central part of the bay the shoreline is steeper and there's more energy coming from this part. In the north and south ends other areas the gradient is much flatter.

Patterson: (Follow up question on the above comment) Suisun Bay is deeper that what is being shown. She thought there were more mud flats in the northern portion.

Dusterhoff: The white being shown is not upland (steep) it is diked muted tidal marsh. The water elevation is managed. It's white because it's not considered tidal marsh because its managed different from the other areas in green.

Clark: There are plans to frack in Suisun Bay. Are there updates?

Patterson: It's not fracking. It's reopening the existing deactivated wells.

Clark: Two questions: Mercury in the dredged material\_ Will the mercury go back into the bay wherever its moved? The upland dirt from landfill, isn't it muted for average daily ground cover in the dump?

Dusterhoff: Yes, the dump needs the dirt for daily cover. How much of the recovered excavated dirt can be diverted to the bay? They would consider contamination and need for uses and disbursement.

As population grows, there's going to be more building and that has been factored in.

As far as mercury, the idea is that if it can be moved to someplace that can be contained, that is the plan.

Patterson: (she has three questions) 1) Army Corps has the jurisdiction for dredging the Vallejo-Napa River estuary, but they're not. The Vallejo marina is restricted for docking due to sediment. Is there any thought on making a business arrangement that benefits Vallejo? That is a good source of sediment.

2) HWY 37 plans, are you familiar? how would this work with sediment management?

3) The issues with the dam releases may have a conflict with getting water through the delta.

Dusterhoff: 1) Its true regarding the Army Corps. The decisions that are made is beyond his knowledge. He agrees that if it could be dredged the sediment would be in demand locally. 2) Hwy 37- one thing to think about is if they can build out the marshes, that will only protect the infrastructure in the long run. There will be a need for levy's and if marshes are put in, levy's would be smaller, better protected, and less costs in maintaining. (Patterson suggested CalTrans get a copy of the sediment report) 3) He hasn't heard much on her third question.

Gregory: He agrees that dredging is difficult and expensive. Is sediment going to be a big enough priority that dredge material becomes a resource and be a catalyst to getting more dredging done.

Dusterhoff: He has no knowledge on the decisions regarding what gets dredge or not. The Army Corps is in charge of most of the dredging in the bay area. they have to follow the federal standard of sediment disposal. They are trying to change that guidance.

The restoration community is concerned that sediment becoming a commodity. There's a conversation on what this means in the long run.

Choo: The biggest conflict is the storage and mobilization of all the sediment. IS SFEI looking into the timing and placement needs?

Dusterhoff: Yes. There are no big spaces to store around the Bay. What they're trying to do is find a way to get sediment to a place ready to take it. There are challenges to transportation. There are no examples of sediment being taken directly to marshes. There needs to be policy change to be able to implement new ideas. Now is the time to have discussion and movement on this topic.

Stompe: Hwy 37 the impact of the berm they are looking into building will have a huge effect on the marshes. SFEI is part of the group looking into the impacts. There would be great competition for sediment if the berm goes forward.

Dusterhoff: Yes, the conversation to have sediment seen as a public good and not as a commodity for the highest bidder.

Patterson: In order to use the sediment, they have to bore down through the bay mud and doing a soil mixing. The causeway is more cost effective.

## 7. **Guest Presentations – Proposed Regional One Water Drought Strategy Funding Initiative**

*Andy Rodgers, Executive Director*

*Chris Choo, Principal Watershed Planner, Marin County Department of Public Works*

Chris Choo and Andy Rodgers provided the Board with a brief conceptual overview plan to engage member agency staff through the Joint Technical Committee forum to identify, develop and position the region for mutually beneficial programs and projects funding.

- NBWA was established nearly 20 years ago to convene, work cooperatively, and craft regional approaches to managing our common watersheds.
- The Joint Technical Committee (JTC) is the project development and implementation arm of NBWA. Chris Choo, Deputy Director for NBWA and Principal Watershed Planner with Marin County, currently chairs the JTC.
- In 2020, NBWA developed an integrated water management approach (*One Water Strategy*) to address challenges of climate change such as seasonal and inter-annual water scarcity, extreme weather events/flooding, and impacted water quality and aquatic habitats.
- The *One Water Strategy* identified a common role/objective for NBWA to provide “regional leadership” as it relates to Convening diverse interests in a shared watershed context, Education, Funding, and addressing Regulatory concerns.
- The 2021 drought introduces unprecedented challenges for water management agencies and the many North Bay communities they serve.
- The NBWA JTC plans to convene member staff and partners to develop a Regional *One Water Drought Strategy Funding Initiative*

Andy and Chris presented a draft meeting #1 agenda for this key initiative. They are hoping to have management level partners at the meetings that can help plan and fund these projects.

