

**Laurel Gazza**

---

**From:** Jillian Ritter  
**Sent:** Monday, November 06, 2017 10:50 AM  
**To:** Agenda Management Support  
**Subject:** 11/7/17 #23

---

**From:** John Ricker  
**Sent:** Monday, November 06, 2017 10:34 AM  
**To:** Becky Steinbruner <[ki6tkb@yahoo.com](mailto:ki6tkb@yahoo.com)>  
**Cc:** John Leopold <[John.Leopold@santacruzcounty.us](mailto:John.Leopold@santacruzcounty.us)>; Bruce McPherson <[Bruce.McPherson@santacruzcounty.us](mailto:Bruce.McPherson@santacruzcounty.us)>; Zach Friend <[Zach.Friend@santacruzcounty.us](mailto:Zach.Friend@santacruzcounty.us)>; Arnold Leff <[Arnold.Leff@santacruzcounty.us](mailto:Arnold.Leff@santacruzcounty.us)>; Giang Nguyen <[Giang.Nguyen@santacruzcounty.us](mailto:Giang.Nguyen@santacruzcounty.us)>; Ryan Coonerty <[Ryan.Coonerty@santacruzcounty.us](mailto:Ryan.Coonerty@santacruzcounty.us)>; Greg Caput <[Greg.Caput@santacruzcounty.us](mailto:Greg.Caput@santacruzcounty.us)>; Susan Galloway <[Susan.Galloway@santacruzcounty.us](mailto:Susan.Galloway@santacruzcounty.us)>; Sierra Ryan <[Sierra.Ryan@santacruzcounty.us](mailto:Sierra.Ryan@santacruzcounty.us)>  
**Subject:** RE: Questions/Comments About Consent Agenda Item #23 on November 7, 2017 Board Agenda re: Groundwater Sustainability Agencies Expenses

Ms. Steinbruner,

Supervisor Leopold requested that I respond to your inquiry regarding the groundwater management item on Tuesdays Board agenda. Following is information relative to your comments/questions:

1. The County's contribution to the Santa Margarita Groundwater Agency (SMGWA) is much less than the County contribution to the Mid-County Agency (MGA) because the FY 17-18 budget for the SMGWA is much less. The SMGWA is not as far along in the process than the MGA and has two additional years than the MGA to complete the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP). The shorter timeframe for the MGA results from designation of the Mid-County basin by the state as being in critical overdraft. We do expect the budget for the SMGWA and the County contribution to the SMGWA to increase in future years.
2. All of the member agencies contribute staff time to both groundwater agencies. The County applied for and received a state Department of Water Resources (DWR) grant for the Mid-County basin, which was only available to counties and compensates the County for some of that staff time. Representatives of private well owners are on the boards of both groundwater agencies and there is much opportunity for public comment on work efforts.
3. The Regional Water Management Foundation (RWMF), which is affiliated with the Community Foundation, provides administrative and planning services to the MGA, but not the SMGWA. The State Water Board grant that will be considered by the Board on Tuesday is intended to be a grant to the County to complement the work already being done by the County to promote groundwater recharge under the County's ongoing DWR grant.
4. The DualEM project is a joint project with the County and the Soquel Creek Water District, to help develop groundwater recharge projects for both the County and the District. It is more cost-effective to combine those efforts than to conduct them separately. The Dual EM work is the next step to build on prior work by Dr. Andy Fisher and the Resource Conservation District. That work identified potentially favorable recharge sites based on general mapped information. The Dual EM will now do detailed subsurface mapping of specific sites to confirm suitability and to target the specific locations for subsurface boring and detailed design of recharge projects. The Soquel Water District and the County both believe there is good potential to develop recharge projects to

benefit the groundwater basin. Once the feasibility and benefit is confirmed, construction could be funded through the District's Water Demand Offset Program. Development of recharge projects through the WDO program has been discussed a number of times at District Board meetings. Efforts to develop recharge projects have also been discussed at the County Water Advisory Commission, which has been very supportive of these efforts.

Please contact me directly if you have further questions on this or other water-related matters.

John Ricker  
Water Resources Division Director  
County of Santa Cruz – Health Services Agency – Environmental Health  
701 Ocean St. Rm 312  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
831-454-2750  
[john.ricker@santacruzcounty.us](mailto:john.ricker@santacruzcounty.us)  
<http://scceh.com/Home/Programs/WaterResources.aspx>

---

**From:** Becky Steinbruner <[ki6tkb@yahoo.com](mailto: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