Bolinas Community Public Utility District A Special Meeting Of The Board Of Directors September 22, 2021 270 Elm Road, Bolinas

In compliance with local and state shelter-in-place orders, and as allowed by the Brown Act as currently in effect under the State Emergency Services Act, the Governor's Emergency Declaration related to COVID-19, and the Governor's Executive Order N-29-20 (March 17, 2020), the BCPUD did not offer an in-person meeting location for the public to attend this meeting. The meeting was conducted by the BCPUD Board, staff and public via Zoom.

1. Call to Order.

7:30 p.m.

2. Roll.

Directors Comstock, Siedman, Smith, and Walker present, director Godino absent; president Siedman presiding.

3. Community Expression.

None.

4. Request from the Stinson Beach Fire Protection District and Stinson Beach Village Association for the BCPUD to Co-Sign a Letter to the National Park Service Concerning Proposed Parking Fees in Golden Gate National Recreation Area parking lots.

Staff reported that the BCPUD has been asked to co-sign a letter prepared by the Stinson Beach Fire District and Stinson Beach Village Association in opposition to a proposal by the National Park Service to impose parking fees in the parking lots serving the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. Those entities oppose the parking fees because they believe visitors would then seek free parking in the adjacent communities, potentially leading to a dramatic increase in vehicles blocking emergency vehicle access and parking in high fire danger zones. In addition, there is a concern the fees would disproportionately impact lower income visitors to the park at Stinson Beach. The letter asks that the National Park Service thoroughly review these concerns and also extend the public comment period by one month to allow local businesses and community members sufficient time to comment. A brief discussion ensued, during which directors Siedman and Walker expressed their support for the draft letter.

K. Walker/D. Smith four in favor, Godino absent authorizing the BCPUD to co-sign the letter to the National Park Service concerning proposed parking fees in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area parking lots.

5. BCPUD Project to Add Two Emergency Groundwater Sources of Supply to the BCPUD's Water System: *Staff Recommendation to Proceed with Installation of Project.*

Staff introduced Allan Richards of Stetson Engineers and Rob Gailey, consulting hydrogeologist, who jointly prepared the BCPUD's recently-approved applications to the State Water Resources Control Board ("SWRCB") to add two emergency groundwater wells to the BCPUD's water system. Staff said that the current drought as well as scientific predictions concerning the impact of climate change in California – including but not limited to data suggesting surface water sources, particularly reservoirs, could be hard hit – makes clear that diversifying the sources in the district's water system will render it more resilient to future challenges. Staff therefore recommends that the Board authorize the district to proceed with the installation of the groundwater wells.

Allan Richards has been with Stetson Engineers since 1993 and has worked with the Stinson Beach County Water District since 2003 on many projects, including several groundwater well installations, experience which is directly relevant to the BCPUD's current projects. Allan shared his screen to show the Board the schematic drawings for both of the proposed groundwater wells and the location of related infrastructure, including but not limited to underground piping, water storage tanks, treatment systems and fencing plans for each of the wells. Allan presented a preliminary cost estimate to bring each of the wells on line – approximately \$130,000 for the Resource Recovery well and approximately \$70,000 for the Wharf Road well – which he emphasized are "budget level estimates" based on the general site plans and schematics required by the SWRCB and not cost estimates for bidding purposes.

Director Godino joined the meeting.

In response to questions from Director Walker, Allan said that he would recommend for now that the district add a 15% contingency to the budget-level cost estimates because there will be additional design

elements to factor in if the Board decides to proceed with the project; he emphasized that his cost estimates are not "design level" estimates because the ultimate design for each system has not yet been finalized. Director Walker said it is important for the Board to understand that the estimates are conceptual at this time and there could be as much as a 15% adjustment in the final cost. Director Siedman noted that a 15% contingency would place the two projects together at about \$230,000; he suggested the Board work with this as the current cost estimate, with the understanding that this number could change over time if the project proceeds. Arianne Dar commented that the Bolinas Community Land Trust ("BCLT") may be able to help with certain of the costs relating to the Wharf Road well as there are components that the BCLT will need to fund in any event relating to its affordable housing development at the site, such as electrical service to the property.

Director Comstock said he is strongly in favor of the district developing back-up water sources for its system. That said, he noted that there seem to be significant differences between the two groundwater wells in terms of the amount of potential water they are likely to provide and in terms of cost. It appears that the Wharf Road well is more productive, but it has not been used or studied over time, whereas the Resource Recovery well is less productive but has been studied for many years now, so the projected flow rates are likely very reliable. Also, the development of the Resource Recovery well is about two times that of the Wharf Road well, primarily due to the recommended UV disinfection treatment process. Allan Richards confirmed that the costs of the UV system is approximately \$60,000; he is recommending a multi-barrier disinfection process for this well in an abundance of caution due to its construction as an irrigation well (so its sanitary seal is less than 50 feet deep) and its location.