### NBWA Joint Technical Committee Meeting #1

#### Goals:

- Develop creative solutions to drought that integrate other One Water considerations.
- Prepare the North Bay for the next drought by prioritizing and implementing regional and sub-regional projects.
- Develop ideas for addressing and mitigating drought problems

#### Approaches:

- Develop ideas for drought problems
- By sector (breakouts for water and wastewater )

- What are the big ideas? (Desalination, purple pipe, building more recycled water capacity at facilities to expand the network)
  - What are our projected future water needs? (New development, housing targets)
  - What are our recycled water goals? (Can we get closer to XX%?)
  - Where are our limitations for this capacity? (Direct potable reuse?)
  - Infrastructure improvements needed to do any of the above? Are they already planned?
- By geography (unique focused breakouts for Napa/Solano and Marin/Sonoma?)
  - Overlay future climate change risks (fire, flood, heat, drought)

Andy asked for Board ideas, suggestions and input, assistance in develop a broadly inclusive invite list, and help identify potential strategic partnerships and associations .

Questions:

Clark: They are unfunded in outreach and they have to build a new Operation Control Center. She is interested in partners to help with education, similar to the Lot project in Seattle. Along with potable water reuse.

Choo: Yes, education is a big priority. Especially in long-term drought planning.  
Gibson: NBWA is positioned well for grants.

Garcia: Like the idea of collaborative process. American Canyon implemented a new online program to monitor water use day by day. A new housing development was built that contains 100% recycled toilets. They have a cash for grass program (saved water for the equivalent of 273 houses) and low flow toilets. There are programs for using recycled water where you can drive up fill up your tank with recycled water to irrigate.

Bytof: Encourages not only having decision makers as part of the meeting, but others as well for additional ideas and may have deeper knowledge to contribute. Look for opportunities for pilots that might inform for future droughts. How do we deal with new housing requirements and water use- requirement for purple pipes?

D'Angelo Juachon: Thinking about this work in its relationship to social equity as a value at this point is far more conducive to reaching goals. This will also help in having an inclusive conversation.

Choo: Existing JTC distribution list has many community driven contacts. Its lacking policy making or decision making. The list can benefit from all types of members.

Patterson: Marin, Sonoma, and Napa are great examples for Solano County. She likes Chris' idea that every year is drought and we need to convey the lessons learned that Solano could apply. Regional enhancement and management connections is important. She suggested a presentation from her connection at DWR that managed the drought in the 90's and 2000's. She has other contacts who could present on the water grid.

Gibson: (directed Andy to follow up with Elizabeth on those presentations)

Mariani: She agrees with Cory to focus on today and tomorrow's drought. Getting fires department and other emergency services involved is important—they have to be part of the solution.

Fraites: North Bay Water District embarked on a recycling program that has over 100 customers. His dream is to have purple pipes in communities. We need to generate funding.

Gibson: They have two shovel ready programs, but the hang up is the analysis for the cost per acres foot.

Andy wrapped up the discussion with indicating he will send a follow up email to the group asking for additional feedback and ideas on partners.

## 8. **Executive Director Report and Agenda Items for Future Meetings**

Andy reported on activities that have taken place since the last meeting:

### **Updates since last meeting**

- Met with Regional Climate Protection Authority on May 13
- Followed up on June 3 Resilient SR37 Policy Committee meeting
- Met with new potential NBWA member
- Met with potential regional collaboration partners

### **Administrative Activities**

- AR – Member dues
- AP – Subconsultants
- Finalized FY 21/22 work plan
- Preparing website and meeting packet updates
- Updating distribution lists - *Please send us any new staff / contacts*

### **Communications**

- Drought information gathering
- Board members and member agency staff
- Regional partners
- Subject matter experts and speakers
- Call for newsletter topics and program highlights

### **Committees**

- Developing JTC plan and focus for 2021
- JTC meetings to resume July 2021
- Conference committee to focus on 2022 event

### **Board Topic outlook**

- July 9 – SR37 Baylands Initiatives, Legislative Updates
- Other topics in development:  
Watersheds and Wildfire Prevention Planning, State Water Board Drought Assistance Programs and Resources, One Water Initiative Highlights, What's Next in Environmental Education, Urban Scale Carbon Sequestration Initiatives, Funding

Opportunities, Regulatory Compliance Collaborations, Water Management &  
Conveyance Innovations, Capital and Natural Assets Management

**9. Board Information Exchange and Drought Updates**

*All Members*

Gibson: The main thing the district has been working on is outreach regarding voluntary conservation efforts. He has been trying to get the district to see the short term (until the next rains) and long term (climate change).

Fraites: They are working on outreach and giveaways to help customers with conservation.

Mariani: They are concentrating on solids that are in the way stream. She agrees with other comments about recycled water being a good way to irrigate.

Boorstein: They are focused on low flow and cleaning pipes. They are talking about adding extra stations. The gen engine is going to be in operations next January. The Bees have arrived- 42 hives have been placed for the summer on some open lots near 580. They RVST were on the cover last month of Municipal Sewer and Water. Their article was on building core competency.

**10. Announcements and Adjourn**

Meeting adjourned at 11:30 am

Next Meeting: July 9, 2021, Zoom

SUBMITTED BY: Andy Rodgers, Executive Director, NBWA