

**WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE (1 of 3)- Miscellaneous Communications
and Agenda Items 5.1, 5.3, 5.4, 6.2, and 6.3.**

From: [Santa Cruz Mid-County Groundwater Agency](#)
To: [Becky Steinbruner](#)
Subject: Re: Correspondence for September 9, 2021 MidCounty Groundwater Agency Board Meeting
Date: Wednesday, September 8, 2021 11:47:02 AM

Dear Ms. Steinbruner,

Thank you for your email. This is to confirm your email (1 of 3) was received. Consistent with the MGA's policy, written communications received are posted on the [MGA website](#) and Board members are informed of the written communications.

Best,

Tim Carson

On Wed, Sep 8, 2021 at 1:55 AM Becky Steinbruner <ki6tkb@yahoo.com> wrote:

Dear MidCounty Groundwater Agency Board,

I will not be able to participate in the September 9, 2021 MGA Board meeting, and would like to offer my comments below for your consideration.

1) Public Communication

a) At the last MGA Board meeting, it was reported (page 9 of this month's Board packet):

DWR Aerial Surveys:

*Staff reported DWR will be conducting airborne electromagnetic (AEM) surveys to gather information about aquifer structures that will support the development and implementation of GSPs. The surveys are starting this summer and will move north through the Central Valley. There are DWR constraints on the program, such as limitations on where they can fly (i.e. not over buildings, and not offshore). They will also use a course grid, whereas the MGA used a fine grid. Staff attended a presentation and learned it will not be possible to pay for a finer resolution. The Basin is so small this survey might not provide much information, but **DWR will be reaching out about other technologies and wants to collaborate on gathering additional data.***

I request that staff report about the DWR actions to contact the MGA staff or Executive Committee about other technologies and collaboration for gathering additional data that could include coarse-grid AEM to determine the status of the freshwater/salt water interface in the Basin.

b) Also at the last Board meeting, it was stated the Board would consider starting the MGA Board meetings earlier, but I see no agenda item to publicly discuss that idea. I am in favor of whatever best serves the needs of the most Board members and members of the public, but support maintaining a 7pm start time due to local traffic congestion.

c) Finally, your Board needs to be aware that there appears to be ZERO collaboration occurring between Soquel Creek Water District staff or agents with the California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife to develop meaningful, effective or enforceable mitigations for the Modified Pure Water Soquel Project, per a Public Records Act request.

On August 17, 2021, I submitted a Public Records Act request to CDFW for correspondence with Soquel Creek Water District and/or the City of Santa Cruz regarding the Project. I am alarmed by the CDFW response of August 30, 2021 that "No Records Exist".

[View Message\(s\)](#)

Request / Incident Summary

Request Type:	Public Records Act Request
Contact E-Mail:	ki6tkb@yahoo.com
Reference No:	R001431-081721
Status:	No Record(s) Exist

I am very concerned that Soquel Creek Water District has not been consulting CDFW to develop an effective and enforceable Mitigation and Monitoring Plan, as the public was assured of when the District certified the Project EIR in 2018.

Under CEQA, a project that affects the habitat of an endangered, rare or threatened species is considered to be a project of statewide significance that requires state agency review of the project's EIR (14 Cal Code Regs 15206(b)(5).

Soquel Creek Water District, as the lead agency, is required to consult with the Department of Fish and Wildlife and obtain written findings on the impact of the project on the continued existence of any endangered or threatened species, in compliance with Public Resources Code 21104.2.

This has not happened.

Please make a recommendation to Soquel Creek Water District that this be remedied immediately. The MidCounty Groundwater Sustainable Plan was approved by the State based on the inclusion of this Project. Therefore, the MGA would do well to make sure there are proper procedures being followed and that meaningful mitigations will occur.

2) ByLaw Amendments (page 38)

4.7.1 Appointment. The Board shall appoint and may remove the Treasurer and the auditor by majority vote of the Board. At present, the Finance

Manager of the Soquel Creek Water District holds the office of Treasurer and auditor of the Agency, as authorized by Section 6505.6 of the Government Code, and performs the duties as authorized in Section 6505 et seq. of the Government Code.

