

CORRESPONDENCE - 10/19/21
ITEM 5.0 - ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

From: [Becky Steinbruner](#)
To: [bod](#); [Emma Olin](#)
Cc: [Becky Steinbruner](#)
Subject: 2020 Study Showing Reverse Osmosis Concentrate Has High Contamination Levels
Date: Tuesday, October 19, 2021 8:10:10 PM

Dear Soquel Creek Water District Board and Staff,
Here is the link to the study I spoke about during Public Comment (Item #5.0) at your October 19, 2021 Board meeting regarding the Reverse Osmosis Concentrate contamination levels in a study conducted in the San Francisco Bay area:

Reverse Osmosis Concentrate Treatment Research Results and Context for San Francisco Bay

Prepared by:

University of California Berkeley

Stanford University

San Francisco Estuary Institute

April 21, 2020

https://www.valleywater.org/sites/default/files/ROC_TechMemo_ETC_Research_0.pdf

It is applicable because your District currently intends to deposit the Modified PureWater Soquel Project Reverse Osmosis Concentrate *directly* into the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary via the Santa Cruz City Wastewater Treatment Facility effluent outfall pipe. As I have notified your Board earlier, that outfall pipe is ruptured 65' offshore, causing a plume of effluent close to recreational and critical marine habitat.

I hope that you will take time to read this important information.

Sincerely,
Becky Steinbruner

CORRESPONDENCE - 10/19/21
ITEM 5.0 - ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

From: [Becky Steinbruner](#)
To: [bod](#); [Emma Olin](#)
Cc: [Becky Steinbruner](#)
Subject: WHY IS THERE NO PUBLIC HEARING ON OCTOBER 19, 2021 BOARD AGENDA FOR 1,2,3-TCP TREATMENT AT COUNTRY CLUB WELL?
Date: Monday, October 18, 2021 10:03:18 AM

Dear Board of Directors,

Your Board's October 19, 2021 agenda does not include any public hearing. However, the October 5, 2021 Board Consent Agenda packet included the calendar items scheduled for your October 19 meeting, and indicated a Public Hearing for the Country Club Well and Treatment Plan that would be held to address this Project and the high levels of 1,2,3-TCP carcinogen in the water at that production well.

(Item 4.3 on page 19):https://www.soquelcreekwater.org/AgendaCenter/ViewFile/Agenda/_10052021-264?packet=true

However, there is NO public hearing scheduled for your Board meeting tomorrow evening.

When *does* the District plan to hold this important public hearing? I respectfully request that it be scheduled soon, before the beginning of the busy holiday season when many people interested in the project may be precluded from participating, due to busier than usual schedules.

The County Club Well is on stand-by status and, according to September 7, 2021 staff reports to your Board, it is one of the six District production wells out of 16 that are offline. (Consent Agenda item 4.4 on 9/7/21).

I worry that because the Country Club Well is on stand-by emergency-use status, the District could resort to using this well in an emergency.

Therefore, I hope that the District will move as quickly as possible to hold a timely and well-noticed public hearing with regard to the County Club Well and Treatment Plan in order to move remediation efforts forward with robust and informed public participation while re-establishing a production well that will not be used as stand-by for water in emergencies that could contain high levels of 1,2,3-TCP carcinogen.

Please acknowledge receipt of this message and respond in writing. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Becky Steinbruner

