



SANTA CRUZ MID-COUNTY GROUNDWATER AGENCY

Thursday, March 15, 2018 - 7:00-9:00 p.m.

Simpkins Family Swim Center

979 17th Avenue, Santa Cruz, California

AGENDA

1. **Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 7:02 p.m. by Chair Marani.

2. **Roll Call**

Board Members Present: Mr. Abramson, Mr. Baskin, Mr. Benich, Dr. Daniels, Mr. Friend, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Kerr, Dr. LaHue, Mr. Leopold, and Mr. Marani.

Board Members Absent: Ms. Matthews

Alternates Present: Mr. Romanini.

GSP Advisory Committee Members Present: Ms. Anderton, Mr. Baskin, Mr. Casale, Mr. Gudger, Mr. Jaffe, Mr. Lear, Mr. Rous, and Mr. Wyner.

Staff Present: Mr. Bracamonte, Mr. Carson, Mr. Duncan, Ms. LaVan, Ms. Menard, Ms. Pruitt, Mr. Rivera, Ms. Ryan, Ms. Schumacher, Ms. Strohm, Ms. Ryan.

Others Present: In addition to board, committee, and named staff there were approximately 22 members of the public in attendance. A large number of water agency personnel attended for presentation of the MGA's study on saltwater intrusion at the coast by Max Halkjær of Ramboll Group and Cameron Tana from HydroMetrics WRI.

3. **Public Comments**

Scott McGilvray, resident of Live Oak and City of Santa Cruz Water Department customer asked if he will have time to speak to agenda item 8.1.

Item 8.1 includes time for comments from the public and questions from the board on public communications submitted to the board.

4. **Consent Agenda**

4.1 Approve Minutes from November 16, 2017 Board Meeting

– Dr. Daniels pointed out typographical errors in the November minutes.

4.2 Accept Audited 2016/17 Financial Statements

– Item removed from the consent agenda

– Staff noted an error in the report that needs to be corrected.

– Chair Marani asks to move item to 6.5 for corrections and approval.

4.3 Acknowledge Member Agency Board Appointments

– Mr. Marani welcome Dr. Bruce Daniels to the board. He is a representative of Soquel Creek Water District.

MOTION: Mr. Leopold; Second: Mr. Baskin. To approve the meeting minutes and other consent items with the corrections to minutes by Dr. Daniels. Motion passed.

Mr. Leopold requested MGA staff organize future agendas to schedule general business items before presentations.

5. Presentation:

5.1 Max Halkjær of Ramboll Group presented on findings of the Hydrogeological Investigation Salt-Fresh Water Interface – Monterey (March 2018). Cameron Tana of HydroMetrics WRI, Inc. presented a technical memorandum to evaluate report findings and analyze basin management risks based on the new information on salt-fresh water interface.

Ron Duncan introduced Max Halkjaer from Denmark to explain the survey technology used to assess the salt-fresh water interface offshore of the MGA basin.

Max Halkjaer of Ramboll Group discussed the report, based on a helicopter survey using electromagnetic resistivity, to determine the freshwater saltwater interface offshore of the Mid-County Groundwater Basin. The MGA sponsored the study to fill data gaps and determine the threat of seawater intrusion into the basin. The survey flew 200 line miles in a pattern along the MGA coastal boundary from the San Lorenzo River south to La Selva Beach. Several additional lines perpendicular to the coast and extending inland were flown to tie the survey together. The presentation focused on using maps and cross-sections to show where saline and fresh water were found in different depths below the surface of the ocean floor. The report conclusively verified that seawater contamination is significant at both the north end of the basin near Soquel Point and south end near La Selva Beach. The report also showed that seawater intrusion is very close to shore in areas where data was previously unavailable.

Cameron Tana of Hydrometrics WRI, Inc. The technical memorandum summarizes the findings and policy implications from the study. Mr. Tana's presentation underlined the importance of protecting the freshwater supply from not just salt water, but from brackish water as well. Mr. Tana indicated that 250 mg/L chloride concentration is the drinking water standard that must be maintained. He also discussed management strategies, especially using protective groundwater elevations that help to keep salty water of shore of the basin. Maps in the memo analyze risk of seawater onshore. The highest risk of seawater intrusion exist at Soquel Point, New Brighton, Seascape and La Selva Beach.

