

*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, May 1, 2020 \* 1:00PM – 3:00PM

### **Zoom Video Call**

Present at Meeting: Ryan Watanabe (CDFW), Emmanuel Ursu (City of Petaluma Planning Dept.), Katie Thompson (City of Petaluma Public Works), Andy Rogers (FOPR), Stephanie Bastionon (FOPR), Sara Azat (NMFS), David Keller (Petaluma River Council), John Shribbs (PWA), David Keller (Petaluma River Watershed Council) Charlie Schneider (RETU), Sarah Phillips (RETU), Drew Loganbill (NRCS), John Parodi (Point Blue), Gina Graziano (Point Blue), Scott Dusterhoff (SFEI), Susan Haydon (Sonoma Water), Shannon Drew (SRCD), Katie Robbins (SRCD)

### **I. Roll Call and Roundtable**

#### **a. Watershed updates from Stakeholders**

- i. Katie Robbins (SRCD) Collaborative Updates: Petaluma River community meeting was canceled and will likely be rescheduled once it is safe. Sonoma-Marin Fairgrounds will likely be the meeting site.
- ii. Sara Azat (NMFS): Mandatory telework at NMFS, not approved for field work
- iii. Stephanie Bastianon (FOPR): Gave updates on Friends of Petaluma River.
- iv. Andy Rodgers (FOPR): Working on developing Sustainability Criteria for the Groundwater Sustainability Plans.
- v. Drew Loganbill (NRCS): NRCS is in the progress of hiring new staff and trying to aid ag producers.
- vi. David Keller (Petaluma River Council): Updates on the Dutra construction site. Concerns about the reindustrialization of the upper marsh. There are protests of the EIR for the planned housing project in the Corona reach of the Petaluma River.
- vii. John Parodi (Point Blue): PB is beginning to do restoration projects again.
- viii. Gina Graziano (Point Blue): PB is working to stay connected with teachers and students during lockdown weeks.
- ix. Sarah Phillips and Charlie Schneider (TU): “Steelhead in the Classroom” program is being held offline.
- x. Susan Haydon (Sonoma Water): SCWA and partner organizations hit a milestone with the Denman reach project, and sediment removal in and around the Corona reach. Funding from SWRCB for implementation projects is going to roll out soon.
- xi. John Shribbs (Petaluma Wetlands Alliance): Been reviewing the hazard mitigation plan for potential flooding and high tides due to climate change.

### **II. Review BOR Project Components**

#### **a. Please see power point to review information regarding the following:**

- i. Petaluma Watershed Collaborative
- ii. Action Plan (includes Top 10 list)
- iii. Complete Petaluma Watershed Enhancement Plan
  1. Katie Robbins (KR) compared the attributes of the action plan and the watershed enhancement plan.

*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.*

Action Plan	Watershed Enhancement Plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Start from scratch</li><li>• Based around Top Ten list</li><li>• Directs future work of Collaborative</li><li>• End product = Funding ready projects</li><li>• Goal is implementation</li><li>• Management AND Restoration</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Completes the previous <i>draft</i> version</li><li>• Relates to interest of all stakeholders</li><li>• Identifies problems and needs within the watershed from existing information</li></ul>

- b. Next, KR presented a timeline of progress goals and deadlines of both the enhancement plan and action plan. The chart included both internal deadlines and submission deadlines to BOR (included within power point).
- c. Susan Haydon inquired about how ready a project needs to be at the time of submission to BOR. KR answered that the contract says that project descriptions should be “funding-ready” when the Collaborative submits them. KR also mentioned that there is now a new manager for this grant at BOR.
- d. John Shribbs asked if addressing current construction projects in the watershed could be made into one of the items on the Top 10 list. Katie suggested that investigating and dealing with impacts of projects could potentially be an item that the group includes.
- e. KR introduced an idea that she has worked on with Stephanie Bastianon and Susan Haydon to discuss how the collaborative group will determine framework for developing the criteria for the top 10 list.
- f. Susan from Sonoma Water gave a presentation on a previous Storm Water Resource Plan (please see power point slides for more information).
  - i. SWRP was a program with the state water board which looked at water quality and supply issues through local implementation projects.
  - ii. The state created 5 buckets, “Benefit Categories” for potential projects:
    - Water Quality
    - Water Supply
    - Flood Management
    - Environmental (in the context of ecological health)
    - Community.
  - ii. The SWRP team developed a 3-step process for screening projects for eligibility.
    - Step 1 = Basic Screening
    - Step 2 = Initial Quantification (to evaluate benefits from a numeric benefit)
    - Step 3 = Detailed Quantification
  - iii. Susan suggested a starting point to the group in their efforts to assemble the Top 10 list. She suggested that group members look at the many projects outlined in the SWRP and Hydrology report and see if the group wants to bring any of those projects into the Top 10 list. Then, later, bring forward important projects NOT described in the SWRP.

