Hi Gerhard,

I have a few questions I would like to submit for the meeting tomorrow. In a video call it is hard to ask questions with so many others wanting answers.

1. How was the $840k County contribution derived? Does it include any County property assessment tax? Do the boundary issues involving County/Private/Public ownership of the levees have any impact?
2. Is the Sanitary district paying an assessment for the equipment protected within their Santa Venetia properties?
3. If an owner pays the assessment upfront, is there any expectation of sharing future annual Administration and Management costs imposed?
4. I did not see any language stating that the Benefit Assessment District would be dissolved after full payment was achieved?
5. Where does the funding come from for the 4.2% peripheral parcels?
6. The evaluation of soil, seismic loads, active and passive pressure before a design can even be realized seems like a huge expenditure before any work can even be done. Unknown easement agreements, permits and CEQUA requirements on top of that seems like this project will incur cost overruns. What is the plan for that? What if all the funds are used up before any work can be done? Another tax?
7. I would like to see more Active management opportunities explored. The report suggests they would be more cost effective and less intrusive. There is more risk but there could also be more precautions put in place. New and better products are being developed.
8. Our recent flooding has occurred from interior drainage issues which DPW has not addressed yet the County is focusing on residents to do their part. Why hasn't DPW been held accountable for damage that has occurred from drainage issues they are responsible for and have known about for years?

Thank you for all the attention you have put into this project. Since there are so many unknowns, I'm just trying to understand this process.

See you at the meeting tomorrow.

Ellen Stein
Hi Gerhard,

I just thought of another question:

If I read the Benefit assessment tax correctly, we will be paying an additional $20 for Staff Administration and management costs above what we would have paid with a parcel tax?

Thanks,
Ellen Stein
Hello Gerhard,

I have only had time to do a brief review of the documents associated with the proposed benefit assessment although I do have a few questions and may have more after your presentation to the Advisory Board.

Thank you.

Robert Dobrin
415.786.1273

1. Does the project include any work on Reach 1 near the Marsh or is the project limited to Reach 2 (TRB/Redwood Box)? Kleinfelder Studies and the project website indicate the earthen levee in Reach 1 is also in danger of failure.

2. What is the basis or reasoning for the the County Contribution of approximately $800,000? I recall from previous meetings this was because the County “owned” approximately 45% of the levee system. Where is that 45% located?

3. What will be included in the mail ballot? How will the project be presented in the ballot?
   A. Will the return envelopes be postage paid?
   B. Who pays for the cost of the Benefits Assessment election? How much is the election estimated to cost?

4. The following tables are from a Staff Report from August 19, 2019 Advisory Board Meeting and the Engineers Report.
   A. Are these estimates still current and how were they calculated? Please provide any analysis, spreadsheets, computer models and other detail that went into the estimates.
   B. Please provide detail for each of the line items in the table? For example the $6M line item for the TRB Improvement, how much is budgeted for construction, easement acquisition, habitat elements and loan interest?
   C. How much of the project budget will be assigned to County Overhead and Staff?
   D. How did you arrive at a reserve budget of $122,000
   E. Considering cost overruns associated with the La Pasada Intercept projects that made repairs to a corrugated pipe under the levee which was budgeted at $332,000 but came in at $464,000, how is the proposed $122,000 reserve budget adequate for a $6.2 Million dollar project that incorporates the repair of two corrugated pipes and rebuilding levees?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Component</th>
<th>Est. Cost</th>
<th>Actions and Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timber-Reinforced Berm</td>
<td>Construct new TRB. The facility will be designed for a higher level of flood protection and will be made of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TRB** Improvement  
$6$ M materials requiring less maintenance. Includes preliminary estimates for easement acquisition, habitat elements, and loan interest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pump Station No. 2 Outfall Reinforcement</td>
<td>$250k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenchless rehabilitation of the pipeline that discharges pump station No. 2 to Gallinas Creek. The project is designed to significantly reduce the risk of levee failure by sink hole over this facility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pump Station No. 5 Gravity Bypass Safe Abandonment</td>
<td>$50k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenching to remove a corrugated metal pipe under the levee that is beyond its expected design life and is no longer needed. The project is designed to significantly reduce the risk of levee failure by sink hole over this facility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Cost: $6.3 M In 2019 Dollars**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Tax Proceeds</td>
<td>$1 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Target*</td>
<td>$3.11 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA, Coastal Conservancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Contribution**</td>
<td>$840k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely contingent on parcel tax.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing ad valorem Zone 7 revenue in fund balance and expected</td>
<td>$1.35 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over the next 7 years. $360,000 available in fund with $142,000 additionally expected per year (reserving funds for estimated basic O&amp;M needs).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:**

* Does not include NEPA, which is paid for by FEMA  
** Does not include CEQA and election management and tax study, which is paid for by the County

Actual costs are not known until construction bids are received. Relative costs per project component may change within the $6.3 million estimate.
My computer microphone doesn't work well, so please read this into the public comments for Agenda Item 6. Thank you.