Mr. Tana indicated that the nearness of the salt-fresh water interface indicates that the management goals for the basin might want to include recovering the basin faster to avoid the potential for further seawater intrusion.

Board Comments:

Dr. LaHue – Why was risk in memo based on 2017 groundwater levels, which are the highest in many years? And does the risk go back to the 70% protective elevations?

Mr. Tana - The risks discussed in the memo is based on current information as a snapshot in time, but that the risk would be greater with the lower groundwater levels seen just a few years ago. However, in both scenarios the risk of seawater intrusion is just offshore. As for protective elevations, those were chosen by Soquel Creek Water District [and the City of Santa Cruz] to provide a level of protection and can be revisited by the MGA in its GSP planning process.

Mr. Leopold – When assessing the risk levels, are we consulting with the state about what levels of risk are acceptable. What happens if the state has a different perspective on acceptable risks than we have in our plan?

Mr. Tana - We will be in contact with the state as the plan is developed, but SGMA is designed to allow local GSAs the discretion to plan for the basin so long as those plans reach a reasonable definition of sustainability.

Dr. Daniels – Are you looking at the risk profiles for flow between aquifers in our stacked and folded aquifer system? Will we use our model to assess crossflow?

Mr. Tana – We are looking at what protective elevations should be as you move inland, and we wouldn't want to allow saltwater to move inland under where our production wells are located. We will use the model to consider cross flow, but I don't think you should only rely on the model when setting protective elevations.

Ms. Menard – Please explain the goal of setting protective elevations at a 70% chance, what do the other levels indicate for people who may not understand the goal?

Mr. Tana – There is a lot of information about the groundwater basin, but we don't have an exact replica of natural conditions. To respond to this lack of perfect knowledge, we modeled a lot of different plausible geologic and groundwater flow conditions that are likely conditions within the basin. We used those estimates about basin conditions and ran a lot of different runs to determine protective groundwater levels need to ensure that seawater intrusion stays offshore. Seventy percent represents our certainty that the protective elevations are sufficient to keep saltwater offshore based on the model we used when those levels were calculated. The higher the certainty the more stringent the management restrictions. We chose a balance to have some level of protection along with some level of use.

Mr. Marani – When evaluating historic levels, do you look at data from the late 1950's focusing on the south coast area and what roll did that play?

Mr. Tana – For setting the protective levels themselves the data from prior years wasn't considered, but we did use those levels to set the goals for the basin.

Mr. Kerr – Is there any way to use the SkyTEM data to estimate past basin conditions about the salt-fresh water interface or make future projections? Mr. Tana - We can use this data as an initial baseline and do another flyover to see how things look in the future, but the past is the past and we didn't have the ability to gather this data before now.

Mr. Kerr – What do you expect to see in five years?

Answer: Mr. Tana – We're not sure. The data doesn't show how fast the SWI is moving. We don't know how fast, but we do know it will move inland. We suggest redoing the study in five years.

Mr. Kennedy – If we don't maintain the protective elevations and salinity went up, what are the consequences? Can we stop seawater intrusion from moving inland?

Mr. Tana – There is evidence that it can be hard to push salt water out once seawater intrusion advances, but we have seen evidence that it can be done. However, it's better to prevent it where possible.

Dr. Daniels – We have data in some wells in the eastern part of the basin and you can get a reading on how quickly it's happening, but this doesn't give indications of the future.

Public Comments: None

MOTION: Mr. Leopold; Second: Dr. Daniels. To accept the report and the hydrologist's review. Motion passed.

6. General Business

6.1 Appoint Replacement Groundwater Sustainability Advisory Committee Representatives for Institutional Water Users and At-Large Committee Vacancies

Ms. Pruitt introduced Tom Wyner to represent Cabrillo College as the replacement GSP Advisory Committee institutional representative. Mr. Wyner is Assistant Director Facilities Planning and Plant Operations at Cabrillo. He has attended GSP Advisory Committee meetings and is willing to serve as the Advisory Committee's institutional representative on behalf of Cabrillo College. Mr. Wyner intends to attend the GSP meetings himself, but has also arranged for a department backup in the event a facilities emergency arises that requires his absence.

Ms. Pruitt also introduces Keith Gudger as the replacement at-large nominee for the open seat on the GSP Advisory Committee. Mr. Gudger applied for the committee, was considered a highly qualified applicant by the nominating committee. He has remained involved in the planning process and has attended every GSP orientation and meeting as an observer.

