

Bolinas Community Public Utility District
A Regular Meeting Of The Board Of Directors
February 19, 2020 270 Elm Road, Bolinas

1. Call to Order.

7:30 p.m.

2. Roll.

Directors Amoroso, Comstock, Siedman, and Smith present; director Godino absent. Director Siedman presiding.

3. Manager's Report and Project Updates.

-- East Tank Rehabilitation Project.

Staff reported that the East Tank is back in service. Staff held a site meeting on January 30th with the project contractor, the coating subcontractor, the district's coating inspector and the district's project engineer to discuss the district's dissatisfaction with the appearance of the exterior paint job. The coating subcontractor immediately acknowledged the bottom third of the tank needs to be re-coated and will do so at no cost to the district. The district's engineer pointed to numerous issues with the coating on the top and middle thirds of the tank and said the best solution is for the coating subcontractor to apply a final full coating to ensure a uniform, professional appearance. Discussion ensued, during which the coating subcontractor pushed back and argued that the coating material was the problem due to the difficulty of application; the coating subcontractor said they would re-coat the middle and top thirds of the tank on a "time and materials" basis with no profit mark-up. The district's engineer said the district is not satisfied with the coating job at this point and it is the district's decision whether to accept it or not. After further discussion, it was agreed that the district's coating inspector will return and do a top-to-bottom inspection of all needed coating repairs and touch-ups on the tank exterior and, depending on the outcome of that inspection, either a full re-coating of the exterior will be done or a full re-coating of the bottom third of the tank will be done, with specific touch-ups as needed on the middle and top thirds. The coating manufacturer's representative will be requested to attend the follow-up site meeting at which this decision will be made.

-- Wastewater Pump Station Replacement Project.

Staff is scheduled to confer with the project engineers tomorrow morning to map out a final schedule for the project bid process.

-- Woodrat Reservoir Rehabilitation Project: Proposal from Moleaer.

Staff had a telephone conference yesterday with Eli Kersh, the district's limnology consultant, who has been negotiating on the district's behalf with Moleare, the nanobubble unit manufacturer, about the scope of a monitoring program to confirm the efficacy of the nanobubble process in the district's reservoir. Moleaere recently decided to purchase its own monitoring equipment, which it will lend to the district, thereby reducing monitoring costs by about half. Eli has submitted a monitoring proposal (with a cost of \$4,000) whereby he will install the equipment and conduct remote monitoring before (to obtain baseline information) and during (to measure progress) the nanobubble 3-month trial period; he will monitor for dissolved oxygen, temperature, PH, specific conductivity, total dissolved solids and turbidity. As for the nanobubble unit, Moleare agreed to provide a one-year warranty on the unit's parts. Staff said the financial "risk" to the district of proceeding with this project on a trial basis is half of the 30% downpayment (\$6,525) on the unit. As for the total potential cost of this project, the purpose of which is to improve the water quality in the Woodrat Reservoir by raising the dissolved oxygen levels, the cost includes \$21,750 for the nanobubble unit, plus \$4,000 for the monitoring. In addition, staff would like to remove the azolla vegetation from the surface of the pond before the nanobubble unit starts operating and presented a proposal from Aquasource to manually do so for a cost of \$5,000. Taking into consideration costs expended to date, the total project cost will be approximately \$35,750. The district has \$20,000 set aside for this project, so an additional \$15,750 will need to be budgeted to complete the project. Finally, staff reported that the district's regulator at the State Water Resources Control Board affirmed that no revision to the district's water system operating permit is needed for this project.

L. Comstock/D. Smith four in favor, director Godino absent authorizing staff to
 proceed with the Woodrat Reservoir Rehabilitation Project.

-- Alliance of Coastal Marin Villages.

Staff presented a series of comment letters submitted by coastal West Marin organizations and districts to the California Coastal Commission ("CCC") on its draft Strategic Plan for 2020-25. The common theme in these letters is that the draft Plan should include an acknowledgement of the need to

protect the special character of coastal communities that are popular destination points on the California coast, consistent with the Coastal Act. The BCPUD comment letter specifically encourages the CCC to focus its stated desire to expand visitation to the coast by directing that expanded visitation to areas of the coast which are not currently overburdened. One of the members of the Alliance of Coastal Marin Villages (“ACMV”) watched the February 2020 CCC hearing at which the draft Plan was preliminarily presented and concluded it had been wise for the ACMV and other West Marin organizations to submit their letters directly to each of the Commissioners because it became clear that CCC staff had not provided any of the 24 comment letters received thus far to the CCC. The ACMV member reported that two of the Commissioners (Mike Wilson from Humboldt Bay and Katie Rice from Marin) specifically referred to the comment letters in their remarks.

