

Laurel Gazza

From: Jillian Ritter
Sent: Monday, November 06, 2017 8:11 AM
To: Agenda Management Support
Subject: #23 11/7/17

From: Becky Steinbruner <ki6tkb@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 5, 2017 10:33 AM
To: Greg Caput; Ryan Coonerty; John Leopold; Zach Friend; Bruce McPherson; Susan Galloway
Cc: Giang Nguyen; Becky Steinbruner
Subject: Questions/Comments About Consent Agenda Item #23 on November 7, 2017 Board Agenda re: Groundwater Sustainability Agencies Expenses

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I have read the documentation regarding Consent Agenda Item #23 and have the following comments:

1. I am curious why the County's contribution to the MidCounty Groundwater Agency is double the amount the County's contribution to the Santa Margarita Groundwater Agency amount (\$60,000 vs. \$30,000), even though the percentage contribution is nearly the same (10% vs. 8%)? Please explain this.
2. I have observed that the County provides a large portion of the administrative contribution, such as the grant applications with the State Water Resources Control Board. Is this staff time fairly accounted for in the percentage contribution to both agencies? How do private well owners and taxpayers have a voice in this expenditure?
3. Does the Community Foundation Water Resource Agency administer both the MidCounty Groundwater Agency and the Santa Margarita Groundwater Sustainability Agency? Why is the County staff doing all the work to apply for and administer grants when it seems that the Community Foundation is available and being paid to do this type of work?
4. I do not feel the County staff should be spending taxpayer money to apply for grants that augment the Soquel Creek Water District's DualEM project. While I applaud groundwater recharge efforts, I do not think the County should be financially supporting a Special District's private project that the District is considering to use as part of their Water Demand Offset requirements for NEW DEVELOPMENT within their service area. This proposed project has been discussed at the Soquel Creek Water District Board meetings, but it has not been thoroughly vetted publicly by the MidCounty Groundwater Agency and the County Water Advisory Commission. I am aware of the excellent work that Dr. Andy Fisher at UCSC has already done in conjunction with the Santa Cruz County Resource Conservation District to identify and profile soils throughout the County for suitable Managed Stormwater Recharge Suitability. I have also not seen documentation of the potential sites that Soquel Creek Water District proposes this Dual EM study be conducted. It is my understanding that this equipment has great limitations regarding the physical terrain to be tested. Would this in any way be used to support the District's proposed PureWater Soquel Project?

Again, while I applaud the groundwater recharge efforts, I do not think it is appropriate for the County of Santa Cruz to spend valuable staff time to help fund Soquel Creek Water District's proprietary project that the District is considering to use as part of their Water Demand Offset requirements for NEW development in a critically-overdrafted Basin.

I would appreciate a response before Tuesday's Board meeting.

Thank you.
Sincerely,
Becky Steinbruner