

Marin County Flood Control and Water Conservation District

**MINUTES OF THE
FLOOD ZONE 9 ADVISORY BOARD MEETING HELD
7:00 PM THURSDAY, APRIL 16, 2015
AT SAN ANSELMO TOWN HALL
525 SAN ANSELMO AVENUE, SAN ANSELMO**

Board Members Present

Tom McInerney (TM), Chairperson
Chris Martin (CM)
Peter Hogg (PH)
David Weinsoff (DW)
Richard Gumbiner (RG)
Sandra Goldman (SG)

District Staff Present

Craig Tackabery, Chief Assistant PW Director
Scott Lyle, Ross Valley Program Manager
Russ Eberwein, Senior Civil Engineer
Hugh Davis, Associate Civil Engineer
Laura Harnish, CH2M HILL Consultants
Alan Turner, CH2M HILL Consultants
Connie Gazaway, CH2M HILL Consultants
Ivy Morrison, Circlepoint
Emily Marsh, Circlepoint

Board Members Absent

Dan Hillmer (DH)

Item 1. Approval of meeting minutes for March 17, 2015

Action by Board: approve March 17, 2015 minutes as written.

M/S: RG/SG, **Ayes:** All, **Nay:** None, **Absent:** DH, **Abstain:** None

Item 2. Open time for items not on the agenda

Ann Morrison, a member of the Larkspur City Council, read a letter dated April 15, 2015 from Mayor Larry Chu and the Larkspur City Council to Chairman McInerney expressing its continued support for the flood control projects. A copy of the letter is attached to these minutes.

Nancy Oswald, San Anselmo, asked if there will be a petition requiring a vote to include Memorial Park detention basin in the flood control program. There has already been over \$400,000 spent and she thinks the Memorial Park project should be put on-hold until the vote is taken.

Item 3. Ross Valley Flood Protection and Watershed Program Updates

a) **Strategic Communication Plan Update**

Ivy Morrison of Circlepoint gave a presentation on the Strategic Communications & Implementation Plan, see [Circlepoint presentation materials dated April 16, 2015](#) and [Circlepoint draft strategic implementation plan dated April 2015](#). The presentation described the purpose of strategic communications, the tools used, and the three phase approach for communication on this program. TM asked if Circlepoint has the role of selling the program to the public? Ivy said no; their role is to clarify the language for the public and provide forums for public engagement.

Public comment was provided by Michael Mackintosh, Fairfax:

- Make sure the message is consistent for all and not tailored for individual communities.

Marin County Flood Control and Water Conservation District

Public comment was provided by Kathleen Lipinski, San Anselmo:

- How will you be funded beyond July 2015? Answer by Ivy Morrison: the goal is to have County staff use tools developed by Circlepoint and implement outreach communication plan after July 2015.

Public comment was provided by Guy Meyer, Fairfax:

- Mr. Meyer expressed that Circlepoint's role is to help the public visualize the government's vision and not the public's.

Public comment was provided by Bob Lewis, San Anselmo:

- How are target audiences and stakeholders being identified? Answer by Ivy Morrison: Circlepoint worked with District staff and community representatives to identify stakeholder groups that would be engaged as one of their first tasks.

b) Ad-Hoc Budget Subcommittee Update

District staff discussed a second meeting held by the Ad-Hoc Budget Subcommittee and District staff on April 6, 2015, [see Staff Report dated April 16, 2015](#). District staff will continue to develop 10-year budget projections for individual projects and for the overall program. They will be available on-line in May or June.

c) Flow Reduction Element Study

CH2M HILL Consultants Laura Harnish, Connie Gazaway, and Alan Turner, provided a presentation regarding the Flow Reduction Element Study elements eliminated due to fatal flaws, ranking of surviving elements, and combinations of elements into alternative programs, see [Staff Report dated April 16, 2015](#), [Presentation Materials dated April 16, 2015](#) and [Draft Ross Valley Flow Reduction Study-Deliverable 2 dated April 12, 2015](#).

TM asked where should community send comments regarding the study? Russ Eberwein said to send comments to him at reberwein@marincounty.org

PH asked if CH2M HILL will use Stetson's model to analyze the program alternatives? Answer by Laura Harnish: Yes. PH asked if the target flow reductions at different points in Ross Valley (reference to Figure 2 of Deliverable 2) are additive in the downstream direction (i.e. - need to be added to the target values indicated upstream)? Answer from Alan Turner: No. Target values are cumulative in the downstream direction.

SG stated that a steady-state model is fine for comparison purposes, but isn't a dynamic model needed to plan operation of the system? Answer by Alan Turner: This is true and Stetson has a dynamic model that they will use. SG asked if outreach has been done to the private property owners of the elements being considered? Answer by Scott Lyle: Yes, the owners were contacted so they are aware that the properties are being discussed as part of the flow reduction study, but they were not asked if they are opposed to detention basin improvements on their property.