Staff believes that both candidates would be excellent additions to the GSP Advisory Committee.

Board Comments:

John Leopold – Stated that he was a member of the nominating committee and supported staff's assessment of the recommended candidates. He also indicated that the nominating committee was very interested in recruiting a representative from Cabrillo College and was pleased that Mr. Wyner had volunteered to serve. He is also pleased that Keith Gudger has remained involved in the process and has agreed to join the Committee.

Public Comments:

Becky Steinberger is pleased that Tom Wyner and Keith Gudger are going to fill the vacant seats on the GSP Advisory Committee. She would like to encourage the MGA Board to add a specific representative from the cannabis agency to the GSP Advisory Committee.

MOTION, Mr. Friend, Second: Mr. Kerr To appoint institutional and at-large representatives as recommended by staff. Motion passed unanimously

6.2 Approve Budget Reallocations in Fiscal Year 2017-2018

Mr. Duncan explained the MGA Fiscal Year 2017-2018 budget and the need for reallocation of funds to take advantage of several opportunities, including commissioning the Ramboll report. The MGA budget had the total amount right, but staff needed to adjust the allocations slightly. Please note, the request is to reallocate existing funds, not provide more funding. The recommended reallocations are as follows:

Approve \$8,000 from MGA FY 2017/18 Miscellaneous Outreach budget of \$28,900 to be used for general technical support from Hydrometrics WRI during the remaining portion of FY 2017/18.

Approve \$1,500 from MGA FY 2017/18 Miscellaneous Outreach budget of \$28,900 to fund Mr. Halkjaer (of Ramboll) to present findings to the board.

Approve \$50,000 from MGA FY 2017/18 GSP Development Graphical Support budget of \$50,000 for Hydrometrics WRI's continued GSP development support in FY 2017/18.

Approve \$5,000 from MGA FY 2017/18 Treasurer's budget of \$28,000 for the Program Director to continue providing staff support in FY 2017/18.

Approve \$23,540 from MGA FY 2017/18 contingency budget of \$49,936 for the planning grant application and potential grant administration related support in FY 2017/18.

Board Comments: None received

Public Comments: None received

MOTION, Dr. LaHue, Second: Mr. Leopold To approve staff recommended budget reallocation. Motion passed unanimously.

6.3 Preliminary Review of Fiscal Year 2018-2019 Budget (Pg. 126)

Mr. Carson presented the proposed budget for 2018-2019. There is a slight increase in budget for this year. The same major cost categories as the current fiscal year were used, as shown in Table 1 in the board packet. Costs include:

- Agency administrative and staff support provides staff time from the member agencies and supports the use of Soquel Creek Water District's Business and Finance Manager as MGA's Treasurer.
- We recommend a slight increase to miscellaneous administrative costs to accommodate additional staff support to the GSP Advisory Committee.
- Legal support services continue to include County counsel and the firm Brownstein, Hyatt, Farber, and Schreck.
- The hydrology contract with HydroMetrics is proposed to increase for additional support on pumping and recharge decisions. These tie into the biennial groundwater management reporting which currently is planned for every two years. This reporting is not mandated in the upcoming year, so the MGA could opt to defer that work, which is estimated at a cost \$50,000, and conducted the reporting in 2020 when it will be required to be performed under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act.

Board Comments (during presentation):

Mr. Leopold – Is it prudent to skip a year of reporting, or is it useful to have that information now and in 2020?

Mr. Duncan – He prefers to focus on the GSP development and to hold off on this report for now.

Dr. LaHue – Concurs with Mr. Duncan’s response. He noted that the monitoring would still be occurring and we’re still getting updates from Hydrometrics, so we’re not missing data collection.

Dr. Daniels – Also concurs, the MGA can’t do much about seawater intrusion anyway until the GSP Plan is done, so let’s just get the Plan done so we can act.

Mr. Carson continues 2018-2019 budget presentation:

- GSP development is the largest increase in the proposed budget because most plan activity happens during the 2018-2019 fiscal year. We have a good idea of costs because approved contracts are in place. The grant award will offset some of those costs.
- We’ve added \$100,000 for engineering support to evaluate water supply project costs and recommend potential water supply strategies and project evaluations. There will be future request for proposals or statement of qualifications to hire a consultant to conduct this work.
- Outreach – Much outreach to date has been funded by the County’s Stressed Basins grant award. Some has been funded by the MGA. There is a funding increase in the upcoming year because the County’s grant will be wrapping up and outreach activities funded by the MGA will increase as part of the GSP preparation activities.