*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.*

### III. Generate Next Steps for Action Plan Items

- a. Katie asked the group if they liked the strategy of looking at the projects identified in the SWRP as the starting point in writing the Top 10 project list.
- b. The group discussed:
  - i. Andy asked what Katie thought of this approach, since she will be the one to take the lead on the process. Katie replied that she thinks it would be a good idea to use work that has already been done by partners to their advantage and to avoid reinventing the wheel.
  - ii. David Keller said that “Preservation,” in the context of protecting Petaluma Watershed land from excessive urban and industrial development, should have been included as one of the evaluation criteria of the SWRP presented by Susan. He opined that SCAPOSD should do more to address land conservation in the wetlands of Petaluma watershed.
  - iii. Stephanie B. suggested this need for land preservation could fall under the “Environment” category.
  - iv. Susan H. agreed with David on the importance of preservation.
  - v. David K. suggested the collaborative should use multiple approaches to come up with the list of projects, in which the group does a brainstorm to produce a raw list of projects in addition to evolving the process of developing the criteria.
- c. Katie Robbins asked for the group’s feedback on benefit categories. The starting point is the list of 5 benefit categories introduced in Susan Haydon’s presentation of the SWRP process.
- d. The group discussed:
  - i. David addressed the need to specifically identify goals within the Environment category, for example, methyl mercury pollution prevention.
  - ii. **Action Item:** Katie R. to distribute Susan Hayden’s presentation slides in a summary email.
  - iii. **Next step:** Katie to lead an online method of collaborating on the categories (using Google Docs, Surveys, etc).
  - iv. Andy Rogers indicated that “Public Health” is interwoven with the 4 other categories.
  - v. Katie R. addressed the difficulty of doing community engagement meetings (a step in the process of preparing the Top 10 list) considering the COVID-19 situation. Katie is going to decide whether to hold a remote/online community meeting OR wait until a safe time for a community meeting. This item is on the table for now.
  - vi. **Action Item:** KR to outreach to other stakeholders to solicit their participation in this collaborative process.

### IV. Develop Group Action Items for Watershed Enhancement Plan

- a. Katie Robbins summarized the remaining tasks and creating of action items for finishing the draft of the Watershed Enhancement Plan
  - i. Find data gaps that exist in the current draft of the Plan and work to fill them in with more info.
  - ii. Katie mentioned that the group will be developing a go-to document specifically listing data gaps. It will be very helpful if people who contribute to the list of data gaps are specific with their requests and provide explanation of where and why they feel more detail is needed.
- b. Katie Robbins lead the group through outline and asked group members to volunteer to work on each chapter of the Petaluma River Watershed Enhancement Plan.
  - i. Katie R. and Stephanie B. clarified that taking the lead on a section of a report is an invitation for you to source data and information from your connections and your organization, and other good reliable sources. You *individually* are not obligated to completely rewrite the section all by yourself. The overall purpose is to provide more or updated info. You can also volunteer to work on more than one section.

*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. Susan H. suggested referencing the SWRP for good outlining of Point and Non-Point Source Pollution.
- c. **Action Item:** Stakeholders to begin adding information into Petaluma Watershed Enhancement Plan from assigned Plan sections as discussed (please see document outlining assignments).