With regard to water operations, staff directed the Board’s attention to the water consumption data in the Board binders which indicates that consumption was up on the mid-Mesa as compared to the same quarter last year. However, this increase is explained by two large leaks that occurred (combining for a total water loss of 36,600 cubic feet or 273,768 gallons). When these leaks are taken into account, water consumption actually was down as compared to the same time last year.

Staff noted that the SWRCB issued a draft report on small water systems and vulnerability to drought and water shortage vulnerability which is out for public comment.

The district’s operations staff is working on tasks to protect the district’s distribution infrastructure, including but not limited to locating and raising valves (many of which become buried over time in the dirt roads on the Mesa), protecting hydrants by installing bollards, and replacing old water meters as needed. Staff continues to receive complaints about kids riding dirt bikes recklessly through the district’s Sewer Pond property despite having posted signs on the property and despite having reached out via social media to try and stop this behavior. Staff suggested it may be time for the Board to send a letter to the Mesa Park Board to request assistance in communicating with the riders since most of them are going through the Sewer Pond property to get to the dirt bike area at Mesa Park. Discussion ensued and director Smith suggested that Dave Duffin and other folks involved with the dirt bike program may be more helpful; director Comstock said he thinks the kids riding these dirt bikes will respond to requests from people they know.

The Marin County Department of Public Works (“DPW”) has responded to staff’s request for drainage improvements on Overlook Road. DPW intends to monitor this location during storms but noted that thus far there has not yet been a significant enough rain event to warrant monitoring. DPW also will ask the maintenance crews currently in town to assess whether there is anything they can do in this area to help.

Staff reported that the Marin County Board of Supervisors has enacted the overnight parking regulations applicable to downtown Bolinas on a 2-year trial basis. On a separate topic, staff said the district received a copy of a letter issued to 20 Ocean Avenue from the County’s Code Enforcement Office requiring all occupants to vacate as the property is dangerous and unsafe for human occupation.

Staff requested the Board’s input on a potential violation of district’s rules and regulations at 79 and/or 81 Crescente. In 1989, the Board approved the transfer of a water meter off of 79 Crescente to another property on the Little Mesa; subsequently, in 1992, a leak occurred at 81 Crescente and it was revealed that the owner had reestablished water service to 79 Crescente by connecting the plumbing. Correspondence from the district to the owner of 81 Crescente at that time ordered the immediate disconnection of water service to 79 Crescente and the district ultimately inspected that this had been done. However, a recent real estate notice advertising these properties for sale seems to indicate the water service to 79 Crescente may have been reestablished. If so, this would be a violation of district rules prohibiting the extension of water lines to a separate assessor parcel. After a brief discussion, it was agreed that Staff will investigate the matter.

Staff directed the Board’s attention to correspondence in the Board binders between the district and certain customers concerning their water usage, leaks and/or violations of limited water use permits. Director Smith noted that a property on Altura received a notice of non-compliance with a limited water use permit but also had a leak at the property and he inquired if the leak was the cause of the non-compliance; staff affirmed that it was and the leak has been repaired. Finally, staff reported that the office staff has been updating and making minor corrections to typos on the district’s website; if the Board members note anything on the district’s website in need of attention, please let staff know.

4. Community Expression.

Director Smith said he would like staff to include an item on the April meeting agenda for the Board to discuss possible amendments to BCPUD Resolution 553 concerning financial relief from quarterly water bills; staff agreed to do so.

5. Request to Remove Political Signage from Trees On or Adjacent to BCPUD property at the Intersection of Olema-Bolinas and Mesa Roads (M. Marin).

Mindy Marin requested that the Board take action to prohibit people from posting political signs on public property in town. Director Siedman said the town seems to have come full circle: for decades the townspeople opposed any signs in town and now the townspeople are erecting signs themselves! He said he personally does not think the BCPUD should get involved in the regulation of political speech. Director Smith said the signs may be on County property, so perhaps Mindy could contact the County DPW. Discussion ensued and the directors noted that the Board has no objection to the signs coming down, if that should happen, but the district is not going to get involved.

6. Request for Financial Relief from Quarterly Water Bill pursuant to BCPUD Resolution 553 – 156 Alder Road (C. Simeone).

