

The notes and discussions outlined below are not comprehensive, not exact quotes, and may not thoroughly describe the entire conversation of the Collaborative. The purpose of the notes are to provide an overview of items discussed, action items, spirit of the discussion, and serve as a reminder for any next steps needed. Please contact the Collaborative Coordinator for clarification.

Petaluma Watershed Collaborative

Friday, December 18, 2020 * 1PM – 3PM

Meeting held remotely via Zoom

Meeting Notes

Present at meeting: Ryan Watanabe (CDFW), Emmanuel Ursu (City of Petaluma), Andy Rogers (FOPR/NBWA), Chris Howington (NRCS), David Rabbitt (Sonoma County Board of Supervisors District 2), Stephanie Bastionon (FOPR), Eric Rubenstahl (MALT), John Shribbs (PWA), Susan Haydon (Sonoma Water), Katie Robbins (SRCD), Shannon Drew (SRCD), Liane Ware (Environmental Science Associates), Sara Azat (NMFS), Tawny Tesconi (Sonoma County Farm Bureau), Ingrid Stearns (SLT), Kendall Webster (SLT)

I. Roll Call and Roundtable (information)

- Watershed Updates from Stakeholders
 - Andy Rogers: Russian River Watershed assoc. is putting on an event Feb 2nd-3rd. Rehydrating the Russian River Watershed. Target Audience is landscapers.
 - Chris at NRCS: Emergency post fire funding and RCPP EQIP. Looking to do outreach in the Petaluma watershed area to have landowners submit RCPP applications.
 - District 2 Supervisor David Rabbitt
 - Emmanuel City of Petaluma: Army Corps of Engineers has completed dredging the Petaluma River. City is in the early stages of updating its general plan.
 - Friends of PR: working with city of Petaluma to broaden their contract and allow for more watershed education. McNear Peninsula was bought by Petaluma River Parks Foundation. Hoping to launch the park around early spring 2021. Working on some climate change action items for the coming year, and some demonstration at Steamer Landing Park.
 - Eric at MALT: continuing to connect with landowners on Carbon Farm Planning and restoration
 - Sonoma Land Trust updates: Petaluma River Baylands Strategy is moving along. Outreach is being conducted to help people get out to protected lands.
 - John Shribbs – PWA removed lots of trash from the Petaluma River that was stuck in the mud which was dredged. Working with Eagle Scouts to do local community service projects. If you know of a small shovel-ready project like this that some Boy Scouts can work on and finish before the end of January, please let John know.
 - Sonoma Water: stream maintenance program, upcoming permit renewal process will happen in the new year. The 4th phase of the Denman Reach project was completed by the City of Petaluma at the beginning of 2020. It's open to the public and a great place to walk around, so go check it out! Upcoming meeting in March – ask Susan if you are interested. Stay tuned for an upcoming call for public input from Sonoma Water.
 - Sonoma RCD: SRCD has some funds to do TA and design work on RCPP-eligible working lands in Petaluma Watershed. Goals of streamflow improvement and sediment reduction. Katie is working with Kendall on the Baylands project to do some town hall community meetings and discuss concerns and plans for future projects in that area. Sonoma RCD has been working to develop a virtual education program based on Open Field Farm in West Petaluma.

The notes and discussions outlined below are not comprehensive, not exact quotes, and may not thoroughly describe the entire conversation of the Collaborative. The purpose of the notes are to provide an overview of items discussed, action items, spirit of the discussion, and serve as a reminder for any next steps needed. Please contact the Collaborative Coordinator for clarification.

ii. **Petaluma Watershed Enhancement Plan Update** (information/discussion)

- SRCD got an extension from BOR to have longer to work on the deliverables of the contract.
- BOR also granted SRCD approval to hire a writing consultant to help with the plan.

iii. **Top Ten Projects Procedure** (action)

- Using Screen Share, Katie Robbins presented the top ten projects procedure document, including a change she proposed to the language to avoid binding the collaborative to complete the top 10 projects.
- Katie Robbins recommended approving this change
- The group agreed with this change, nodding and giving thumbs-up.

iv. **Project Submission Form** (action)

- Using Screen Share, Katie Robbins gave a quick review of the Project Submission Form
- Recommend Approving this online survey.
- Andy Rogers suggested providing context and clarity to the community. Andy thinks we should provide background to the potential survey respondents, so all are aware of the intent behind the projects, and not a hidden attempt to do “data-mining” or an attempt to charge landowners extra fees or taxes.
- Susah Haydon: keep your direction and intent as simple, clear, and apparent as possible. Make language as approachable and clear as you can.
- Andy: recommend running this form by anyone who isn’t familiar with watershed jargon.
- KR asked the group if there were any objections to publishing a survey like this?
- Group says it sounds good, but timing is important.
- To get the word out takes time. That alone could take a month.

v. **Project Scoring and Ranking** (action)

- Using Screen Share, Katie Robbins provided an orientation/summary of the Project Scoring and Ranking Sheet, which is an Excel document. She explained the use for some of the components of the Scoring and Ranking Sheet. Katie Robbins recommended approving.
- Katie Robbins asked the group if they foresee any potential roadblocks in the project, based on the group’s previous experience with project scoring and ranking processes.
- Sara Azat recommended getting together before the final scoring and talking out the process with stakeholders, because many ranking items might be open to interpretation.
- John Shribbs recommended testing out the spreadsheet by working backwards and running a few known (or finished) projects through the project scoring/ranking form to see if the form favors the desired attributes of a potential project. E.g. how well would the concept of the finalized Denman Reach project score if we run it through this spreadsheet?
- Eric R. from MALT thinks the form is already looking good, but some “sensitivity testing” could be valuable to refine the spreadsheet and help figure out what may need to be tweaked. Also, different people will score subjective attributes differently.
- Susan H: We should take all numeric rankings generated by self-scoring with a grain of salt and recognize that each person will score subjective questions differently. Asking specific questions will get us specific answers and asking general questions will yield more general answers. We should aim for a flexibility by starting with broader questions, and then categorizing from there.
- Katie’s idea: We should have a volunteer core team do the initial review of project submission, then bring the top 15 or so projects to the greater group.
- The collaborative thinks the existing project scoring and ranking sheet is a good sheet to have the core team within the stakeholder group work on internally.

The notes and discussions outlined below are not comprehensive, not exact quotes, and may not thoroughly describe the entire conversation of the Collaborative. The purpose of the notes are to provide an overview of items discussed, action items, spirit of the discussion, and serve as a reminder for any next steps needed. Please contact the Collaborative Coordinator for clarification.

- Susan Haydon ran the Denman Reach Project through the Project Scoring and Ranking tool, and reported her ranking experience and observations with the group. She was comfortable with the process and the tool.

vi. **Upcoming Stakeholder Involvement** (discussion)

- Community Outreach
 - Letting the community know what our efforts are
 - Virtual town hall meetings
- Project Ranking
 - Taking the submitted projects and having a core team rank them by using the Project Scoring and Ranking Excel sheet.
- Project Development
 - Developing selected projects.
- Katie Robbins asked the group if anyone is available to be a part of the process. She also requested any general feedback, ideas, or advice on this.
- Since so many people are missing from the stakeholder group meeting because of the holidays, Emmanuel Ursu recommended sending out a survey to request availability. Sara Azat agreed.
- The most efficient way of reviewing this project will probably only result in about 1-2 days of volunteer time from core team members.

Meeting Adjourned 2:46 PM