The proposed budget comes in just under \$1.3 million. The planning grant award of \$1.5 million from DWR is a 50% match and will fund much of this fiscal year’s work based on our grant proposal and prior match dollars. We estimate that about \$1 million will be reimbursed in arrears by the grant for activities in fiscal year 18/19. The DWR grant will reimburse the MGA for funds expended.

The next steps for this is to revise budget based on input from today and to include the grant contributions. This budget will be revised further before the May board meeting to reorganize some budget categories. For example, the costs associated with the senior planner will shift from agency administration into GSP plan development. This is a better fit with the work performed and will better align the FY 18/19 budget with the grant proposal budget.

Board Comments:

Dr. Daniels – Suggested we consider need to move some items in the hydrology budget category into GSP development since that work is to inform the Plan.

Mr. Carson – Yes, we can consider that as we finalize the MGA budget and the grant budget.

Mr. Kerr – Is the increase in Kearns & West costs based upon the number of meetings of GSP Advisory Committee in the next year?

Mr. Carson – Yes, the overall contract amount did not change. The increased costs

compared to last year is because they will be facilitating more meetings in the upcoming year. The bulk of their work is planned to be done in June 2019.

Dr. LaHue – How will the reimbursement work for the agencies? Will all agencies put in their annual contributions and be reimbursed when the grant comes in or be reimbursed by a future offset?

Mr. Carson – The timing of the grant reimbursement is a bit of unknown at this point. The reimbursements are paid in arrears. The member agencies will still make the upfront annual contributions because the MGA has limited reserves and we don't want to find ourselves in a situation where there's not enough funding in the account to pay MGA bills if the DWR grant funds are delayed. The grant reimbursements would be used to reimburse the agencies or would be used to reduce a future member agency contribution.

Dr. Daniels – This is a perfect time to bring this up as agencies are prepping budgets now.

Mr. Carson – Yes, we have been working closely with the member agencies in developing the budget. The cost share split is the same as the prior year, with 70% Soquel Creek Water District, 10% for the other three agencies.

Ms. Menard – The individual agencies have been using the budget and cost share estimates in developing their own budgets.

Mr. Duncan – Soquel Creek Water District just updated its annual budget accordingly.

Mr. Marani – Are the roll-over amounts included in the cost contribution calculation?

Mr. Carson – We will apply roll over funds not spent this year to reduce agency contributions. The overall budget is \$1.3M, which we estimate to reduce by 105k for this year's contribution.

Public Comments:

Ms. Becky Steinbruner commented that she would like to know more about how the public can get more information about the budget and MGA funds. She is concerned that the RWMF, which provides staff support to the MGA, is not a public agency and is not subject to public records act requests. She is concerned about the custodial provisions in the MGA's annual financial report that states that some of the MGA's funds are collateralized and are not held in the agency's name. In addition, she would like to see how the DWR grant money is being spent. She does not think the budget is transparent.

MOTION: Preliminary budget review completed. No action required.
--

6.4 Ratify Contract for Administrative and Staff Support from the Regional Water Management Foundation

Mr. Duncan noted this is to ratify the contract with the Regional Water Management Foundation to provide administrative and planning support to the MGA. The budget and scope of work was previously presented to the Board. This action authorizes the Board Chair to execute the contract in the amount of \$223,500 with the RWMF for the scope of work outlined in Attachment 1; and authorizes Mr. Duncan to sign the purchase order.

Board Comments: None received

Public Comments: None received

MOTION, Mr. Leopold; Second: Mr. Kerr To authorize Board Chair to execute contract for RWMF. Motion passed unanimously.

6.5 Previously item 4.2 pulled from the Consent Agenda. Accept Audited 2016/17 Financial Statements

Mr. Marani noted this item was pulled from the consent agenda in order to fix an error noted in the report.