CORRESPONDENCE - 10/19/21

ITEM 5.0 - ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

From: [Douglas Deitch](mailto:Douglas.Deitch)
To: citycouncil@cityofsantacruz.com; 100-District 5 (831) 647-7755; district2@co.monterey.ca.us; district3@co.monterey.ca.us; district4@co.monterey.ca.us; Zach Friend; bruce.mcpherson@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; greg.caputi@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; Ryan Coonerty; Manu Koenig; Melanie Mow Schumacher; bod; Padilla_Stephen@Coastal; Brownsey_Donne@Coastal; Groom_Carole@Coastal; Turnbull-Sanders_Effie@Coastal; Uranga_Roberto@Coastal; Howell_Erik@Coastal; Aminzadeh_Sara@Coastal; Ainsworth_John@Coastal; Luster_Tom@Coastal; Rice_Katie@Coastal; Luce_Shelley@Coastal; gapatton@stanfordalumni.org; [Doug Deitch](mailto:Doug.Deitch); Godwin_Timothy@DWR; craig.altare@water.ca.gov; [Ddeitch](mailto:Ddeitch@seasleperez@cityofsantacruz.com); meversd@svbosa.org; mark@markprimack.com; jcummines@cityofsantacruz.com
Subject: Fwd: We have received your response for Form
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 10:49:19 AM

Input on Salinas Valley Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plans

Public comment,

CORRESPONDENCE - 10/19/21

ITEM 5.0 - ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

Oct. 15, 2021

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Jotform** <noreply@jotform.com>

Date: Fri, Oct 15, 2021 at 6:16 AM

Subject: We have received your response for Form

To: <siddhartha1002@gmail.com>

Form	
Name	Douglas Deitch
Organization	Monterey Bay Conservancy (MBC)
Email Address	siddhartha1002@gmail.com
Subbasin	Langley Eastside Forebay Upper Valley Monterey Whole Basin 180/400
Chapter	Salinas Valley Basin GSA (entire)
Comments	<p>https://twitter.com/DouglasDeitch/status/1375814806364594178/photo/1</p> <p>Part I-General comments on balkanized/"sub basined" and too many Monterey Bay GSAs, our ground water commons, our Water Berry (and other similar) Ponzi Schemes (MBC @ CCC 2009 @ http://www.begentlewiththeearth.org , http://ourinconvenienttruth.net http://ourinconvenienttruth.org http://ourinconvenienttruth.com & 2011 @ http://douglasdeitch.com http://douglasdeitch.net & MBC @ http://dougforassembly.com @ SWRCB requesting SWRCB Monterey Bay Regional "Intervention" for the first time in 2016 @ 11:21 @ http://thebestthatmoneycantbuy.org), and their ongoing and worsening (terminal?) tragedy ... and our Alternatives</p> <p>1. "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it." : "Toolittle/toolatefortheCentralValley (and Monterey Bay's \$5 billion+ annual production) &it'sAG? Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it, like we have forgotten in the Monterey Bay w/ berries&Driscolls/Reiter (et al) instead of cotton&Boswells@ http://youtube.com/watch?v=15uloJ5m1o&feature=youtu.be http://santacruzfoods.com https://twitter.com/DouglasDeitch/status/1448627629557354500</p> <p>Alternative#1 @ Living within our means @ http://dougdeitch.info , 1995 Zmudowsky Beach 43 acre Pilot Project @ http://dougdeitch.com & @ MBC @ CCC in 2011 @ https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ja6HUDP-eY</p> <p>2. "VAST majority of the water/food/RE resources of World's 5th biggest economy/Community are inextricably tied to SFBay/Delta/Sierra-Snowpak&CentralValleyag. CCC predicts 3.5ftSLR in 30 years@ http://documents.coastal.ca.gov/assets/slr/CCCendorsement_SLRPrinciples.pdf . 5:42@ http://pebblebeachrealestate.com Dr.Mount sez what 1 foot will do!" https://twitter.com/DouglasDeitch/status/1374672809163550720</p> <p>Question #1: If one foot of SLR will "salt up" the Delta, as Dr. Mount tells us in 2015, how, for example will this same one foot SLR affect our already overuse/critically overstressed local ground water commons? How is this above referenced projected CCC 3.5 feet SLR in next 30 years accounted for, if at all, in any current Monterey Bay GSA, particularly the only and first two and already approved ones in this or your, my, and GM/Santa Cruz Mayor Meyer's neighbor's and partner's "Mid County Ground Water Agency" and the sustainability of each's respective ground water basins and "sub basins"?</p> <p>Here's my recent comment to the CCC on this exact issue:</p> <p>"Good Afternoon Dear Chair and Commissioners,</p>