DW asked why the owners have not been asked if they are open to the idea? If owners are not open, it may be fatal flaw and be a waste to analyze their sites as part of the program. Answer by Scott Lyle: Staff will follow-up with property owners that may be included as part of program alternatives.

Marin County Flood Control and Water Conservation District

TM asked how will CH2M HILL estimate the land acquisition costs of the private property? Answer by Connie Gazaway: The previous rating included assigning each element to a range of costs. The next estimates will include land costs at a planning level. Estimating land costs is a specialty and eventually a land appraiser may be needed.

DW asked that CH2M HILL keep in mind the letter from the City of Larkspur that supports flood control measures that provide economically feasible flood protection as soon as possible.

CM asked how CH2M HILL determined the storage capacity of the proposed detention basins? Answer by Alan Turner: They used the 2-foot contour maps provided by the County, sketched a proposed conceptual detention basin, and calculated the storage volume.

TM asked why the bypass conduit options scored low when they reduce flooding at one location? Answer by Alan Turner: The bypass conduits scored lower because they do not reduce flooding at downstream locations after the flow is returned to the natural channel. This program has a requirement to reduce the flow in the downstream portion to match the design flow of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Unit 4 project. Also, bypass conduits require a lot of existing utility relocation and a lot of public disruption during construction. TM asked if there are no additional channel improvements in the downstream area that will allow bypass conduits? Answer from Alan Turner: No, we need to reduce the flow reaching the creek to reduce flooding along entire reach.

PH asked if 5,500 cfs is the current capacity of the existing concrete channel? Answer from Alan Turner: No, it will require additional improvements to the concrete channel to reach that capacity.

TM asked why LID scored high when it doesn't reduce flooding very well? Answer by Connie Gazaway: She agrees LID doesn't solve flooding very well, but it is still a good practice for other reasons. LID scored low on flood reduction, but scored high on low cost and no public disruption. TM asked if the next analysis will look at the effects of locating the detention basins in different areas than currently planned? Answer by Alan Turner: Yes and they will look at phased operations. TM asked if the final report will be available for review the weekend before the AB meeting? Answer by Laura Harnish: Yes.

Public comment was provided by Martha Cherry (?), Fairfax:

- Will the 18" sea level rise be considered? Will the high tides be considered? Answer by Laura Harnish: Climate change and sea level rise will be included and considered during CEQA review process.

Public comment was provided by Barry Spitz, San Anselmo:

- There should be a criteria on how well the element retains (instead of detains) the water. We need the water. Answer by Laura Harnish: Phoenix Lake project will consider retention of water. Other sites are considering detention only and to change purpose to include retention will greatly increase scope and price of projects.

Public comment was provided by Lucy Wilson, San Anselmo:

- She is happy to see the possible detention basin in Sleepy Hollow. If the flow reduction in Sleepy Hollow Creek means we do not have to replace two bridges, we can save \$5M.

Public comment was provided by Kevin Haroff, Greenbrae (Larkspur City Council member):

- He supports the Larkspur letter and is pleased with all the public comments. He feels a programmatic EIR is necessary.

Marin County Flood Control and Water Conservation District

Public comment was provided by Ross Asselstine, San Anselmo:

- He likes the broad look that CH2M HILL is taking in the study but that the study needs to start with planning.
- He is concerned that quality of life issues are not included as a criteria. There is no criteria relating to recreation. This is why the petition against Memorial park was started.

Public comment was provided by Frank Egger, Fairfax:

- He thinks we need to step back from Memorial Park, Lefty Gomez and Loma Alta sites and that water catchment in residential properties should be considered.

Public comment was provided by Michael Mackintosh, Fairfax:

- 250 ac-ft. of storage is estimated for his property (Marin Town & Country Club) and that is impractical. He has 22.5 acres of flat area. It would take a detention basin covering his entire property that is 17 feet deep to detain 250 ac-ft.
- He thinks we should be looking at retaining water, not just detaining it.
- He thinks an EIR is required.

TM asked if the next analysis will include potentially reducing the storage capacity of some of the original (current) detention basins? Answer by Alan Turner: Yes, when they do the current program modeling and again later during the CEQA process.

Laura Harnish responded to the public comments about retaining water for supply purposes by saying that there are many more regulations tied to water supply projects and it will complicate the flood control program and possibly delay implementation.

Item 4. Project Status Updates (Information Item):

a) Phoenix Lake Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Retrofit Project

District staff provided an update to the Phoenix Lake IRWM Retrofit Project, see [Staff Report dated April 16, 2015](#).