Mr. Carson note that the table in the audited 2016/17 financial statements presenting the board terms for private well owners representatives is incorrect and needs to be corrected. He explained the MGA's Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) and bylaws define the process and terms for MGA member agencies' director appointment terms. The term durations for private well owner representatives on the board are not designated. The MGA's may consider amending the JPA agreement at a future date to define the private well representative terms. This is among several other administrative items in the JPA and bylaws that have been identified and may warrant revision. All changes will be brought to the board together at a future meeting. Specific to the item on tonight's agenda, it is limited to noting the error in the audited 2016/17 financial statements and proposing a correction.

Ms. Strohm summarized stated the information will be updated and corrected in the final annual financial report.

Board Comments: None received

Public Comments: None received

MOTION, Mr. Leopold, Second: Mr. Friend, Accept the Audited 2016/2017 Financial Statements for the period ending June 30, 2017 as amended to present the Private Well Owner board term end dates as undesignated. Motion passed unanimously.
--

7. Informational Updates

7.1 Treasurer’s Report for November 2017 – February 2018

Ms. Strohm, MGA Treasurer present to take questions

Board Comments: None received

Public Comments: None received

7.2 Outreach Reports (Oral)

Ms. Ryan discussed staff progress on community outreach. Staff is developing a scope of work for consultant to help communicate planning efforts to the public by developing graphics, videos, and other visuals. She expects the request for proposals will be ready for review at next meeting. There are over 600 subscribers to the MGA’s email list. Also, the MGA participated in the Connecting the Drops on February 1, 2018 with over 140 members of public present. Main stage presentations were recorded by CommunityTV will be posted online shortly.

Mr. Leopold thanked Mr. Carson and Ms. Ryan staff and board participants who helped make the Connecting the Drops a great event.

Board Comments: None received

Public Comments: None received

7.3 Board Member Reports (Oral)

Dr. Daniels discussed his experience at the last GSP Advisory Committee meeting where he observed some difficulties with the Committee coming to focus on their task. He made an analogy to the CEQA process of preparing an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The process is very complex, that’s why you hire experts. Once the experts put an EIR together then they allow the public to review it and comment and identify errors, as opposed an approach where the public participates in writing the EIR. A second item he noted is that water usage statewide is generally increasing and agencies are seeing a rebound in water demand after the several years of drought conservation, which he thinks we need to keep in mind when planning.

Ms. Menard noted that Santa Cruz is only seeing a very modest water usage rebound. Mr. Daniels added Soquel Creek’s rebound is also modest but occurring.

Board Comments: None received

Public Comments: None received

7.4 Groundwater Sustainability Plan Advisory Committee (Oral)

7.4.1 Groundwater Sustainability Plan Advisory Committee Meeting Summaries from November and December 2017 and January 2018

Mr. Kennedy summarized the GSP Advisory Committee process in the four official meetings and four public orientations were held between October 2017 and March 2018. The GSP Advisory Committee has completed its charter for the group, developed an initial problem statement, and taken an initial look at the state identified sustainability indicators with an initial discussion on consequences on potential loss of groundwater. He noted it's been somewhat of a struggle for the committee to assimilate all the complex information. The committee has also provided important feedback to staff to reorient the way in which information is presented and how they would like to approach plan development going forward.

Board Comments:

Mr. Baskin expresses a desire to have a GSP framework populated with as much information to comment on and see where the committee should focus its work to fill in the gaps. Mr. Baskin notes this is a new planning process. He feels that staff should focus on the statute and guidance and how to translate the legal jargon into language that is the committee can make policy recommendations.

Mr. Romanini believes that the committee has addressed many of its initial "growing pains", there is a learning curve on the terminology and the process, and feels it has started to make progress and it will continue to improve.

Public Comments:

Ms. Becky Steinbruner appreciates the GSP Advisory Committee meeting audio recordings and has listened to them. She would appreciate GSP Advisory Committee public comment opportunities being held earlier in the meeting and more frequently throughout the meeting. Ms. Steinbruner would also like all members of GSP have their own agency email addresses available for direct contact to they are directly accessible. Ms. Steinbruner objects to having to sending public comments to GSP Advisory Committee and MGA Board members through Ms. Pruitt and Ms. Ryan. She enjoys the meetings and appreciates these efforts.

7.5 Staff Reports (Oral)

7.5.1 Reminder on Annual Form 700 Filing Requirement

Mr. Bracamonte encouraged board members to complete their disclosure forms and contact Mr. Carson or Mr. Bracamonte with questions. Mr. Carson reminds members that even those stepping off from the board are required to complete their forms.