I do not feel it is wise to allow the same person or entity to act as both the Treasurer and the auditor. Please amend this to read that the auditor must be from a different JPA agency or contracted by the JPA as a neutral third party.

I do see that it is the Treasurer's duty to contract with an auditing agency (duties on page 38):

Contract for an independent audit to be made by a certified public accountant, or public accountant, in compliance with and as required by Government Code Sections 6505.

I note that Gov't Code 6505(c) requires an annual audit report:

(c) When an audit of an account and records is made by a certified public accountant or public accountant, a report thereof shall be filed as public records with each of the contracting parties to the agreement and also with the county auditor of the county where the home office of the joint powers authority is located and shall be sent to any public agency or person in California that submits a written request to the joint powers authority. The report shall be filed within 12 months of the end of the fiscal year or years under examination.

When was the last MGA fund audit report submitted to the Board? I am not able to find this information on the MGA website.

3) Item 5.3 Private Well Representatives

I have read the staff report, proposed changes to the ByLaws, and staff recommendations.

I protest the continued screening and selection of the Private Well Owner representatives by the Board SubCommittee, and respectfully request that the MidCounty Groundwater Agency align with the Santa Margarita Groundwater Agency and instead allow the Private Well Owners themselves to interview and select our representatives on the MGA Board.

Please do not take action to merely renew the three existing Private Well Owner representatives for another four years without supplying any notification of this potential action to the Private Well Owners at large.

If the Board is determined to take action on Item 5.3 during the September 9, 2021 meeting, I request actions 2(a), (b) and (c) are adopted for now. (page 50): https://www.midcountygroundwater.org/sites/default/files/uploads/meetings/board-packet/MGA_Board_Packet_%202021-0909.pdf

As a customer of a Private Well Owner, I request that Section 2.2 be re-written to include a process similar to the Santa Margarita Groundwater Agency ByLaws:

<https://www.smgwa.org/media/AgencyDocuments/Second-Amended-and-Restated-Bylaws.pdf> (see pages 3-5):

2.2 TERM OF APPOINTMENTS.

The term of the appointment for each Director on the Board shall be established by each entity they represent ("Represented Entity"). If a Director has no Represented Entity (as may be the case for the Well Owner Directors or the Well Owner Alternate, collectively referred to herein as "Well Owners"), the term of appointment shall be three (3) years and such term shall continue until the successor is duly appointed by the Board. At the expiration of a Well Owner's term, the Board may (i) elect to initiate the appointment procedure for a Well Owner position under section 2.3 of the Bylaws; or (ii) authorize a then-serving Well Owner to serve another term, subject to Board approval with the unanimous approval of the Member Directors participating in voting. Subject to Board approval, a Well Owner Director and the Well Owner Alternate may mutually agree to rotate positions so that the Well Owner Alternate assumes the role of Well Owner Director, and the Well Owner Director assumes the role of Well Owner Alternate ("Rotation") for a period of time not to exceed the respective terms of either Well Owner, or six months, whichever is earlier. The Rotation shall automatically terminate upon the expiration of the term of either Well Owner, or upon six months from the date of the appointment, unless the Board approves an extension of the term of the Rotation.

2.3 PROCEDURE FOR APPOINTMENT OF WELL OWNERS.

2.3.1 Under section 6.3.7 of the Agreement, Well Owners shall be nominated and approved by the procedure described in these Bylaws.

2.3.2 At minimum, one (1) of the two (2) Well Owner Directors shall be from an Individual Water System. If one (1) of two (2) Well Owner Directors is from a Small Water System, then the preference in choosing a Well Owner Alternate shall be given to an Individual Water System representative.

2.3.3 Any person meeting the requirements of section 2.3.2 and the following qualifications may apply to serve as a Well Owner (individually, an "Applicant"). At a minimum, an Applicant shall (a) be an owner of a private well located within the boundaries of the Agency, a tenant leasing property with a private well located within the boundaries of the Agency, or a representative of a small public water system with a well located within boundaries of the Agency; (b) be at least 18 years of age; and (c) exhibit high standards of integrity, commitment, and good judgment; (collectively, 2.3.3 (a)-(c) shall be the "Qualifications"). Once appointed, a Well Owner shall meet the Qualifications for the duration of his or her service as a Well Owner.