Director Siedman recused himself from participation in this item.

Director Smith noted the house has been sold and inquired whether the new owner is responsible for the leak. Claire Simeone explained that the house indeed was sold in January, but the leak was discovered when the final bill was issued (for water use up to the effective date of sale) and it was enormous. She said she was shocked as the house was formally inspected at the end of May and she was there throughout July to clear out the house. It turns out there was a toilet leak in a second unit that was not being used, so no one heard the toilet running. Claire noted that her water bill in the beginning of October was a bit higher than usual, but she attributed that to landscape watering. Subsequently, the water meter was turned off somehow, likely when the meter was replaced; it was then turned back on late in the year when Claire discovered it had been turned off. After Claire received the final bill, she immediately communicated back with the district and new owners and ultimately it became clear there was a faulty toilet, which the new owners have replaced.

Director Smith said the Board normally approves a 25% reduction for toilet leaks because the expectation is that a homeowner should be aware of such a leak and able to repair it before it gets out-of-hand. However, he noted that in this case there were extenuating circumstances involved in getting the house ready for sale and difficulty identifying where the leak occurred, so he suggested the Board modify its usual practice to grant a 75% reduction. Director Comstock said he agrees with this approach in this case; in general, he does not agree with the concept of granting 100% relief, but he will go along with a 75% reduction due to the extenuating circumstances.

L. Comstock/ D. Smith three in favor, director Godino absent, director Siedman recused to forgive 75% of the amount of the bill attributable to the leak as determined by the historical water use at this property during the same quarter during the last three years.

7. Request for Financial Relief from Quarterly Water Bill pursuant to BCPUD Resolution 553 – 460 Birch Road (R. Borrone).

Roy Borrone said he is not sure what happened and he feels terrible about the water loss. He said his neighbor walked by his home and heard water running; he entered the yard and discovered a hose running. Bob turned off the water and called Roy to let him know. Roy said that roofers had been at the house, but they would have no reason to turn on the water. He said a tenant across the street told him that she saw the gate to his property open at one point and she went to shut it and saw kids running off the property. Roy said he does not live at the house full time but comes frequently (although less in recent times due to medical issues). In response to a question from director Comstock, Roy said he is quite sure there wasn't a leak at the property; he said perhaps he should remove the handles on the outside hose bibs. Director Siedman said it seems pretty clear someone came on to the property and turned on the water. The resulting bill was over \$4,000 (with more than 150,000 gallons of water lost).

Director Comstock said extenuating circumstances came into play here, with medical issues meaning Roy wasn't at the property as regularly as he surely would have caught this, and also there is a historic of careful and very modest use of water at this property. However, this is a huge water loss, equal to nearly two days of consumption by the entire town. He said he would like to grant some relief from this bill, but the question is how much given the huge water loss. Discussion ensued about the appropriate percentage of relief to grant based on prior cases involving hoses left on at properties.

V. Amoroso/ D. Smith four in favor, director Godino absent to forgive 50% of the amount of the bill attributable to the leak as determined by the historical water use at this property during the same quarter during the last three years.

8. Request for Financial Relief from Quarterly Water Bill pursuant to BCPUD Resolution 553 – 250 Mesa Road (B. Hunt).

Barbara Hunt explained that she purchased the property in 2018 but she does not live there full-time. She rents a cottage on the property to a young couple and they did not realize that the garden hose for the cottage is supplied with BCPUD water whereas the garden hoses for the botanical gardens are served by a pond. The tenants extensively watered around their cottage, not realizing that they were using BCPUD water. In addition, Ms. Hunt explained that an underground water line had broken and was leaking for

quite a while before it was discovered and repaired. She apologized for the misunderstanding by the tenant and also for the water loss due to the leak.

Director Smith observed that the Board usually forgives 100% of the water loss attributable to a blind leak, but in this case the water also was mistakenly overused by a tenant who should have been informed that this was BCPUD water and been more careful. He therefore proposed “splitting the difference” and granting 50% relief. Director Comstock concurred with this approach, noting that water use at the property went back down during the next billing period and the water loss was not as large as the previous customer’s.

V. Amoroso/L. Comstock four in favor, director Godino absent to forgive 50% of the amount of the bill attributable to the leak as determined by the historical water use at this property during the same quarter during the last three years.

