Bolinas Community Public Utility District A Special Meeting Of The Board Of Directors July 9, 2019 270 Elm Road, Bolinas

1. Call to Order.

11:30 a.m.

2. Roll.

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

3. Community Expression.

Alicia Gamez was present; she said she is a part-time resident of Bolinas and she thanked the district for sending her a copy of the meeting agenda as she was able to arrange her schedule to attend. Ms. Gamez said she is concerned about the integrity of the water moratorium and has questions about BCPUD policy regarding the number of units allowed on one water meter. She said there are a lot of rumors circulating in town and asked if the district would be willing to issue a statement of policy, or clarification of existing policy, as that would be much appreciated. In response to a question from director Siedman, Ms. Gamez explained that she would like to understand the BCPUD policy applicable to proposed developments with multiple units, especially given that forecasts are not optimistic with regard to water supplies in the future.

Director Siedman explained the BCPUD's limited water use permit procedures, whereby property owners seeking permits from the County of Marin to develop their property must apply to the BCPUD for a limited water use permit, regardless of the purpose or scope of the proposed development. He explained that the County has jurisdiction over planning, zoning and building issues (such as whether a multiple unit project is an allowable land use), not the BCPUD. The BCPUD's role in connection with development projects is limited to monitoring and permitting water use and enforcing compliance with the terms of its limited water use permits – the BCPUD has no role in stipulating *how* the water is used. In response to additional questions from Ms. Gamez, staff explained that the BCPUD regularly monitors water use throughout the district and, if a customer is out of compliance with the terms of a limited water use permit (i.e., is using more water than permitted), the BCPUD issues a notice of non-compliance with the ultimate sanction being termination of water service. Staff said no water service has been terminated for this reason as of yet because the district has been able to work with customers exceeding their limits to bring their water use down and comply with the terms of their permits.

Ms. Gamez inquired where the town is with regard to water consumption vis-à-vis a sustainable use of this resource. Staff explained that the district is in compliance with all of its water licenses (i.e., not diverting more water than allowed) and noted that water consumption throughout the district has declined by about 25-30% following the comprehensive rationing imposed by the district in 2009 (after three successive years of drought). Staff noted at that time many customers replaced/installed low flow fixtures and appliances, and many also installed water catchment systems to store rainwater for landscape irrigation, all of which have contributed to the overall reduction in water use. Director Siedman explained that anyone with concerns about the specifics of any particular development project is always able to take their concerns to the County and he noted the average water use in town is 1800 cubic feet per quarter, or 150 gallons per day per property.

Ms. Gamez thanked the Board for the information and said she does not know if these details about the BCPUD's role are generally known in the community. She said that she hears a lot of concerns being expressed about the sustainability of the town's water supply in light of several proposed mulit-unit developments. Staff said the district is able to provide water to meet the current demand within the terms of the district's water licenses and noted that the limited water use permit process is a key way the district manages water use; limited water use permits are required regardless of the type of development proposed (i.e, single-use or multi-use projects). A brief further discussion ensued, during which director Comstock underscored the points made during the discussion, to wit: BCPUD has jurisdiction over the water connections and volume of water only, all other decisions as to a proposed development project, including but not limited to number of units allowed, are the responsibility of the County of Marin.

4. BCPUD's East Tank Rehabilitation Project: Contractor's Cost Proposals for Repair of Tank Roof.

Director Siedman said the Board has two proposals in its binders for the repair of the tank roof. Staff reminded the Board that, as previously reported, the sandblasting and inspection work conducted to-date confirms that approximately 46% of the roof of the East Tank needs to be replaced or repaired. The contractor solicited a proposal from a tank repair subcontractor, Paso Robles Tank, which is approximately \$118,000. Staff noted this company is located in the Central Valley and the cost proposal does not include the transportation and related costs that would be incurred by the district's coating

inspectors to oversee the work. The second proposal is approximately \$600 higher and the current contractor, Piazza Construction, would do the work with Irish & Sons Welding (based in Marin). The steel plates would be fabricated and coated by Abrasive Blasting & Coating in Vallejo, approximately 20 minutes away from the district's coating inspectors. On balance, the district's engineer and staff recommended accepting the second proposal as the overall cost to the district would be lower due to the proximity of the subcontractors and coating inspector.

Discussion ensued during which director Smith expressed shock at the \$118,000 additional cost and suggested that an asphalt shingle roof would be only about \$5-10 per square foot whereas this proposal is almost \$50 per square foot. Given that the purpose of the roof is to keep dirt and other contaminants out of the water, he said, it seemed to him that an asphalt single roof should be considered. Chief Operator Bill Pierce said he does not believe such a roof is allowed anymore (they historically were used on redwood storage tanks) and likely would need to be replaced relatively soon anyway due to the corrosive environment inside the tank that would rot the wood. Also, he noted that the roof would need to be reframed as the steel rafters are too widely-spaced to support a wooden roof. Director Comstock said he has never seen a water storage tank for treated water with an asphalt shingle roof; he noted the district can inquire with its engineer as to whether this is a viable idea, but he would prefer to select a proposal to authorize the work to proceed (as proposed, with a repaired steel roof) in order to get the project completed as soon as possible.

The Board discussed the anticipated lifespan of a repaired steel roof, corrosion protection, and maintenance activities the district should consider to best preserve the rehabilitated tank going forward. Staff assured the Board that the district's coating inspector is on site every day blasting and/or coating work occurs to ensure the blasting and coating process is completed appropriately to protect against corrosion. Director Comstock requested that staff solicit a recommendation as to how frequently the tank should be inspected once the rehabilitation is completed. Staff agreed and also noted that a 1 and 3 year inspection is built into the contract to be consistent with the warranties. Staff reminded the Board that this tank was identified as problematic (including the roof) based on an inspection in 2014 and was prioritized over the West Tank for rehabilitation based on this professional assessment of their respective conditions at that time.

Director Siedman said he was prepared to call the question based on director Comstock's preference to select a proposal and authorize the recommended work to proceed because time is of the essence and staff is requesting authorization to proceed. In response to questions from director Amoroso, staff said approximately \$12,000 of the \$20,000 contingency built into the contract has been spent on work approved via change orders (i.e., the installation of a second manway, security features for the access ladder), so \$8,000 remains to be applied to the \$118,000 additional cost. The district will need to loan itself the excess funds needed to pay for this roof repair from its water reserves and then collect funds to replenish those reserves over time in upcoming budget cycles.

L. Comstock/V. Amoroso three in favor, director Smith abstaining and director Godino absent to select the roof repair proposal submitted by Piazza Construction to be paid for by the district's water reserves which shall then be replenished over time.

5. Adjournment.

12:11 p.m.