2.3.4 If a Well Owner position becomes vacant for any reason, including death, permanent disability, inability to perform his or her responsibilities, resignation, removal, or failure to meet the Qualifications, the following process shall apply:

2.3.4.1 In the event of Well Owner Director vacancy, the Well Owner Alternate shall fill the vacancy as a Director if the Well Owner Alternate is willing to serve as a Director, subject to compliance with section 2.3.2 of these Bylaws. The Well Owner Alternate who fills a vacancy under this section shall serve as a Director for the remainder of the term of the departing Well Owner Director.

2.3.4.2 If a Well Owner Director vacancy is not filled under section 2.3.4.1, or if a Well Owner position remains vacant, the Board shall appoint an ad hoc committee of three (3) Directors of the Agency to facilitate the appointment process ("Committee"). At least one (1) of the members of the Committee shall be a Member Director, and the Board shall give preference to then-serving Well Owners to fill the remaining two (2) Committee positions.

2.3.4.2.1 The Committee shall provide or cause to be provided a notice of the opportunity for individuals to submit an application to serve as a Well

Owner to fill a vacancy. The notice may include a description of the work of the Agency, the minimum qualifications of a Well Owner, the desired characteristics and skills of a Well Owner, criteria to be used in evaluating applications received, as well as deadlines and the timeline for decision-making on appointees. The notice shall also inform Applicants that if there are more Well Owner Applicants than the number of positions available, the Applicants will have the opportunity to self-nominate a Well Owner by reaching agreement among themselves by having some Applicants voluntarily withdraw their applications so that the remaining number of applications is the same as the number of vacant positions. To encourage participation, a variety of print media, electronic or other formal and informal communication mechanisms may be utilized, and the period of notice shall cover, at a minimum, ten (10) working days.

2.3.4.2.2 The Committee shall be given the names and contact information of all Applicants. The Applicants shall be informed that they have at least twenty (20) days but no more than forty (40) days ("Deadline") to meet and/or confer and endeavor to seek agreement on which Applicants elect to voluntarily withdraw their applications and which Applicants will be recommended to fill the vacant positions. Committee members are encouraged to attend the meetings of the Applicants. The Committee may recommend the rejection of an application if the Applicant fails to meet the Qualifications or if an Applicant fails to attend a meeting of Applicants called for the purpose of nominating an Applicant to fill a vacancy.

2.3.4.2.3 An Applicant may withdraw his application prior to the Deadline by sending a written request to the Principal Office by mail, email or facsimile.

2.3.4.2.4 If by the Deadline, the number of Applicants equals the number of vacancies, then the applications shall be forwarded to the Board for consideration, provided the Applicants meet the Qualifications.

2.3.4.2.5 If no applications are forwarded to the Board under section 2.3.4.2.4, then the Committee shall report its findings and forward all of the applications of the Applicants to the Board. The Board may then appoint any Applicant to fill each vacant Well Owner position.

2.3.4.2.6. If a Well Owner position remains vacant after the conclusion of the forgoing process, the Board may appoint any person meeting the requirements of section 2.3.3.

2.3.5. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary herein, the final appointment of any person to fill a Well Owner vacancy shall be subject to the approval of the Board and the unanimous approval of the Member Directors participating in voting.

(see pages 3-5):

<https://www.smgwa.org/media/AgencyDocuments/Second-Amended-and-Restated-Bylaws.pdf>

4) Item 5.4 Subcommittee to Form Non-de Minimis Metering Program

I have read the staff report and recommendations and **request that the MGA send a notification letter to all non-de minimis pumpers and host a meeting with these pumpers.** Many may already be metered, but others may not have had the financial or physical ability to meter all service connections.