9. Second Notice of Non-Compliance with Terms of Limited Water Use Permit – 61 Crescente (S. Ganis).

David Adams indicated that he is present on behalf of the Ganis family. Director Siedman referenced a chart prepared by director Smith based on historic water use at the property and said, “can’t keep doing this.” David said he knows; he explained that he was hired as the property manager in June 2018 and based on his analysis of the water use information for the property, he believes the episodic non-compliance at this property is a summer irrigation issue. He is working with others on the gardening team and an irrigation specialist to address the issue. Director Smith inquired whether he has walked the lines on the irrigation system to ensure there are no leaks; David said yes, this is done each spring before the system is turned on for the season. He intends to turn the station on next week for the purpose of analyzing each station to calculate the amount of water used. Director Smith said that the system should be converted to drip irrigation (it currently is a spray irrigation system) as this would be much more water efficient. He noted the limited water use permit has a high limit (4,600 cubic feet/quarter) and during the summer the water use regularly is twice the limit, which is not acceptable.

Genie McNaughton inquired when the district would turn off the water for non-compliance at this property. Director Siedman noted that the property regularly comes back into compliance after the summer season, but perhaps the district needs to take action during the quarter in question. David Adams said he is confident the property can comply with the terms of the permit and committed to working with his team and district staff to ensure this. Director Smith said this is a second notice of non-compliance so the Board needs to decide now whether to take a further enforcement step -- shutting off the water may be the only way to get the message through to the property owners. Director Comstock said he would like to offer a less drastic approach; he suggested that Mr. Adams read the water meter on a monthly basis to make sure the property is within the limit and email the reading to the district each month so that the staff does not have to do so. David Adams said he would be happy to do this. Director Comstock said he wants to see a sustained period of compliance.

Director Comstock moved that BCPUD hold in abeyance any further enforcement action on the condition that the property owner send in monthly readings to show consistent compliance (1/3 of 4600 cubic feet). Director Amoroso noted that the exceedance is always in the June and/or September quarter. Discussion ensued, and the Board concluded it would be easiest to receive monthly readings (and not readings only during the summer and/or fall months), beginning March 1st. Director Siedman said any exceedance will be agendaized for Board action.

L. Comstock/D. Smith four in favor, director Godino absent holding in abeyance further enforcement action on the condition the property owner submits monthly meter readings to show the property is in compliance with the terms of its limited water use permit.

Director Smith noted that this is not the only property which has been repeatedly in violation of his or her limited water use permit during the summer and/or fall quarters; he said that per the district’s existing enforcement procedures, water use is averaged over two successive quarters to determine non-compliance, which seems to inadvertently allow this phenomenon of episodic non-compliance (i.e., a high water use quarter, typically in the summer, followed by a lower water use quarter). Director Smith suggested the Board review the enforcement notification process and potential revisions to it at the next regular Board meeting; in addition, he would like to discuss additional sanctions the Board might impose short of termination of water service and said the district may need legal advice on that question. After further discussion, the Board deferred these enforcement topics (i.e., revisions to current processes and scope of potential sanctions for non-compliance) to the Operations Committee for consideration and recommendation for action to the full Board.

10. Request to Transfer Water Service from APN# 191-261-21 (20 Oak Road) to “Floating” Status. (J. Wintersteen).

Director Siedman said that the owner of this property wishes to detach the water meter from the property as the house is about to be demolished as it is no longer habitable due to bluff erosion. Director

Amoroso said he did not see an issue under the circumstances; director Comstock concurred, noting the district has approved such requests in the past.

V. Amoroso/L. Comstock four in favor, director Godino absent to transfer the water service from APN# 191-261-21 to “floating status”.

11. 100 Brighton Avenue Seawall Repair Project: California Coastal Commission Permit Hearing, March 11 – 13, 2020; Update on “Special Conditions” Required for Permit; BCPUD status as co-applicant.

Anne Blemker with McCabe & Associates appeared by telephone; director Siedman explained that he just called the item for discussion and requested an update. Anne reported that the California Coastal Commission (“CCC”) staff released draft special conditions last week and will release the official staff report on February 21, 2020, with findings and justifications for all special conditions. On February 21st, the specific hearing date for the project also will be released – either March 11, March 12 or March 13 – and Anne noted that the project permit application must be heard before April 2nd per applicable law, but a 90-day extension of that date could be mutually agreed upon by the applicants and CCC staff.