CORRESPONDENCE - 10/19/21

ITEM 5.0 - ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

Please find my four (4) comments (in reverse order) I tendered last Friday, as described in the "Subject" of this email, and various attached images/articles/etc. w/ some repetition? (please excuse)

I hope you will have the opportunity to review them and watch the 12 minute VICE video @ I suggested you please review @ www.sandiegorealestate.com (and elsewhere) at the last real public in person meeting you had in March 12 of 2020, so long ago,

... @ minute/second 12:12 @ <https://cal-span.org/tnipage/?site=cal-span&owner=CCC&date=2020-03-12&mode=large&fbclid=IwAR1Fh5WDXG7kaFHj0Nvnp1e58Ry8zsMXnsOAd3cgJZ9poK5LjQjXQPqW-E>

Best/health/tikkun olam,

Respectfully,

Douglas Deitch

MBC

Aptos, Ca, 95003

831.476.7662

<http://sipodemos.democrat>

<http://lomejorqueeldineronopuedecomprar.com>

www.dougdeitch.info

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

Subject: Fwd: Please add Additional Comment 4. + attached image (Fwd: Comments on "public review draft of Critical Infrastructure at Risk: Sea Level Rise Planning Guidance for California's Coastal Zone")
Date: Fri, 24 Sep 2021 15:17:27 -0700
From: ddeitch@pogonip.org
To: StatewidePlanning@coastal.ca.gov, Ddeitch <ddeitch@pogonip.org>

4. continued: Here is the MC Weekly 2018 article mentioned below @ https://www.montereycountyweekly.com/news/local_news/as-seawater-intrusion-advances-new-farmland-puts-marina-s-water-supply-in-peril/article_b35ca7e0-f66e-11e7-b541-57771b472126.html

"As seawater intrusion advances, new farmland puts Marina's water supply in peril.

* David Schmalz

<<https://www.montereycountyweekly.com/users/profile/David%20Schmalz>>

* Jan 11, 2018

* Along Highway 1 just north of Marina, what has been grassland for decades is turning into row crops. A look at satellite images on Google, stretching back to 1984, shows that farming on the property, known as Armstrong Ranch, started in 2014 just south of the Marina landfill.

<https://www.montereycountyweekly.com/news/local_news/as-seawater-intrusion-advances-new-farmland-puts-marina-s-water-supply-in-peril/article_b35ca7e0-f66e-11e7-b541-57771b472126.html#comments>

Expect that trend to continue: On Nov. 21, 2017, Valle Del Sol Properties LLC bought 1,784 acres of Armstrong Ranch for \$81.5 million. (Monterey County Assessor Steve Vagnini says the price per-acre, just over \$45,000, is in keeping with local agricultural land values.)

Three new ag wells have been drilled on the property since 2015, and an application for another is currently being processed by the county. But here's the rub: The wells are pumping from an ancient, finite water source. It's the same water source that residents of Marina and the former Fort Ord rely upon for their municipal water production.

The property's groundwater – in both the 180 – and 400-foot aquifers, named for their respective depths – is impaired by seawater intrusion, a process that occurs when excessive pumping creates a pressure differential that draws seawater into the aquifers, fouling their water with salt.

The only groundwater available to irrigate the property is in the so-called deep aquifer, an ancient groundwater supply 900-plus-feet underground that is not recharging through natural mechanisms. Scientists believe the water is probably more than 20,000 years old.

The only recharge to the deep aquifer, hydrologists say, comes from leakage from overlying aquifers. In the coastal area around Marina, those aquifers are already compromised by seawater intrusion, making them unusable as municipal or irrigation water supplies.