Once again, the Private Well Owners need to be able to choose their own representatives on the MGA Board and this proposed Committee. **Although Temporary Committees are not required to abide by the Brown Act or be open to the public, I respectfully request that this Committee do both.**

How will the two proposed groups be identified and notified? (page 54);

- (1) All non-de minimis pumping operations expected to extract more than 5 acre-feet per year, and
- (2) All non-de minimis pumping operations expected to extract more than 2 acre-feet per year in priority areas that may impact seawater intrusion or stream flow.

What is the timeline for implementing this program?

5) Item 6.2 Financial Status Report

I have the following questions and ask that the Treasurer provide answers:

- a) 5520 Legal Services 1,875.00 (page 59) What legal services were performed that required this payment?
- b) 4400 Grant Revenue 64,076.99 (page 59) Many thanks to the grant writer and grant manager!
Page 59

6) Item 6.3 Contract Change Order for Administrative Services

What administrative duties caused the second Contract Change Order to be necessary?

At the June 17, 2020 meeting of the Santa Cruz Mid-County Groundwater Agency (MGA) Board of Directors, staff advised the Board that for Fiscal Year (FY) 2020/21, administrative services costs were higher than initially projected. The Board approved an increase in the administrative budget of \$15,000 for FY 2020/21 and FY 2021/22.

*The Executive Team subsequently approved a Contract Change Order (CCO) in the amount of \$20,400 to increase RWMF's FY 2020/21 contract amount from **\$129,600 to \$150,000**. The budget increase is for administrative services (within the Administrative budget category) and planning/program support (within the Management & Coordination budget category). (page 68)*

Thank you for taking the time to consider my comments and thank you in advance for answering my questions.

Sincerely,
Becky Steinbruner
Customer of Private Well Owner / Small Water Company
831-685-2915

From: [Santa Cruz Mid-County Groundwater Agency](#)
To: [Becky Steinbruner](#)
Subject: Re: Fw: Concerns re: Soquel Creek Water District Placement of Monitoring Wells for PureWater Soquel Project Injection of Recycled Water
Date: Wednesday, September 8, 2021 11:47:45 AM

Dear Ms. Steinbruner,

Thank you for your email. This is to confirm your email (2 of 3) was received. Consistent with the MGA's policy, written communications received are posted on the [MGA website](#) and Board members are informed of the written communications.

Best,

Tim Carson

On Wed, Sep 8, 2021 at 8:36 AM Becky Steinbruner <ki6tkb@yahoo.com> wrote:

Dear MidCounty Groundwater Agency Board,
I want to make you aware of this issue regarding the Soquel Creek Water District's placement of monitoring wells for the Modified PureWater Soquel Project.

To date, I have received no response to my July 2, 2021 query below.

Sincerely,
Becky Steinbruner

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Becky Steinbruner <ki6tkb@yahoo.com>
To: Packard, Harvey@Waterboards <Harvey.Packard@waterboards.ca.gov>
Cc: Nathan Salazar <nathan.salazar@santacruzcounty.us>; Keeling, Matt@Waterboards <Matt.Keeling@waterboards.ca.gov>; Epp, Jennifer@Waterboards <Jennifer.Epp@waterboards.ca.gov>; Bishop, James@Waterboards <James.Bishop@Waterboards.ca.gov>; Becky Steinbruner <ki6tkb@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 2, 2021, 12:24:19 PM PDT
Subject: Re: Concerns re: Soquel Creek Water District Placement of Monitoring Wells for PureWater Soquel Project Injection of Recycled Water

Dear Mr. Packard,
Thank you for sending this information.

- 1) What contaminants are already found in the background monitoring well areas?
- 2) How does the model calculate the migration of the proposed injected effluent? I note there is quite a range in prediction of particle tracking travel times. Is that all hypothetical, or were real tracking tests performed?