Anne said that the CCC staff has issued 16 draft special conditions and many of them are problematic. First, the restriction on the width of the seawall to no more than 6 feet (and the accessways on each side be expanded to 6 feet from the proposed 4 feet in width). Directors Comstock and Amoroso said the width restriction would be unacceptable. Director Siedman inquired at this point about logistics: would representatives of the community need to attend the March hearing to oppose these conditions? Anne said yes, the hearing will be held in Scotts Valley near Santa Cruz; she noted that the property owner has not agreed to reduce the width of the wall any more than it already has proposed in its design drawing (i.e, a 7 foot width on the downcoast end and a 15 feet width on the upcoast end). Anne said the CCC staff special condition of a 6 foot maximum width appears to be based on the Bolinas Fire Protection District’s (“BFPD”) minimum width requirement for emergency access across the seawall, which is why the CCC staff also placed this width condition on the accessways on each side of the seawall.

Director Smith said the CCC staff’s special conditions completely ignore the public uses and recreational values of the seawall. Anne said the CCC staff views the seawall as a “private island of development” and if the seawall and home were not there, the beach would be there and available for the public to use. She said this is consistent with the CCC’s “managed retreat” philosophy. Director Smith said the special conditions are so onerous that they seem designed to stop the project so that the current wall deteriorates and the house eventually goes away; in contrast, the district as the local government representing the public know that this seawall is used every day by the public (locals and visitors alike), which is why the district agreed to participate in the project and does not believe it is in the public interest to allow it to deteriorate.

Director Comstock said he would like to bring forward a public benefit issue that hasn’t been a focus to date, which is: what is the value of the seawall as a seawall -- for protecting not only this house, but the properties behind it and the downtown altogether? For example, the CCC staff approach of managed retreat seems to be implying that if the seawall fails and the house is lost and beach is therefore created, the retreat will just stop there – but that isn’t realistic. He noted that the district has focused on the public *access* benefits of the seawall, but what about the additional public benefits to the community of the *protection* provided by the seawall? Director Comstock noted that the next agenda item raises the issue of the seawall that supports and protects Wharf Road and adjacent homes. He inquired whether the CCC should be confronted with the argument that this particular seawall has additional protective public benefits? He said the CCC staff clearly has taken the approach that armoring is “bad, per se” and that managed retreat is “good, per se”, but perhaps this should be challenged head-on.

Discussion ensued and Anne said that the analysis conducted to date is limited to the existing parcels (and the protection of the seawall for those parcels), but it seems a logical extension that if the existing parcels are protected the parcels behind them will be, as well.

Discussion turned back to the March hearing and Anne explained that the applicants have an automatic right of postponement but, because of the April 2nd deadline (which is 180-days after the project permit application has been deemed complete), the CCC would need to agree to any postponement past April 2nd. As such, the applicants would need to be very specific as to why a postponement is warranted, such as the fact that a more local venue would facilitate public participation in this matter; she noted there is a CCC hearing upcoming in June 2020 in Rohnert Park. Anne recommended the applicants wait until the staff report is issued on February 21st to make a decision in this regard. Director Siedman concurred and said that whenever the permit is going to be heard, some advance planning will be required to mobilize the community to attend.

Anne said that the property owner has strong concerns about many of the draft special conditions apart from the restriction on the width of the wall. She is scheduled to have a call with CCC staff to discuss the draft special conditions to try and negotiate on some of the conditions, but she is not particularly hopeful in that regard. Director Smith asked if CCC staff does not agree to make any

changes, can the applicants still bring the permit application as submitted to the Commissioners directly? Anne said yes, there are 12 voting members of the Commission and they make the decisions; however, she warned that the Commission almost never deviates from the CCC staff recommendations, which is why she would like to narrow the scope of difference with CCC staff as much as possible.

Director Comstock said that the district's focus is the public interest and the district does not think the CCC staff is acting in the public interest; he said this argument should resonate with the Commission. Director Smith said there is a special condition to remove all of the wooden pilings, planks and posts on the upcoast side of the project (on a separate assessor parcel); however, he said, these vestiges of old seawalls essentially are functioning as a groin by capturing sand and building beach. If the pilings, planks and posts are removed, the beach would disappear and it would be even harder for people to get upcoast; in addition, the bluff would be further threatened as would Terrace Avenue above. Director Smith said he does not see any basis for the CCC staff to insert this condition in to the project.