CM asked what are the next steps after the feasibility studies are completed? Answer by Russ Eberwein: Execute an agreement with MMWD to proceed with final design and CEQA, do the final design and CEQA. CM asked if the project is on schedule to start construction in 2016? Answer by Russ: No, it is almost mid-2015 and final design and CEQA will take at least 18-24 months to complete.

b) Memorial Park Dual-Use Facility

District staff provided an update to the Memorial Park Dual-Use Facility, see [Staff Report dated April 16, 2015](#).

c) Lefty Gomez Field Dual-Use Facility

District staff provided an update to the Lefty Gomez Dual-Use Facility, see [Staff Report dated April 16, 2015](#).

Marin County Flood Control and Water Conservation District

d) Loma Alta Dual-Use Facility

District staff provided an update to the Loma Alta Dual-Use Facility, [Staff Report dated April 16, 2015](#).

e) Bridge Replacements in Town of San Anselmo

District staff provided an update to the San Anselmo Bridge Replacement projects, see [Staff Report dated April 16, 2015](#).

f) Winship Avenue Bridge Replacement in Town of Ross

District staff provided an update to Winship Avenue Bridge Replacement project, see [Staff Report dated April 16, 2015](#).

g) Azalea Avenue Bridge Replacement in Town of Fairfax

District staff provided an update to Azalea Avenue Bridge Replacement project, see [Staff Report dated April 16, 2015](#).

h) Corte Madera Creek Units 3 and 4 Project

District staff provided an update to the Units 3 and 4 Project, see [Staff Report dated April 16, 2015](#).

TM asked staff to explain the difference between Unit 3 and Unit 4. Answer by Hugh Davis: Unit 4 is the reach of Corte Madera Creek from the Sir Francis Drake Blvd. bridge downstream to the fish ladder and Unit 3 is from the fish ladder downstream to the College Ave. bridge.

RG asked what are the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) milestones for Units 3 and 4? Answer by Hugh Davis: Identify gaps in data and prepare high-level conceptual design. RG asked if the District will have input? Answer by Scott Lyle: Yes, the District will review the milestone submittals and provide comments back to the USACE.

i) Lower Corte Madera Creek Improvement Project

District staff provided an update to the Lower Corte Madera Creek Improvement Project, see [Staff Report dated April 16, 2015](#).

TM asked what is the status of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the City of Larkspur? Answer by Hugh Davis: it is being prepared and reviewed by County counsel and City of Larkspur.

PH asked what is the status of the proposed dredging? Answer by Hugh Davis: A survey was performed in 2010 and in 2014. Dredging is not currently needed. There are no definite plans, but we will consider geomorphic dredging in the future.

Public comment was provided by Rich Cimino, Larkspur:

- He stated that the USACE has a permit to dredge near Lucky Drive. PH said the dredging is being done by the adjacent community, not the USACE.

Marin County Flood Control and Water Conservation District

Public comment was provided by Ross Asselstine, San Anselmo:

- He thanked the staff for going after funding grants.
- He has previously asked 100 questions and has not gotten all of them answered yet. We deserve answers.
- How much money has been spent to date?
- Quality of life issues cannot be evaluated by a consultant; the Advisory Board needs to include quality of life issues.

Public comment was provided by Frank Egger, Fairfax:

- The box culvert under Sherman Street in Fairfax was determined to be under-sized in 1958. It needs to be upsized.

Public comment was provided by Lise Stampfli, Flood Mitigation League:

- She would like the flood control process to move faster, but she believes in the process. She thinks the AB is listening to the public.

Public comment was provided by Carolyn Turner, San Anselmo:

- Sorich Creek is full only when it rains and most of the flood water is not from Sorich Creek.
- If the Memorial Park detention basin is constructed, we will have to relocate a sanitary sewer main, we will lose a lot of trees, and we will lose the path to the shopping center.

Public comment was provided by Tom Peacock, San Anselmo:

- He thinks the existing signs which show the depth of flooding should be modified to show the reduced depth of flooding after the detention basins are constructed.
- He does not want to see Memorial Park destroyed.

Public comment was provided by Sean Condry, San Anselmo (Public Works Director):

- As a resident who lives next to Memorial Park, he loves Memorial Park.
- We need flood protection.
- We will look at alternatives during the CEQA process.

Public comment was provided by Carol Page, Fairfax:

- She has been flooded. She thinks this is a good process.
- The USACE created a problem by designing the concrete channel with hydraulic jumps which reduce the channel capacity. The USACE should be made to fix the existing concrete channel.

Item 5. Set May Meeting Schedule

The Advisory Board and District staff set the next meeting for May 20, 7:00pm at the Town of San Anselmo Town Hall.