Monterey SWIP Well Monitoring Wells

"Two monitoring wells are proposed to monitor groundwater between the Monterey SWIP well and the nearest private well (2603 Monterey Avenue), MM-1 and MM-2; both of which will monitor the Purisima A unit only. MM-1 is located approximately 1.2-months travel time from the SWIP well and is approximately 30-months upgradient of the nearest drinking water well. MM-2 is located approximately 9-months travel time from the SWIP well and is approximately 24-months upgradient of the nearest drinking water well."
(page 8 of report)

Willowbrook SWIP Well Monitoring Wells

"Two monitoring wells are proposed to monitor groundwater between the Willowbrook SWIP well and the District's

Tannery well, WM-1 and WM-2; both of which will monitor the A unit only. WM-1 is located approximately 0.75-months travel time from the SWIP well and is greater than 33-months upgradient of the nearest drinking water well. WM-2 is located greater than 36-months travel time from the SWIP well and is estimated to be greater than 24-months upgradient of the nearest drinking water well."
(page 9 of report)

How can two wells so close together yield such different travel times of the SWIP effluent?

Also, there is no mention of the private well located at the end of Abbey Lane, about one block to the west of the SWIP well, even though it is shown on the map on page 11 of the report.

Twin Lakes Church SWIP Well Monitoring Wells

"Six monitoring wells are proposed to monitor groundwater between the TLC SWIP well and the nearest drinking water wells: Estates well and Pine Tree Lane well. Two pairs of clustered wells will be used to monitor groundwater between the TLC SWIP well and the Estates well; TLM-1A/TLM-1BC and TLM-2A/TLM-2BC. Each cluster will monitor both the Purisima A and BC units. The TLM-1A/TLM-1BC cluster is located approximately 2.5-months and 11-months travel time respectively, from the SWIP well and is over 30-months upgradient of the nearest drinking water well. The TLM-2A/TLM-2BC cluster is located more than 30-months travel time from the SWIP well and is approximately 30-months upgradient of the nearest drinking water well in the Purisima A unit (and greater than 30-months in the Purisima BC unit). Two wells will be used to monitor groundwater in the Purisima BC unit between the TLC SWIP well and Pine Tree Lane wells. TLM-3BC is located approximately 12-months travel time from the SWIP well and is greater than 24-months upgradient of the nearest drinking water well. TLM-4BC is located greater than 36-months travel time from the SWIP well and is greater than 24-months upgradient of the nearest drinking water well."

(page 9 of report)

Where are the three Cabrillo College production wells located in relation to the SWIP? I do not see them on the map on page 12 of the report.

Thank you for helping me understand this issue. I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Becky Steinbruner

On Thursday, June 3, 2021, 04:01:09 PM PDT, Packard, Harvey@Waterboards

<harvey.packard@waterboards.ca.gov> wrote:

Ms. Steinbruner, attached is the technical memo referenced in my previous email.

Thanks, Harvey

From: Packard, Harvey@Waterboards

Sent: Thursday, June 3, 2021 2:44 PM

To: Becky Steinbruner <ki6tkb@yahoo.com>

Cc: Nathan Salazar <nathan.salazar@santacruzcounty.us>; Keeling, Matt@Waterboards <matt.keeling@waterboards.ca.gov>; Epp, Jennifer@Waterboards <jennifer.epp@waterboards.ca.gov>;

Bishop, James@Waterboards <James.Bishop@Waterboards.ca.gov>

Subject: RE: Concerns re: Soquel Creek Water District Placement of Monitoring Wells for PureWater Soquel Project Injection of Recycled Water

Dear Ms. Steinbruner,

Thank you for your email regarding the location of the monitoring wells associated with Soquel Creek Water District's Pure Water Soquel project. Central Coast Water Board

(CCWB) staff participated in discussions and decision-making related to the location of monitoring wells associated with Pure Water Soquel. These discussions included staff from the State Water Board's Division of Drinking Water (DDW) and Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment Program (GAMA), Soquel Creek Water District (SCWD), and consultants for the Pure Water Soquel project. Monitoring well locations were chosen to ensure that the wells provided adequate monitoring relevant to the protection of groundwater quality and human health and were compliant with rules governing monitoring well placement included in Article 5.2, Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), *Indirect Potable Reuse: Groundwater Replenishment-Subsurface Application*. (Article 5.3 of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations can be accessed on the Internet via the following link:

https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/drinking_water/certlic/drinkingwater/documents/lawbook/rwregulations.pdf.)