Discussion ensued among Board members about the necessity for the UV treatment process given the additional cost and given the fact that disinfection via chlorination already is planned. Director Smith noted that the district's SWRCB regulator commented that this source may not need UV treatment in addition to chlorination and indicated that he agrees with this assessment; he noted that chlorination is the sole disinfection process used at the water treatment plant and it fully removes the pathogens from the creek and reservoir water. Director Godino said she feels the district should be quite cautious given that the piping from this well runs through the sewer pond property on its way to Mesa Park. Chief Operator Stew Oakander concurred and stated that, in terms of pathogens, wastewater effluent is very different from the contaminants found in natural surface water systems such as the Arroyo Hondo; as such, he favors including the UV process. Rob Gailey noted that the Drinking Water Source Assessments for this well identifies the nearby sewer force main as a potential vulnerability and, in fact, there was a recent leak on the force main at this location, which also argues in favor of a multi-barrier process. Following a brief discussion, all directors expressed support for installing the UV treatment system.

In response to questions from director Comstock about potential complications the district should prepare for due to the addition of two new water sources, Allan Richards said he does not expect any, commenting that the Stinson Beach County Water District has a variety of surface and groundwater sources in its system that operate similarly to how the district's two wells will operate within the existing water system. Allan said the Resource Recovery well water will be pumped into the existing distribution system on Mesa Road and will comingle with water from the district's water storage tanks throughout the distribution system, no change in pressure within the system will result. With regard to the Wharf Road well, its water will be entering at a different pressure zone in the system and will comingle only in that downtown pressure system; a pressure reducing valve and pressure switch will be installed to ensure this lower pressure zone doesn't get over-pressurized.

Discussion turned back to the engineer's cost estimate for the two projects. Director Walker expressed concern that the 15% contingency previously discussed seems very high and said she doesn't feel comfortable approving a project without better certainty on the cost. Staff explained that cost estimates will be defined as the design is finalized and specific costs are better known. As Allan explained, the estimates at this point are "budget level" and by definition not precise. Staff said the district generally follows this process when starting projects – a budget level estimate is obtained, then the design process refines the likely costs, then the project is bid and if the low bid is accepted, the construction costs are then known. Staff requested Board approval to proceed with the project assuming a budget-level cost estimate of \$230,000 at this point in time. Allan Richards noted that a fair amount of preparatory work can be done by BCPUD staff, such as the tie-ins to the existing mains, and transporting the storage tanks from Stinson Beach and installing them at the well locations. In the meantime, he will be obtaining specific quotes from equipment suppliers and subcontractors and will update his cost estimates as needed.

L. Comstock/G. Godino four in favor, director Walker abstaining to authorize the district to proceed with the installation of the two emergency groundwater wells at an estimated cost of \$230,000.

6. BCPUD Resolution 692: Declaring that an Emergency Exists, Waiving the Competitive Bid Process and Authorizing a Sole Source Contract for the Immediate Repair of the Woodrat 1 Reservoir Overflow Pipeline and Finding that the project is Statutorily Exempt under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), Section 15269(b) (emergency repairs to publicly owned service facilities necessary to maintain service essential to public health, safety or welfare). Staff reminded the Board that a recent video inspection of the overflow pipe at the Woodrat 1 Reservoir indicates that it is in urgent need of repair so staff is requesting that the Board approve BCPUD Resolution 692, which sets out the findings in support of an emergency declaration and a waiver of the competitive bid process to install an immediate repair. Staff is further requesting that the Board find this project to be statutorily exempt under CEQA Section 15269(b) as set out in BCPUD Resolution 692.

D. Smith/L. Comstock all in favor to approve BCPUD Resolution 692, finding that an emergency exists, waiving the competitive bid process, and authorizing a sole source contract for the immediate repair of the Woodrat 1 Reservoir Overflow Pipeline.

L. Comstock/D. Smith all in favor finding that the project is statutorily exempt under CEQA Section 15269(b).

7. BCPUD Comment letter re: Critical Infrastructure at Risk: Sea Level Rise Planning Guidance for California's Coastal Zone; Public Review Draft Released by the California Coastal Commission on August 16, 2021; Comment Deadline September 24, 2021.

Staff reported that the Coastal Commission guidance document is 224 pages long and, with only a few weeks allowed for public comment, staff has not had sufficient time to prepare a responsible response. Staff checked with some of the neighboring districts and, with the drought and on-going pandemic, it does not appear that anyone else nearby is intending to comment. Staff does not have a draft comment letter to recommend at this time.

8. Other Business.

a. Warrants.

L. Comstock./G. Godino all in favor to approve the warrant list.

b. Scheduling of Next Meeting(s).

Special Board meeting to visit the Arroyo Hondo water source: October 11, 2021 at 12:00 noon. Regular Board meeting October 20, 2021 at 7:30 p.m.

9. Adjournment.

8:51 p.m.