Pumping from the deep aquifer is considered "water mining," and has long been viewed as a last-ditch water supply that is both expensive to tap – it costs upwards of \$1 million to drill a well into it – and risky to rely on because its quantity is unknown. Yet Marina Coast Water District, which supplies the city of Marina and the former Fort Ord, pumps roughly 50 percent of its water from the deep aquifer. (In 2017, that came out to 1,587 acre-feet of 3,239-acre feet.)

In October, Howard Franklin, senior hydrologist with the Monterey County Water Resources Agency, presented six recommendations to the County Board of Supervisors to help combat worsening seawater intrusion.

Among those recommendations was a moratorium on new wells in the deep aquifer until a study determines its viability as a water supply..."

"All wells in the deep aquifer are of concern with respect to the recommendations," Franklin says. "This is an urgent situation. This is imminent."

According to Michael Cahn, an irrigation water resources adviser with UC Cooperative Extension in Salinas, an acre of strawberries requires about 2.5 to 3 acre-feet of water annually.

That means if the entire 1,784 acres were converted to strawberries, it would require in excess of 4,000 acre-feet of water annually – more than Marina Coast's current annual production.

Franklin, when articulating the urgency of the situation for Marina Coast, and others that rely on the deep aquifer, says the human-caused mechanism of recharge for the deep aquifer – leakage from overlying aquifers – does not happen easily, or quickly, but that it will happen in a matter of years.

"The damage is being done now, and the impact of that damage could be 10 years from now, but if you [pump the deep aquifer] today, the damage will occur," Franklin says. "You're putting into motion mechanisms that take a long time."

Marina Coast does not have jurisdiction over new agricultural wells on Armstrong Ranch.

CORRESPONDENCE - 10/19/21

ITEM 5.0 - ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

"It's on our radar, and we're concerned about it, but we're not necessarily in the loop," Marina Coast General Manager Keith Van Der Maaten says. "Unfortunately, I don't think we're as involved as we should be. We should have a more active role."

The county's Environmental Health Bureau processes applications for new wells, but while projects for residential water supplies face a gauntlet of bureaucratic hurdles, wells for agriculture are typically approved without any pushback.

That may change in the coming years with the formation of the Salinas Valley Groundwater Sustainability Agency, but ag wells in the region have so far have faced minimal regulation.

Marina Coast is currently exploring new potential water supplies, other than desalination. The agency is vying for up to \$1 million in state grant funds – the grants will be awarded in February – to study water storage options in the aquifers around Armstrong Ranch.

The project would potentially seek to store excess winter flows in the Salinas River, which would make it similar to the Monterey Peninsula's aquifer storage and recovery project in the Seaside Basin, where winter flows are pumped from Carmel River and injected underground.

Theoretically, Van Der Maaten says, Marina Coast could produce between 2,000-8,000 acre-feet of water annually with the project, and even send some of the water north to Castroville.

But he says there are still many unknowns, including whether it is technically feasible, whether Marina Coast could secure the water rights to those flows, and whether it would be economically feasible for Marina Coast to supply Armstrong Ranch farmland with water so that they stop pumping from the deep.

Van Der Maaten knows it won't be easy, but the mission is clear: "We absolutely need to get into this deeper, and get people off the deep aquifer."

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

Subject: Please add Additional Comment 4. + attached images (Fwd: Comments on "public review draft of Critical Infrastructure at Risk: Sea Level Rise Planning Guidance for California's Coastal Zone")
Date: Fri, 24 Sep 2021 14:48:18 -0700
From: ddeitch@pogonip.org
To: Ddeitch <ddeitch@pogonip.org>, StatewidePlanning@coastal.ca.gov

Please add Additional Comment 4. + attached images:

4. The recent September 20, 2021 presentation by USGS and CCC staff (see attached images) on ground water and Sea Level Rise underlines and emphasizes the unadvisability and inherent risks and unknowns involved with our too many recent non DPR recycled water supply projects like Pure Water Monterey, Soquel, San Diego caused by sea level rise invading our ground waters despite our best efforts and intentions to prevent this.