Decisions that culminated from the discussions between CCWB, DDW, GAMA, SCWD, and associated consultants are included in the attached draft technical memorandum.

Monitoring well locations were selected based on the requirements of Title 22 of the CCR which require that wells be located within specified travel times of injection wells. Travel times and groundwater flow paths were estimated using calibrated numerical and analytical groundwater models. Once the injection wells are developed and operational, modeled travel times will be verified using either an intrinsic or added tracer. This tracer test will be initiated prior to the end of the third month of operation, per the requirements of Title 22.

In addition to complying with Title 22 of the CCR, monitoring well locations also considered the hydrogeology (i.e. monitoring multiple aquifers) and constraints related to developing and maintaining wells in an urban environment. The well locations were chosen in part by the availability of accessible land available for the development and ongoing monitoring of these wells.

Regarding your concern that only two of the monitoring wells are located "upstream" of the injection wells, this is inconsistent with modeling results. Modeling results indicate that monitoring wells are appropriately located such that they will be completed within the recycled water injection plume and located appropriate distances away to comply with the travel time requirements. Figures 2-6, 2-7, and 2-8 of the attached technical memorandum provide a visualization of the injection wells, modeled injection plume, modeled travel times, monitoring wells, and private domestic wells.

Regarding your concerns about the private wells located near the Twin Lakes Church injection well, these private wells were identified and considered as part of the evaluation of monitoring well placement. The monitoring wells are located such that they provide adequate response retention time for the Pine Tree Lane private wells, per the requirements of Title 22.

Regarding your request to require that SCWD provide funding for private domestic wells to monitor production water quality, this additional monitoring is not required because the monitoring wells will serve this purpose. Monitoring wells are located such that they are downgradient from the injection wells and upgradient from the private domestic wells. Any water injected into the aquifer will arrive at the monitoring wells before it arrives at private domestic wells. In addition, the monitoring wells are located an appropriate distance upgradient that, in the event that off specification water is injected into the aquifer, SCWD will have adequate time to identify the presence of this off specification water in the two downgradient monitoring wells, notify potentially impacted private domestic wells, and provide replacement water prior to the arrival of the off specification water at the downgradient private supply wells.

Thanks, Harvey

From: Becky Steinbruner <ki6tkb@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 12:59 AM
To: Keeling, Matt@Waterboards <Matt.Keeling@waterboards.ca.gov>; Olson, Tammie@Waterboards <Tammie.Olson@Waterboards.ca.gov>
Cc: Packard, Harvey@Waterboards <Harvey.Packard@waterboards.ca.gov>; Nathan Salazar <nathan.salazar@santacruzcounty.us>; Becky Steinbruner <ki6tkb@yahoo.com>
Subject: Concerns re: Soquel Creek Water District Placement of Monitoring Wells for PureWater Soquel Project Injection of Recycled Water

EXTERNAL:

Dear Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board,

On June 1, 2021, the Soquel Creek Water District Board approved, via Consent Agenda Item #4.5, a nearly \$1.4 million contract with Maggiora Bros. to drill eight new wells to monitor the flow of injected treated sewage water into the aquifer from three energy-intensive injection wells (Twin Lakes Church, Willowbrook, and Monterey Injection Wells). Ten contractors held bid packages, but only Maggiora Bros. actually submitted a bid.

The troubling thing is that all but two of the new monitoring wells will be located *upstream* of the injection well sites.

How will these monitoring wells actually monitor anything at all related to the flow of the injected recycled water and possible contaminants once the water is pressure-injected into the aquifer?

How will the District be able to assure compliance with the State's required six month holding times of injected Indirect Potable Re-Use recycled water?

Please see page 30 of the Board agenda packet to see the well locations on the map:

https://www.soquelcreekwater.org/AgendaCenter/ViewFile/Agenda/_06012021-251?packet=true

Unfortunately, the map does not indicate the location of the injection wells themselves, but because I am familiar with them, I assure you that only TLM-4BC and TLM-2A are downstream of the Twin Lakes Church Injection Well, but all others are upstream of the Monterey and Willowbrook injection wells.

