

Petaluma Valley Groundwater Sustainability Agency

Board Meeting

Minutes

Date: August 22, 2019

Time: 4:00 p.m.

Location: Petaluma Community Center

320 N McDowell Blvd, Petaluma

<http://www.petalumavalleygroundwater.org>

Agenda

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Susan Gorin, Sonoma County Water Agency

Mike Healy, City of Petaluma

David Rabbitt, County of Sonoma

Mike Sangiacomo (Alternate for Carolyn Wasem), North Bay Water District

Bruce Abelli-Amen (Absent), Sonoma Resource Conservation District

2. Consent Calendar

a) Approve Minutes of June 27, 2019

b) Approve 2019-2020 Year-to-Date Financial Report

c) Approve 2019-2020 Year-to-Date Member Agency Contributions

No public comment.

Director Gorin moved to approve the Consent Calendar as presented, **Director Sangiacomo** seconded. Motion passed 4-0-1.

3. Directors/Subcommittee Report

None.

4. Advisory Committee Report

Provided in writing in meeting packet.

5. Information items:

a) Agricultural Water Conservation: An informational item presented by Sonoma Resource Conservation District on water-saving innovations and practices

Keith Abeles, Sonoma Resource Conservation District, provided an in-depth update on new agricultural irrigation practices and technologies.

Board Comments/Questions:

QUESTION: Is filtration needed for groundwater or surface water or both?

RESPONSE: It depends, but generally no.

QUESTION: What is the uptake of these tools from the agricultural community?

RESPONSE: It's estimated around 15%. It's hard for people to make changes; they get used to doing things a certain way.

COMMENT: Excellent presentation. Thank you for the information and the details.

Public Comment/Questions:

QUESTION: How much water is used per acre of vines?

RESPONSE: It varies widely. There are some vineyards that receive 80 gallons per vine annually and others that get 250 gallons per vine.

QUESTION: What is the source of water for vineyards?

RESPONSE: Primarily groundwater, but surface or recycled water is used, too.

QUESTION: What is the difference between new and old vines regarding water use?

RESPONSE: It depends. Don't normally need as much per vine for new vines, but conditions vary.

QUESTION: Do we need more regulations on water use?

RESPONSE: Most people are reasonable, and others won't follow the rules. RCD focus is on education versus regulation.

COMMENT: It seems like these demonstration projects take a lot of work and there is site-to-site variability.

QUESTION: Hillside vineyard planting – is there a difference from vines planted on the contour versus those planted up and down?

RESPONSE: There are VESCO rules regarding hillside planting, and grape growers need to consider the costs of everything they do, which can also factor into decision making.

COMMENT: Seems like the GSAs need to prepare for cannabis water use.

RESPONSE: Staff noted that the Advisory Committee will receive a presentation about cannabis water use at its November meeting.

b) Facilitation Services: Update on current facilitation status and possible request for facilitation services

Rich Wilson, The Consensus and Collaboration Project facilitator is leaving. Staff provided an update on efforts to find a new CCP facilitator and informed the Board that if a good match isn't possible, an RFQ for facilitation services might be issued.

Board Comments/Questions:

QUESTION: Could one of the member agency staff provide facilitation services?

RESPONSE: This was considered. There are concerns about neutrality of staff, as the stakes become higher with the development of Sustainable Management Criteria.

6. Action Items

a) Recycled Water: Support for City of Petaluma recycled water grant

The City of Petaluma sought Board support for a recycled water project grant.

No Board or Public Comments.

Chairman, David Rabbitt, asked for opposition to support the City Petaluma's project to expand the tertiary treatment capacity of its wastewater treatment plant, and seeing none, announced the 4-0-1 unanimous support.

b) Resource Groundwater Recharge: Support for application and match for grant submitted by Sonoma and Gold Ridge resource conservation districts

The Sonoma and Gold Ridge Resource Conservations Districts asked the GSA for support of a Natural Resources Conservation Service grant application to evaluate, demonstrate, and quantify the benefits of approaches to increase groundwater recharge on agricultural lands, and a \$10,000 match from GSA Proposition 1 funds.

No Board or Public Comments.

Chairman, David Rabbitt, asked for opposition to supporting the grant and the \$10,000 match from GSA Proposition 1 funds, and seeing none, announced the 4-0-1 unanimous support.

c) Groundwater User Registration: Authorize GSA Administrator and Plan Manager to assess initial groundwater registration program questions in an amount not to exceed \$5,000

Staff asked for Board approval to provide up to \$5,000 in already budgeted funds to support the development of an initial groundwater registration program in conjunction with the other two Sonoma County GSAs.

Board Questions/Comments:

COMMENT: Would like the registration program to be adaptable to the Petaluma Valley and reflective of the different needs of the basin.

No public comment.

Chairman, David Rabbitt, asked for opposition to authorizing the expenditure of up to \$5,000 to work with the other two Sonoma County GSA's, and seeing none, announced the 4-0-1 unanimous support.

7. Legal Counsel, Plan Manager and Administrator Report

Ann DuBay, Administrator, provided a written report, and reminded the Board of the Recharge Workshop on December 11.

Jay Jasperse, Plan Manager, reported that staff is working on the groundwater model and budget, and also a process for developing Sustainable Management Criteria.

Scott Morris, legal counsel, reported that water agencies and any local agencies that deal with environmental regulations should be monitoring SB 1 (Atkins).

Board Questions/Comments:

QUESTION: Is DWR being flexible on GSPs? We don't want to do more than is needed or required.

RESPONSE: Staff is reviewing the draft Groundwater Sustainability Plans submitted by critically over-drafted basins and the comments DWR made regarding Alternative Plans. DWR's response to these early submittals will give the GSAs an indication of the level of detail and analysis that needs to be provided.

QUESTION: Why was Napa's Alternative Plan not approved?

RESPONSE: DWR commented that the plan didn't show how it was achieved and would maintain sustainability.

8. Public comment on matters not listed on the agenda but within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Board

None.

9. Closed Session

- a) Public Employee Performance Evaluation (GC § 54957) Title: Legal Counsel and Administrator

The Board reported that it will consider a contract with both legal counsel and the administrator for up to three years at its next meeting.

10. Adjournment

Adjourned at 5:48 p.m.