Board Comments: None received

Public Comments: None received

7.5.2 Groundwater Sustainability Planning Grant Update.

Mr. Carson stated we are still awaiting DWR's final award announcements. He will provide an update at the May board meeting.

Board Comments: None received

Public Comments: None received

7.5.3 Upcoming Joint Session of the MGA Board and GSP Advisory Committee on Water Supply Augmentation Projects

Ms. Menard noted there has been a lot of work done within the basin in the last five to eight years to evaluate supplemental supply options. Much of that information can inform the GSP planning process. Staff believe it would be good to have joint meeting between the GSP Advisory Committee and the board to share that information especially to talk about history of project identification and our current work. We anticipate that joint meeting to take place in May or at another meeting in the near future.

Board Comments:

Mr. Marani recommends more meetings to ensure the planning process is well informed and stays on schedule.

Mr. Kennedy suggests a joint meeting to consider risks involved in the planning process.

Ms. Menard commented that many factors will be taken into consideration in forming the sustainability indicators. It will be an iterative process of reviewing and optimizing projects and options.

8. Written Communications and Correspondence

**8.1 Written Correspondence - Water for Santa Cruz County Brochure
with cover note from S. McGilvray**

Scott McGilvray – Resident of Live Oak and a member of Water for Santa Cruz County, a community group of citizens interested in water related issues. Mr. McGilvray became interested in finding additional water supplies for Santa Cruz County in response to his opposition to the joint City of Santa Cruz/Soquel Creek Water District desalination plant proposal. He has attended public meetings and wants to encourage the MGA to pursue river water transfers between Santa Cruz and Soquel Creek Water District. He previously met with Ms. Menard and Mr. Duncan to share information and discuss his ideas. He provided a brochure with that group's assessment of the water transfer project costs and water available for transfer.

Board Comments:

Mr. Kennedy inquired if the information provided by Water for Santa Cruz County will be part of the upcoming joint meeting of the board and GSP Advisory Committee.

Mr. Duncan responded that Water for Santa Cruz County will present at Soquel Creek Water District's board meeting on Tuesday, March 20, 2018. Ms. Menard and her team will also present at information on water transfers between the District and the City at that meeting. Information on water transfers will be included in the future joint session of the MGA board and GSP Advisory Committee on water supply alternatives.

Dr. LaHue pointed out that any water supply projects between the City and the District must be approved by the City of Santa Cruz since it is their water.

Ms. Menard commented that there are a lot of problems with the information presented in the Water for Santa Cruz County brochure. For example, there are a lot more constraints on north coast water than presented. Some of the underlying information and assumptions made in the brochure are inaccurate. She has a lot of concerns about what she considers to be misinformation in the brochure. She has previously shared these with Mr. McGilvray.

Mr. Duncan noted the river transfer is an option in the Soquel Creek's Community Water Plan and will be discussed more Tuesday at their meeting.

Mr. Marani thanked Mr. McGilvray for his interest and appreciated that he was bringing a solution forward for consideration.

8.2 Email Correspondence from Ms. Steinberger

Board Comments: None received

Public Comments: None received

9. Future Agenda Items

Dr. Daniels would like MGA staff to include review of some of the issues from the GSP Advisory Committee so the board can begin discussing them. For example, basin management issues and fees and financing issues.

Mr. Kennedy would like to see the board consider the concept of the impact on the basin. This board can help put context into the issues about fees and how those fees should be utilized to manage the basin.

Mr. Baskin suggests putting some of these items on the agenda of the joint meeting of the board and the GSP Advisory Committee agenda.

Mr. Kennedy suggests formation of a joint ad hoc committee of advisory and board members to determine items to discuss at joint meeting.

Dr. Daniels comments that during the last GSP Advisory Committee meeting there was a preliminary discussion about acceptable seawater intrusion impacts to utility wells that seemed misguided. He would like to be sure that there is a feedback mechanism to ensure that the GSP Advisory Committee is making well informed recommendations to the board.

10. Adjournment - Meeting adjourned at 8:49 pm.

SUBMITTED BY:

APPROVED BY:

Tim Carson
Regional Water Management Foundation

Cynthia Mathews
Board Secretary
City of Santa Cruz