Anne said that all of these arguments and more can be made to the Commission when the permit application is considered; she advised that the district and property owner work closely together in a unified manner on a presentation to the Commission, even though there may be different priorities with regard to certain of the draft special conditions. Anne noted that one of the draft special conditions would require the removal of the property owners' "encroachments" (i.e., portions of a fence and a shed) onto the BCPUD parcel which were discovered when the property was surveyed; she said she hopes this can be resolved by an easement agreement allowing the encroachments to remain (a draft of that agreement is in progress). Anne noted that the CCC staff does not agree that BCPUD should allow the encroachments to remain, arguing that they impeded public views of the coast. Director Siedman requested that Anne keep the district updated and pledged to continue to work together on this project.

(cont'd) Request to Transfer Water Service from APN# 191-261-21 (20 Oak Road) to "Floating" Status. (J. Wintersteen).

Staff requested clarification with regard to the Board's action on item 10, above. Staff noted that when Board took action on a very similar request last May for a property on Rosewood Road, the Board conditioned approval on the owners' commitment to pay the annual fee directly to the BCPUD and maintain the water service as an active connection. In response to questions from the Board, staff reported that Mr. Wintersteen indicated during a conversation at the office (when he submitted the transfer request letter) that he did not wish to suspend the meter and staff noted County records indicate that a demolition permit has been issued to remove the home at 20 Oak Road. After a brief discussion, the Board directed staff to advise Mr. Wintersteen in a letter informing him that the Board approved the request and it is the district's understanding that the house will be demolished and that Mr. Wintersteen will pay the annual water service fee directly to the district henceforth.

12. Request for Letter from BCPUD to Marin County Department of Public Works re: Failure of Existing Concrete Vertical Seawall in the County-Owned Right-of-Way Along Wharf Road Adjacent to the Bolinas Lagoon and Need for Repair (C. Woodman, 79 Wharf Road).

Curtis Woodman appeared by telephone to discuss his request. Director Siedman said he went down to Wharf Road today to look at the conditions there, and he noted that the Board members have reviewed the photos and emails that Mr. Woodman submitted with his request. Director Siedman said he assumes that Mr. Woodman would like the BCPUD to write a letter alerting the County DPW to the apparent failing condition of the seawall, and he commented that the BCPUD has water and sewer utility infrastructure under Wharf Road at this location.

Mr. Woodman said that Wharf Road essentially is pushing his home (located just past the area of Wharf Road adjacent to the public boat dock where the County repaired the seawall a few years ago) toward the lagoon because the old historical seawall underneath the road, which is comprised of concrete and timbers, is failing. In the last 18-24 months, the process of the seawall failing is causing the road to buckle on the surface right in front of his house. He said that all of the property owners along Wharf Road agree that the failing seawall is a serious maintenance issue the County needs to address. Director Comstock requested clarification on exactly what needs to be done: rebuild and/or extend the seawall and then resurface the road? Director Siedman said it is plain to see that the road is fine where the County did the seawall repair project and starts failing right after that – it seems the request should be for the County to extend the seawall repair further down Wharf Road. Mr. Woodman said that the Rod & Boat Club is also experiencing problems with the road pushing against their building/deck; there are certain sections where the seawall is failing and they need to be addressed, it may not be necessary to do the entire length of the road. Director Amoroso suggested that other property owners on Wharf Road should get involved.

Mr. Woodman said there is excellent precedent for the County to take action to repair the failing section of the seawall because the California Coastal Commission already issued a permit for the prior project near the boat dock which recognizes the key public benefits of this road. Director Comstock said that he thinks the Board should begin with Supervisor Rodoni, not the County DPW office, because this project will require significant funding and a challenging permit process, notwithstanding the issuance of the earlier permit. Director Smith agreed with this suggestion and said he'd like to review the successful arguments made in favor of the earlier permit. Director Amoroso concurred and urged that as many local people as possible on Wharf Road should get involved. Director Comstock said that Supervisor Rodoni

will need to understand the potential scope and scale of the repair work needed. The Board directed staff to coordinate with other property owners along Wharf Road and Supervisor Rodoni to schedule a site meeting to evaluate the conditions and solicit his leadership. Mr. Woodman said he could allow access for the Supervisor via the dock on the side of his home to provide a good view of the seawall and its condition.

13. Recology Sonoma-Marin Decision to Cease Dropping Green Waste Collected in Bolinas at the Bolinas-Stinson Beach Resource Recovery Project Site.

