

## North Bay Watershed Association

Summary of the meeting of the North Bay Watershed Association (NBWA) Board of Directors

Date: Friday, September 8<sup>th</sup>, 2017 – 9:30 a.m.

Location: Novato Sanitary District, 500 Davidson Street, Novato, CA

### Delegates/alternates Present Included:

<b>Board Member</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Board Member</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Michael Boorstein/Jason Dow	Central Marin Sanitation Agency	Ryan Gregory	Napa Sanitation District
Leon Garcia	City of American Canyon/ Napa County Flood Control & Water Conservation District	Rick Fraitcs	North Marin Water District
Paul Jensen	City of San Rafael	Brant Miller	Novato Sanitary District
Megan Clark	Las Gallinas Valley Sanitation District	Michael Boorstein/Pamela Meigs	Ross Valley Sanitary District
Jack Gibson	Marin Municipal Water District	Brad Sherwood	Sonoma County Water Agency
Mary Sackett	County of Marin	Pam Drew	City of Novato
Mike Healy	City of Petaluma	Rob Carson	Marin Co. Stormwater PP

Delegates/alternates present represented 15 of the 19 agencies signatory to the Association MOU.

### Board Actions:

- Call to Order – Jack Gibson, chair, called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m.
- Public Comment – No public comments.
- Approval of Agenda – The agenda was unanimously approved.
- Approval of Minutes – The minutes of the previous Board meeting were approved with one abstention.
- Treasurer’s Report – The treasurer’s report [current through July] was presented by Judy Kelly, NBWA executive director, on behalf of Cheryl Howlett, NBWA treasurer.
- Director’s Report – Judy Kelly presented the director’s report; specifically noting the activities of the July JTC meeting, see <http://nbwatershed.org/meetinginformation/> for more information.
- Rob Carson, MCSTOPP. Rob briefed the Board on the status of the NBWA-supported regional stormwater trash control planning effort. This BASMAA-lead project was done for all of North Bay; NBWA paid for two tasks in the scope: all of Task 1 and Task 2.2. The project is based on new trash-related state stormwater requirements passed in 2015. These trash amendments are focused on high-density trash areas and will go into effect under the permittee’s five- year stormwater permits. They are expected to be fully in effect by 2020. The regulations require one of two tracks; Track 1 is “full trash capture” in all high priority areas – a standard that is very hard to meet where municipalities have many commercial areas, some without trash capture options. Track 2 requires “equivalent” actions to capture the same amount of trash as Track 1. Track 1 could be something as small as a drop-in catchment unit, or as big as vortex separator (10 to 30 acre treatment). Track 2 is putting those units in where possible, plus

institutional controls like street sweepers, information campaigns, source controls, etc. Much of the consultants work with the SWRCB was to determine exactly what "equivalent" meant and defining compliance monitoring requirements. The total project costs were \$162,000 with NBWA contributing \$30,000. Rob reminded the Board that trash pathways are many; most trash does not come through waterways and that the issue is bigger than stormwater systems. NBWA-funded deliverables included a compliance memo and meetings, draft trash reduction framework (how to define full trash capture "equivalency" was a big discussion) and map work. Rob noted that Marin went with Track 2 while some areas in Napa opted for Tract 1 but that municipalities can change tracks later. Q: Will Private landowners be affected? The regs are being interpreted so that private capture efforts (like parking lots with treatment) are outside municipal jurisdiction but it's likely there will be new requirements on private development. Final compliance deadline will be 2030. Cost estimates are \$8 per person per year (State Board estimates). The key compliance tool will be visual assessment. New maps model trash generation rates based on land use and other factors. The maps are then ground-truthed and calibrated. Where this has already been done, trash generation rates turned out to be mostly lower than expected in the model. Q: Can the public contribute? Marin has many volunteers removing trash and is looking for a way to have them help do the visual assessments. Q: Where will the \$8 per person costs come from? General funds first, capital costs, not a lot of options. Might get grant funding for green infrastructure as the state has said green facilities can qualify for full trash capture. Also Senate Bill 231 would allow municipalities to charge fees to finance projects capturing stormwater the same way they finance projects for sewer water, trash collection and water delivery systems.

8. Petaluma Historic Hydrology Study. Sean Barmgarten (SFEI) and Anya Starovoytov (Sonoma Resource Conservation District). Anya began the presentation by reminding the Board about the creation of the RCDs and how this project started: local agencies noted there was a lack of understanding about how the Petaluma watershed has changed over time and how restoration efforts could benefit from the insight that historical analysis provides. The RCD teamed up with the San Francisco Estuary Institute and with grant funds from US EPA started collecting data and working with an advisory group. After analysis is complete, the final piece will be for the RCD to reach out to landowners who might want to start a conservation project and apply the information from the historical assessment to guide those projects. The RCD's role is to be a collaborator and match landowners and resources. Sean then reminded the Board about the many historical ecology projects SFEI has done around the state. These reports are used to create a tool to help guide land use practices and conservation efforts by providing a synthesis of historical information and create a way to use that information to help set priorities for actions in the watershed. He noted that the basis of research is archival and that the team drew on 21 sources for old maps, new articles, diaries, photos etc. that showed the water and land types found on the valley floor. The team found that the river was very sinuous then and the floor had many wetlands and seasonal wetlands like vernal pools. Major land use changes have occurred over time-- grazing and ranching in mid-1800's and then with settlement of Petaluma in 1850, the river became a navigational channel. Dredging began in the river during the late 1800's and farming became more prevalent. All this lead to significant losses of non-tidal wetlands and tidal wetlands but the Petaluma marshes are still the largest old marsh system in the Bay. When complete, the report is intended to help set priorities for restoration, and focus on where those best opportunities exist on the landscape. The RCD will be taking this work and looking for on-the-ground projects with interested landowners.

9. Water Bond Status – Brad Sherwood presented on the status of current discussions in Sacramento about a water and parks bond for the 2018 ballot and noted that as it stands now, no money is included in the proposed bond for the IRWMP. Brad suggested that participating NBWA agencies immediately get in contact with the bond negotiators to ask them to reinstate the \$125 million that was originally included in the bond proposal for IRWMP. Brad will send additional information to Judy for distribution to the Board early next week

10. There were no items of Interest

11. Items for the Next Agenda

Tour of fish facilities (SCWA) Reservations are required for transportation. To register or learn more, please contact Sophie HallamEames, at [Sophie.HallamEames@scwa.ca.gov](mailto:Sophie.HallamEames@scwa.ca.gov) or (707) 524-6430.

**Next meeting information:** October 6<sup>th</sup>, 2017 – Meet at SCWA’s Westside Water Education Facility, 9703 Wohler Road, Healdsburg, CA 95448

SUBMITTED BY:

Judy Kelly  
Executive Director, NBWA  
[Judy.NBWA@gmail.com](mailto:Judy.NBWA@gmail.com)