Can you please review the placement of the monitoring well locations and determine why they have been placed upstream of the injection wells?

I am concerned in particular that the Pine Tree Lane Water Mutual and Bluff Water Mutual, as well as other private wells are located adjacent to and downstream of the Twin Lakes Church Injection Well, and may be adversely affected by the recycled water injection. Please require the District to provide funding for these small water providers to test and monitor their production well water quality now and moving forward with any pressurized recycled water injection associated with PureWater Soquel Project work.

Please respond. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Becky Steinbruner

3441 Redwood Drive

Aptos, CA 95003

831-685-2915

From: [Santa Cruz Mid-County Groundwater Agency](#)
To: [Becky Steinbruner](#)
Subject: Re: Fw: Status of Approval for Modified PureWater Soquel Project Conveyance Permits for Stream Crossings?
Date: Wednesday, September 8, 2021 11:48:13 AM

Dear Ms. Steinbruner,

Thank you for your email. This is to confirm your email (3 of 3) was received. Consistent with the MGA's policy, written communications received are posted on the [MGA website](#) and Board members are informed of the written communications.

Best,

Tim Carson

On Wed, Sep 8, 2021 at 9:05 AM Becky Steinbruner <ki6tkb@yahoo.com> wrote:

Dear MidCounty Groundwater Agency Board,

The Soquel Creek Water District Board will consider yet another potentially significant modification to the PureWater Soquel Project at their October 5, 2021 Board meeting, according to the calendar in the September 7, 2021 Board agenda packet.

(See page 5): https://www.soquelcreekwater.org/AgendaCenter/ViewFile/Agenda/_09072021-261?packet=true

I urge your Board to review this information as soon as it is available and to comment on the CEQA Determination. I asked the Board last night during public comment on the Consent Agenda to please conduct the review of this proposed (Second) Addendum in a public hearing, but it is currently not listed as a public hearing item.

I want to make you aware of the following information regarding the issues of permitting problems and changes in the Soquel Creek Water District's Modified PureWater Soquel Project.

To date, Mr. Packard has not answered my questions regarding the State Waterboard's oversight of the potential chloramine-laden effluent leaks in conveyance pipes at any of the multiple stream and riparian crossings, including the San Lorenzo River.

This is yet another reason that the California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife staff needs to be taking an active role in developing adequate and enforceable mitigations for this Modified Project. However it appears that is not the case, per Public Records Act request response.

On August 17, 2021, I submitted a Public Records Act request to CDFW for correspondence with Soquel Creek Water District and/or the City of Santa Cruz regarding the Project. I am alarmed by the CDFW response of August 30, 2021 that "No Records Exist".

[View Message\(s\)](#)

Request / Incident Summary

Request Type:	Public Records Act Request
Contact E-Mail:	ki6tkb@yahoo.com
Reference No:	R001431-081721
Status:	No Record(s) Exist

I am very concerned that Soquel Creek Water District has not been consulting CDFW to develop an effective and enforceable Mitigation and Monitoring Plan, as the public was assured of when the District certified the Project EIR in 2018.

Under CEQA, a project that affects the habitat of an endangered, rare or threatened species is considered to be a project of statewide significance that requires state agency review of the project's EIR (14 Cal Code Regs 15206(b)(5).

Soquel Creek Water District, as the lead agency, is required to consult with the Department of Fish and Wildlife and obtain written findings on the impact of the project on the continued existence of any endangered or threatened speices, in compliance with Public Resources Code 21104.2.

This has not happened.

I respectfully ask that your Board discuss this publicly due to the fact that the Modified PureWater Soquel Project is an integral element of the MidCounty Groundwater Agency's Sustainable Groundwater Plan.