At minute/second 5:41 @ the 12 minute VICE video at <http://www.sanfranciscoealestate.com> , Dr. Jeff Mount in 2015 explains what just one foot of SLR will do to the Delta and the CCC plans for 3.5 feet SLR by 2050 (@ https://documents.coastal.ca.gov/assets/slr/CCCendorsement_SLRPrinciples.pdf) . So, just imagine what that same 1 foot of SLR will do to our coastal ground water, particularly in our already critically overdrafted coastal ground water basins and related new water supply infrastructure.

Now add to this uncontrolled and unplanned for increased ag coastal well pumping for new ag, such as is present in the Pure Water Monterey area described in this Monterey Weekly article from a couple of years ago which will, at 5400 acre feet per year, completely offset the cleaned injected recycled water in the Monterey Pure Water expanded project.

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

Subject: Comments on "public review draft of Critical Infrastructure at Risk: Sea Level Rise Planning Guidance for California's Coastal Zone"
Date: Fri, 24 Sep 2021 06:33:31 -0700
From: Douglas Deitch <ddeitch@got.net>
To: StatewidePlanning@coastal.ca.gov, Ddeitch <ddeitch@pogonip.org>

"Thosewhocannotrememberthepast <https://youtu.be/15uloOJ5m1o> <<https://t.co/aLDaJE4pbz?amp=1>>can't adapt to 3.5' in30yrSLR?@
<https://twitter.com/DouglasDeitch/status/1374672809163550720> <<https://twitter.com/DouglasDeitch/status/1374672809163550720>>toprotectvastmajoritywater/food/re assets w/o 1. <http://sipodemos.democrat> <<https://t.co/Bp6SfcedM3?amp=1>>2. <http://dougdeitch.info> <<https://t.co/3HKcZ2FLDw?amp=1>>: <https://t.co/2L1RYOqKrl>
<http://dougforassembly.com> <<https://t.co/RUzu4phz12?amp=1>>?" (<https://twitter.com/DouglasDeitch/status/1426946751336914944>)

Comments on "public review draft of Critical Infrastructure at Risk: Sea Level Rise Planning Guidance for California's Coastal Zone" <

1. "VAST majority of the water/food/RE resources of World's 5th biggest economy/Community are inextricably tied to SFBay/Delta/Sierra-Snowpak&CentralValleyag. CCC predicts 3.5ftSLR in 30 years@ http://documents.coastal.ca.gov/assets/slr/CCCendorsement_SLRPrinciples.pdf <<https://t.co/MHGvcXOtm?amp=1>>. 5:42@ <http://sandiegorealestate.com> <<https://t.co/6A42utceWT?amp=1>>Dr.Mount sez what 1 foot will do!" @ <https://twitter.com/DouglasDeitch/status/1374672809163550720> :

Analysis & Conclusions: Due to this 2020 3.5 ft. SLR by 2050 "planning guideline/projection" (and other reasons like possible COVID19 and other possible contamination of our waste waters which cannot be cleaned (@ <https://twitter.com/DouglasDeitch/status/1426593026571313152>)

Additionally, this is why we must immediately begin investigation of feasibility and advisability of damming the Golden Gate run down @ <http://sipodemos.democrat> @ LinkedIn:

<https://twitter.com/CA_DWR>
CA - DWR
<https://twitter.com/CA_DWR>

You Retweeted <<https://twitter.com/DouglasDeitch>>
<<https://twitter.com/DouglasDeitch>>
Fair&Balanced! @ MakeCaliforniaGreatAgain.DEMOCRAT
@DouglasDeitch
<<https://twitter.com/DouglasDeitch>>
Replying to
@CA_DWR <https://twitter.com/CA_DWR>
#CaWaterBoards <https://twitter.com/hashtag/CaWaterBoards?src=hashtag_click><https://twitter.com/DouglasDeitch/status/1401916742541013000>
<<https://twitter.com/DouglasDeitch/status/1401916742541013000>>