Staff reported that for some time now, green waste collected in Stinson Beach no longer is dropped at the Bolinas-Stinson Beach Resource Recovery Project Site (“RRP”) because of the amount of food scraps in the green waste bins; the RRP is not permitted to accept food scraps so this material is being taken to Recology’s green waste facility at Redwood. Last summer, staff attended a meeting at the County where it was explained that state law soon will require solid waste haulers to offer curb-side food scrap collection and the only way to do that economically is via the green waste bins; as such, the district has been aware that it will need to plan for this transition and the loss of revenue to the RRP. However, it was a surprise to the district when Recology, beginning in November 2019, suddenly ceased bringing green waste collected in Bolinas to the RRP, so staff contacted Recology management. Discussions then occurred between staff and Recology management about what the franchise agreement does or does not allow and also about the company’s assurances at the time it acquired the franchise that its operations would remain as-is. Recology management committed to looking into the matter further and following up with the district.

Staff noted that even if this issue is resolved satisfactorily in the short-term, the pending change in law with regard to food scraps almost certainly will mean permanent changes for the RRP. Director Smith inquired whether there is any possibility the permit for the RRP can be amended to allow it to accept food scraps. Staff said that is not likely given the requirements for such facilities. Staff did a quick review of the finances of the RRP in recent years to anticipate the likely financial impact on the RRP from loss of revenue from Recology. Historically, the revenue received by RRP from Recology has been about 25-30% of its annual revenue; however, if less material is brought in, operating costs will be reduced as well. Discussion ensued about whether Recology can unilaterally alter the agreed-upon green waste dropoff site without any notice. Staff recommends that the Board request an explanation about what is going on; the Board agreed, noting that the RRP is the approved green waste disposal site per the franchise agreement.

14. Volunteer Committee Reports:

-- Resident Permit Parking Plan Committee: Minutes of the January 4, 2019 meeting of the Resident Permit Parking Plan Committee.

Director Smith noted that there is an error in the minutes of the Resident Permit Parking Plan Committee that needs to be removed: in item 7, the minutes erroneously state that “the community 50 years ago developed a legal mechanism to protect Bolinas from development” which is entirely inaccurate and perpetuates a misunderstanding of the water moratorium. The moratorium was put in place due to a water emergency arising from the limited nature of the district’s water source and *not* for the purpose of limiting development. He requested that this phrase be stricken from the committee minutes and that the committee be advised of the need to do so and why. The Board directed staff to email the committee members and advise them of the need to amend the meeting minutes.

-- Resource Recovery: Nothing further to report.

-- West Marin Mosquito Control Coordinating Council: Nothing to report.

-- Land Stewardship Committee: Nothing to report.

-- Internet Access Committee: Nothing to report.

15. Other Business.

a. Board Committee Reports.

-- Finance: The Finance Committee is scheduled to meet next Tuesday, February 25th at 11:00 a.m.

-- Legal: Nothing to report.

-- Mesa Septic, Flood Control and Roads: Nothing to report.

-- Operations: Minutes of the December 4, 2019 meeting of the Operations Committee.

Directors Smith and Comstock offered clarifying revisions to the draft minutes of the December 4, 2019 meeting of the Operations Committee.

L. Comstock/D. Smith four in favor, director Godino absent to approve the minutes
of the December 4, 2019 meeting of the Operations Committee, as amended.

-- *Park and Recreation*: Nothing to report.

-- *Personnel*: Nothing to report.

-- *Sewer*: Nothing to report

b. Minutes of the December 18, 2019 regular Board meeting; Minutes of the January 15, 2020 regular Board meeting; Minutes of the February 10, 2020 special Board meeting.

Director Smith and Amoroso offered clarifying revisions to the draft minutes of the December 18, 2019 regular Board meeting.

L. Comstock/D. Smith four in favor, director Godino absent to approve the minutes
of the December 18, 2019 regular Board meeting, as amended.

Director Amoroso offered clarifying revisions to the draft minutes of the January 15, 2020 regular Board meeting.

L. Comstock/V. Amoroso four in favor, director Godino absent to approve the minutes
of the January 15, 2020 regular Board meeting, as amended.

L. Comstock/D. Smith four in favor, director Godino absent to approve the minutes
of the February 10, 2020 special Board meeting.

c. Warrants.

D. Smith/L. Comstock four in favor, director Godino absent to approve the warrant
list.

d. Scheduling of Next Meeting(s):

March 18, 2020 at 7:30 p.m.

14. Adjournment.

10:06 p.m.