Please respond. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Becky Steinbruner

----- Forwarded Message -----
From: Becky Steinbruner <ki6tkb@yahoo.com>

To: Packard, Harvey@Waterboards <harvey.packard@waterboards.ca.gov>
Cc: Hammer, Phillip@Waterboards <phillip.hammer@waterboards.ca.gov>; Keeling, Matt@Waterboards <matt.keeling@waterboards.ca.gov>; wesley.stokes@wildlife.ca.gov <wesley.stokes@wildlife.ca.gov>; Serena Stumpf <serena.stumpf@wildlife.ca.gov>; Becky Steinbruner <ki6tkb@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, June 28, 2021, 12:13:54 PM PDT
Subject: Re: Status of Approval for Modified PureWater Soquel Project Conveyance Permits for Stream Crossings?

Dear Mr. Packard,

I very much appreciate the update on the PureWater Soquel Project conveyance system with regard to the San Lorenzo River crossing.

What information was the Water Board requesting of Soquel Creek Water District associated with the application denial September 11, 2020?

Will the State Water Board oversee any mitigations regarding that crossing to address the chloramine levels now planned in the effluent? The effluent conveyance system will still have to cross the San Lorenzo River at some point, attached to a bridge.

I am copying State Dept. of Fish and Wildlife officials on this message as well, as they have recently indicated they are unaware of the significant Project Modifications.

The Project has been modified to include an additional nBAF treatment facility at the Santa Cruz City Wastewater Treatment Facility because of elevated nitrate, ammonia and total organic carbon levels in the secondary treated sewage water supply. The District has elected to use this treatment system that would require adding chloramine to the pressurized effluent enroute to the Advanced Water Treatment Facility in Live Oak four miles away, crossing multiple waterways and streams.

How will the State Water Board work with the District to establish mitigations that would reduce risk of effluent leaks over the San Lorenzo River and the multiple other stream crossings planned in the Project conveyance system? Chloramine is toxic to all aquatic life, is not volatile, and could pose great threat to water quality in the Project area.

I look forward to your response. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Becky Steinbruner

On Friday, June 18, 2021, 10:00:23 AM PDT, Becky Steinbruner <ki6tkb@yahoo.com> wrote:

Dear Mr. Packard,
Thank you for this information.

I am glad to know that the effluent pipeline will not be crossing beneath the San Lorenzo River.

What was the supplemental information that your agency requested of Soquel Creek Water District?

What capacity is the Water Board still involved with the Modified PureWater Soquel Project permitting?

Thank you for your help.
Sincerely,
Becky Steinbruner

On Friday, June 18, 2021, 09:28:29 AM PDT, Packard, Harvey@Waterboards <harvey.packard@waterboards.ca.gov> wrote:

Hello Ms. Steinbruner,

I asked staff for an update on this project and learned that we issued a denial without prejudice on Sept. 11, 2020, because supplemental information we requested was not forthcoming. The District then withdrew its application because they changed their stream crossing methods enough so that they are not taking action in waters of the state. They are trenching either above a culvert through a roadway cover, hand mining below a culvert that is through a road, or are mounting the pipeline onto a pipe bridge. So the Water Board will not be involved in the permitting of the pipeline project.

Thanks, Harvey

From: Becky Steinbruner <ki6tkb@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 17, 2021 11:40 AM
To: Keeling, Matt@Waterboards <Matt.Keeling@waterboards.ca.gov>
Cc: Packard, Harvey@Waterboards <Harvey.Packard@waterboards.ca.gov>; Becky Steinbruner <ki6tkb@yahoo.com>
Subject: Status of Approval for Modified PureWater Soquel Project Conveyance Permits for Stream Crossings?

EXTERNAL:

Dear Mr. Keeling,

In reviewing actions of the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board, I note that Soquel Creek Water District applied for a permit for PureWater Soquel Project conveyance systems crossing stream areas on August 2, 2020.

https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralcoast/board_info/agendas/2020/sep_23/item16_att1.pdf

What is the status of that permit application? Has the Board considered the recent significant modifications to the PureWater Soquel Project that would now include chloramine in the effluent of the eight miles of pressurized conveyance system, crossing under the San Lorenzo River and over multiple other streams?

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Becky Steinbruner