Public comments from Jami Ellermann
Flood Zone 7 Meeting August 6, 2020
Agenda Item 6

Listed below are my concerns regarding the Levee Upgrade Project:

The impact on dredging: In my opinion, dredging and the levee project need greater coordination. Could dredging occur at the same time during the two years the levee is being built? Will a dredge even be allowed after the levee is built or will the line then be that a dredge would somehow destabilize the new levee? Having gone to csa #6 dredge meetings for three years with little progress forward, I have come to the conclusion that the county is hoping to turn the area around the island into a wetlands through inaction and delay. Permitting for the levee project may require some remediation - is turning the island creek section into wetlands an unspoken part of the plan? Before voting for the levee upgrade, I would like public assurance that this is not the case and that dredging, including around the island, will definitely happen.

Cost: I would like to know how the overall cost for the project was derived without 1) a detailed geotechnical report as called for in the Flood Barrier Study (2) detailed property surveys showing landscaping and structures that need removal and other special conditions and (3) appraisal estimates for the easements. What happens if the assessment district is approved, but the costs to complete this project come in at a much higher number?

Impact on individual properties: It has been repeatedly stated and is written under the website that stairs, ramps, and gates or fences will be "accommodated". What exactly does that mean and will it be written into the boilerplate contract? I have personally seen levee boxes that were replaced in the last several years wherein stairs and/or ramps were simply lopped off and left there. To avoid this happening to unsuspecting homeowners, the boilerplate contract should contain the promises that are being made at this stage of the process.

General Questions if not already answered during the presentation:

1. 
Does EACH homeowner get to vote, or is it one vote per parcel?

2. Why is an 868 sq ft home assigned the same “building factor” as a 3,000 sq ft home? Surely, the larger home gets a greater benefit. Similarly, slab homes anywhere within the district are more likely to flood, aren't they receiving a greater benefit as well?

3. How were the mean elevations derived?
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Gordon Epke,
Senior Program Coordinator, Marin County Flood Control District
3501 Civic Center Dr, San Rafael, CA 94903

depke@marincounty.org

VIA EMAIL – August 6, 2020

Dear Mr. Epke,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Benefit Assessment proposed to finance the Timber Reinforced Berm (TRB) and other improvements to flood control infrastructure on Gallinas Creek. The Coalition of Sensible Taxpayers is concerned with the financing for this project and thus refrains from commenting on project merits.

COST is most concerned this Benefit Assessment has replaced a previously proposed Parcel Tax for which County Staff, the Zone 7 Advisory Board and the Santa Venetia Community have already spent considerable effort for many months.

Since the project has not changed materially in scope, it appears the Benefit Assessment is now pursued since passage only requires a majority of proportionally cast ballots as opposed to the 2/3 majority of votes required to pass a parcel tax. COST opposes circumventing the 2/3 majority requirement mandated by Proposition 13. The Benefit Assessment alternative provides a route to passage of taxes/fees that appear unlikely to gain approval from 2/3 of voters and short-circuits finding a solution with broader community consensus.

COST is wary of the precedent this will set and a resulting proliferation of benefit assessments countywide. We are concerned that County divisions may abuse benefit assessments to balance and/or justify their own budgets.

This Benefit Assessment is ill-timed as many property owners are struggling with the economic fallout of the pandemic. The proposed mailing of ballots on October 23, two weeks before the Presidential Election, is equally problematic as it deprives property owners the opportunity to evaluate their household budgets in relation to other tax measures on the General Election ballot.

COST also notes the inherent inequities in the methodology used to determine relative assessments as properties with lower elevation are assessed at a higher rate than properties on higher ground. In general, the owners of homes at lower elevations live in more modest dwellings and therefore have less household wealth to begin with. A larger tax bill will further depress the value of these homes.
COST believes the proposed Flood Zone 7 benefit assessment should be paused until such time as the Board of Supervisors makes formal policy as to where and when Benefit Assessments should be used instead of traditional taxes. COST would actively participate in helping to formulate such policy.

Sincerely

Mimi Willard
President, Coalition of Sensible Taxpayers

Cc: Marin County Board of Supervisors
    Matthew Hymel, Marin County Administrator
    Roy Given, Marin County Finance Director