
Comments on Palm Avenue Pipeline Replacement Project

From martha davis <mlcmarthadavis@gmail.com>

Date Mon 7/27/2026 5:26 PM

To Board Comment <boardcomment@marinwater.org>

 1 attachment (55 KB)

NLOA Comments July 28 2026.docx.pdf;

Thank you for sharing our comments with the Board.

Martha

--

mlcmarthadavis@gmail.com

"Adjust to changing times while staying true to your principles."

Jimmy Carter

"The opposite of love is not hate, it's indifference."

Elie Wiesel

"You must be bold, brave, and courageous and find a way... to get in the way."

John Lewis



July 27, 2026

Re: Comment: Palm Avenue Pipeline Replacement Project

Dear President Smith and Members of the Board,

The Nicasio Landowners Association is writing to provide comments on the proposed Palm Avenue Pipeline Replacement project where approximately 1,730 feet of pipeline is to be installed in the unincorporated community of Kentfield, replacing old leak-prone, fire flow deficient piping.

In January, the Board identified the need for staff to evaluate opportunities to install new recycled water piping in projects. We appreciate that staff conducted an assessment in its board letter. However, staff's analysis only considers where the closest sources of recycled water is currently located, not where future recycled water pipelines are likely to be routed and whether including purple pipe with the replacement pipe makes sense.

Previously, staff provided the Board's Planning Committee with high level "heat maps" illustrating areas where Marin Water's highest 10% of summer use are located and estimating the amount of potable water that is being used for non-potable outdoor irrigation. The Kentfield area was included on this map. It is appropriate for staff to consider whether there will be future opportunities to hook up these customers up to recycled water in a few years.

In the Palm Avenue Pipeline project, Marin Water will open a trench and could easily add the recycled water piping at a reasonable additional material cost – this would be much cheaper than re-opening the trench in future years to do the same thing.

The Pipeline project could be a cost-effective investment that would help a high-water using neighborhood to access recycled water for non-potable uses in the future. This option merits consideration before the final project design is approved.

Martha Davis,
Board Member,
Nicasio Landowners Association

Comment for today's Board Planning Committee meeting

From Phil <ps33@ix.netcom.com>

Date Tue 7/28/2026 2:38 PM

To Terrie Gillen <tgillen@marinwater.org>

 1 attachment (60 KB)

Comment to MMWD Board Planning Committee - 72826.pdf;

Hi, Terrie,

Larry Russell asked that I send in the comment I planned to make in person at this morning's Planning Committee meeting. He said that the Board would see it and consider it.

I'm attaching it to this email. The link on the website looks like it's for advance comments, so I'm sending it to you as you will know how to handle it. Please let me know if I should submit it a different way.

Thanks for your help!

Best, Phil Sotter
Woodacre

Comments to MMWD Board Planning Committee - 7/28/26

Item 4b:

Thanks for the presentation. I'm a bit confused as the Staff recommendation for this item is Review and Comment, while the project description says that the bids will be opened on July 30th, two days from now, suggesting the project has gone out to bid exactly as is. It also says that a recommendation for contract award will come back to the Board at a future meeting. So I'm not clear where the opportunity is for the Board and the public to have input on the project if the project is already out to bid.

This is important because the project description before you today says that the project has been evaluated for the installation of recycled water piping, which is encouraging, but that the closest recycled water connection is nearly four miles away and therefore this project will *not* include piping for recycled water. And that's not only discouraging but also seems like we're wasting a sensible opportunity for future recycled water delivery.

While the Kentfield area is currently not part of a recycled water network, it certainly will be part of any realistic future plan to expand the District's use of recycled water. There's a high concentration of heavy users of potable water in Kentfield, it's been identified as an area with a high concentration of lawns, and Google maps shows large lawns along the Palm Avenue route.

Ben has previously said that new recycled water pipeline will cost \$3 million a mile. That means that the 3/10 of a mile included in this pipeline project would cost \$900 thousand if it were part of a standalone recycled water pipeline project. However, if 3/10 of a mile of purple pipe were laid down as part of this project, with the road already torn up and repaving costs covered by the County, I expect it would cost a small fraction of that amount. The incremental cost of adding 3/10 of a mile of purple pipe as part of this project would likely be much less than even the project's \$71,000 contingency fee.

So I request the Board to not approve the project without knowing the incremental cost of adding purple pipe. Otherwise the District is signaling it will no longer pursue recycled water as a future water supply option.