CORRESPONDENCE - 10/19/21

ITEM 5.0 - ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

DPRisbest! like @ my "NAURAL SOLUTION" @ <http://dougdeitch.info> <<https://t.co/3HKcZ2FLDw?amp=1>> and 21000 acre Monterey Bay Estuarine Nat'l Monument in the Monterey Bay, which will include up to 31k a/f/yr from Castroville Reclamation Plant repurposed to urban, recharge, and conservation uses from ag use in perpetuity, to wit:

<https://twitter.com/DouglasDeitch/status/1411648137878380551>

*"Douglas Deitch, Balanced Law and Order Liberal Democrat for State Senator"

<<https://www.facebook.com/dougieforcongress/>?_ft__[0]=AZW2qDru7r47H4s1QIXam4UMFDGpRwwgPv_nICGAHU0mhdH_0X6ct5nSBAE4NVgRYsn44ddNfGA4tMP3shwyibp00-qwgYXfwVVOV4vPAOzIVMCXRSl0h1Z2SPSY2RDpQ8h5RUKk_YvqaGExMFLJiX-pL9cN4rrhNodXh8hkN3kj3byZsCjOCG4aFIpsF0g&_tn__=UC%2CPR>

September 14, 2019 <[https://www.facebook.com/dougieforcongress/posts/2328781884027843?>](https://www.facebook.com/dougieforcongress/posts/2328781884027843?)

WELCOME TO www.DOUGEITC.H.INFO <[https://l.facebook.com/l.php?u=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.dougdeitch.info%2F%3Ffbclid%3DlwAR1prRzLVfPSP8H2IC5rVt-I04VW659Ncfl7dMnyg7IGOBjBxs7vmWcM&h=AT3YhO90ewBn4xu-92H9aOxVx2jkWNthzV7h1iKH4l4ipQuX3QL8r-dX9HsB5-Ftapt84DxtV1bFi-3bvf6lBH8dd5vCyBblhwhMdzeyvVdw3eourRh1WugPg7F-n4t_jmIv0hn12r7YC14W0w&_tn__=UK-R&c\[0\]=AT1xxrHu9L.S0-eOEEFwQw-0RWLUdXcft735kAWBXzil4olmVf47Y2xNXWxBjVM2XCpnMVJGT964tV5nVGHgOZFrkZKRIS-00MrV6ICDG2oZwr8nM4WQOOMW9PZIk7HGDCtGvND04_Lo8b3jdDTHLSEL-cljYuKpqrAye7GMPJNccDxbUGxYhe9Vgvc7kZISP3NDQXMAAH5wt1">https://l.facebook.com/l.php?u=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.dougdeitch.info%2F%3Ffbclid%3DlwAR1prRzLVfPSP8H2IC5rVt-I04VW659Ncfl7dMnyg7IGOBjBxs7vmWcM&h=AT3YhO90ewBn4xu-92H9aOxVx2jkWNthzV7h1iKH4l4ipQuX3QL8r-dX9HsB5-Ftapt84DxtV1bFi-3bvf6lBH8dd5vCyBblhwhMdzeyvVdw3eourRh1WugPg7F-n4t_jmIv0hn12r7YC14W0w&_tn__=UK-R&c\[0\]=AT1xxrHu9L.S0-eOEEFwQw-0RWLUdXcft735kAWBXzil4olmVf47Y2xNXWxBjVM2XCpnMVJGT964tV5nVGHgOZFrkZKRIS-00MrV6ICDG2oZwr8nM4WQOOMW9PZIk7HGDCtGvND04_Lo8b3jdDTHLSEL-cljYuKpqrAye7GMPJNccDxbUGxYhe9Vgvc7kZISP3NDQXMAAH5wt1](https://l.facebook.com/l.php?u=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.dougdeitch.info%2F%3Ffbclid%3DlwAR1prRzLVfPSP8H2IC5rVt-I04VW659Ncfl7dMnyg7IGOBjBxs7vmWcM&h=AT3YhO90ewBn4xu-92H9aOxVx2jkWNthzV7h1iKH4l4ipQuX3QL8r-dX9HsB5-Ftapt84DxtV1bFi-3bvf6lBH8dd5vCyBblhwhMdzeyvVdw3eourRh1WugPg7F-n4t_jmIv0hn12r7YC14W0w&_tn__=UK-R&c[0]=AT1xxrHu9L.S0-eOEEFwQw-0RWLUdXcft735kAWBXzil4olmVf47Y2xNXWxBjVM2XCpnMVJGT964tV5nVGHgOZFrkZKRIS-00MrV6ICDG2oZwr8nM4WQOOMW9PZIk7HGDCtGvND04_Lo8b3jdDTHLSEL-cljYuKpqrAye7GMPJNccDxbUGxYhe9Vgvc7kZISP3NDQXMAAH5wt1)> !!

