

**DRAFT MINUTES OF THE  
COUNTY SERVICE AREA NO. 6 ADVISORY BOARD MEETING  
HELD WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2022  
AT THE ROOM 330 BOS CHAMBER  
MARIN CIVIC CENTER, SAN RAFAEL**

**Board Members Present**

Ellen Stein (ES)  
Lawrence Greenhill (LG)  
Bill Adkison (BA) *term expired*  
Rik Super (RS)

**District Staff Present**

Roger Leventhal, Senior Engineer

**Board Members Absent**

none

**Item 1. Welcome, Introductions, and Sign-In**

The AB greeted attendees and introduced themselves. Staff introduced themselves. Staff administered the oath of office to Rik Super and Laurance Greenhill who were officially appointed by the BOS on October 18, 2022. Bill Adkinson did not complete his application in time to be reappointed but has subsequently completed his application and will be officially reappointed at the November 8, 2022 BOS meeting.

**Item 2. Approval of April 4, 2018 Meeting Minutes**

No edits to the minutes were received.

**Action by Board:** Recommended approval of the April 4, 2018 meeting minutes.

**M/S:** RS/ES, **Ayes:** All, **Nay:** None, **Abstain:** None

**Item 3. Open Time for Items Not on the Agenda**

Audience member (Frances) asked about the flood control basis for the CSA 6 and if dredging of outfalls is included in the proposed dredging plan. There was a request for the shoaling figure prepared by Foth in 2018 to be provided *[this map will be posted to the CSA 6 site]* and staff agreed to post the CSA 6 resolution to the web page.

LG spoke about his experience with dredging of the Marinwood Lagoon in the last few years. They had to dredge, dry and truck the material to the Cullinan project at a cost of approximately \$100 per cubic yard.

ES and audience members asked about a hybrid meeting (both in-person and on-line) as an option for future meetings. The recent Zone 7 meeting was a hybrid. *[post meeting update: Staff have looked into either all Zoom or hybrid meetings as requested. All Zoom meetings are not currently allowed because of State statutes and a hybrid meeting could be conducted but a*

**County of Marin**

*specialty company has to be brought in to operate the camera equipment and the cost is \$3,000 (that was the additional cost for the recent Zone 7 meeting). Prior to the next meeting, staff will poll AB members if they want to spend \$3,000 in CSA 6 funds to make this a hybrid meeting.]*

**Item 4: Gallinas Creek Geomorphic Dredge Project Update**

Staff provided a presentation following information in the staff report (although in a slightly different order). A copy of the presentation is attached.

- a) Recap of the last meeting in 2018 and a brief history and summary of the geomorphic dredge approach
- b) Summary of dredge quantities and costs Dredging Costs in SF Bay
- c) Reminder of sediment quality sampling for permitting of dredge sediment disposal
- d) Summary of disposal options end of 2018
- e) Recap of work from 2018 to 2022
  - a. LGVSD fields no longer available
  - b. County of Marin Parks McInnis update and next steps
- f) Next steps for 2023/2024
- g) Review of CSA budget and request to move \$300k into professional services

(a) Since there had not been an in-person meeting since 2018 (pre-pandemic) the presentation started with a recap of the basis for the geomorphic dredge and the difference in quantity and costs versus the prior dredging events (last dredged in 1992/1994).

(b) Staff showed the estimated cost estimates for local hydraulic disposal versus clam-shell dredging and disposal. We also presented some recent (2022) dredging costs from the Petaluma turning basin (\$30/cy).

(c) Results of the sediment quality sampling for permitting of dredge sediment disposal were presented. Results of sediment sampling of creek sediments show that 90 percent of the sediment is suitable for disposal in a wetlands environment (such as McInnis marsh project) or reused for levee stabilization (possible LGVSD use) but approximately 10% (9,000 cy) requires covering by a minimum of four feet of clean sediment from any wetlands surface. The project plans to resample the area of slightly elevation concentrations to further delineate and confirm these areas.

(d) Geomorphic Dredge and Disposal Update. Staff presented an update on the dredge site disposal options since 2018. The LGVSD fields are now not viable. For McInnis, staff worked closely with Parks staff over the last several years to include the Gallinas sediments into the restoration planning for McInnis. We provided an update on dredge sediment placement only options that Staff presented to the permitting agencies (the BRRITT) in May 2022. Project staff continue to work with Parks through responses to agency comments to that presentation.

Staff also presented our plan to evaluate in-bay disposal at SF-10 as an alternative. This option requires much more in costs for pre-dredge disposal testing (specifically very expensive biological testing) but may be more cost-effective in the long run since no long-term monitoring and reporting would be required which would be a permit requirement for placement at McInnis. Also, the permitting may be much easier so this is a trade-off we will be evaluating in Q1/Q2 of 2023.

(e) Next Steps for 2023/2024- Staff presented their recommendation to move an additional \$300k into professional services. This raised a number of questions from the audience (especially from Alan Scotch) on the need for these funds when there is already \$200k in professional services available. Staff explained that the additional \$300k is needed because if the CSA Board wants to proceed on parallel tracks at the same time to speed up eventual dredging, then two different consultants would be working on the project. The \$300k is for Foth Engineering to lead survey, sampling and permitting for the In-Bay disposal option (survey and sampling at a lower cost is required for McInnis and would also be handled by Foth) while engineering design services for McInnis would be led by the consultant to Parks (ESA Associates) who are already working on the McInnis project. If McInnis looks like a viable placement alternative, then CSA 6 would have to fund ESA directly for engineering studies and permitting. Therefore, to proceed along both pathways simultaneously then we needed to add funds to Foth in the amount of \$292,000 which is going to the BOS on December 6, 2022 for approval. We have not yet had to directly spend funds on ESA at McInnis as Parks has been paying these costs to-date, but if we proceed on a dredge sediment only option at McInnis, then we will have to enter into a direct contract with ESA to cover these costs through CSA 6 funds. So, to cover all our potential bases for dredge design, permitting and disposal through contracting, the \$300k in funds for Foth are needed.

However, Staff also clearly stated that we will not perform all the expensive sampling and analysis work without having a preferred disposal alternative and coming back to the CSA 6 board for discussion and approval first. This means that while we have the \$500k available to cover either disposal option – we do not anticipate spending the entire amount because we will focus on one disposal site. Our goal is to have more clarity on both disposal options by Summer 2023 for the next CSA board meeting.

**Recommended Action:** *Recommend the Board of Supervisors increase the CSA 6 professional services budget by up to \$300,000 for updated sediment surveying, testing, and analysis, and if needed analysis of additional disposal options.*

**Action by Board:** *Recommend to the Board of Supervisors to increase the CSA 6 professional services budget by up to \$300,000 for updated sediment surveying, testing, and analysis, and if needed analysis of additional disposal options. Vote was 3-0 unanimous.*

**M/S:** ES/LG, **Ayes:** All, **Nay:** None, **Abstain:** None

### **Item 5. Schedule Next Meeting**

Staff indicated the next meeting likely in Summer 2023 following additional information and permitting agency feedback on the status of the design and permitting of the two potential dredge placement options, McInnis and In-Bay. No actual date was discussed.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 8:30pm.