... Best SUSTAINABLE Monterey Bay region "SLR" (Sea Level Rise) water solution? lomejorqueledineroNopuedecomprar.com <http://lomejorqueledineroNopuedecomprar.com/?fbclid=IwAR3PZ_qs_WL_TgmD8O-S-00ZcyPqGDAXDA89CXu3AWorK16ommBLedtsds> / lawandorderliberal.org <[https://l.facebook.com/l.php?u=http%3A%2F%2Flawandorderliberal.org%2F%3Ffbclid%3DlwAR1g1l.LPmvrR2nlRM6Oy9UxFAmrtZq2W60hbgIKLsYoY4kP404zyfaZKOWU&h=AT0GnDe-d3sfghFR37SGT2Nkkt8V7Dp7bCqD4V-C3fwszakOFOq-ZleP92vci08mrAXSisSgwMkbbxqBHtYpE_17KNye12YRn-xdvd4fb-9oVlmPO-5a21Pqe4K2C2tWENkKfz7FRiVG-oM6Z6O&_tn__=UK-R&c\[0\]=AT1xxrHu9L.S0-eOEEFwQw-0RWLUdXcft735kAWBXzil4olmVf47Y2xNXWxBjVM2XCpnMVJGT964tV5nVGHgOZFrkZKRIS-00MrV6ICDG2oZwr8nM4WQOOMW9PZIk7HGDCtGvND04_Lo8b3jdDTHLSEL-cljYuKpqrAye7GMPJNccDxbUGxYhe9Vgvc7kZISP3NDQXMAAH5wt1](https://l.facebook.com/l.php?u=http%3A%2F%2Flawandorderliberal.org%2F%3Ffbclid%3DlwAR1g1l.LPmvrR2nlRM6Oy9UxFAmrtZq2W60hbgIKLsYoY4kP404zyfaZKOWU&h=AT0GnDe-d3sfghFR37SGT2Nkkt8V7Dp7bCqD4V-C3fwszakOFOq-ZleP92vci08mrAXSisSgwMkbbxqBHtYpE_17KNye12YRn-xdvd4fb-9oVlmPO-5a21Pqe4K2C2tWENkKfz7FRiVG-oM6Z6O&_tn__=UK-R&c[0]=AT1xxrHu9L.S0-eOEEFwQw-0RWLUdXcft735kAWBXzil4olmVf47Y2xNXWxBjVM2XCpnMVJGT964tV5nVGHgOZFrkZKRIS-00MrV6ICDG2oZwr8nM4WQOOMW9PZIk7HGDCtGvND04_Lo8b3jdDTHLSEL-cljYuKpqrAye7GMPJNccDxbUGxYhe9Vgvc7kZISP3NDQXMAAH5wt1)>

My 21,000 acre "Monterey Bay Estuarine National Monument", etc. "Water Fix" ..., of course. The Castroville reclamation plant/project, run down @ http://montereyonewater.org/facilities_tertiary_treatment... <[https://l.facebook.com/l.php?u=http%3A%2F%2Fmontereyonewater.org%2Ffacilities_tertiary_treatment.html%3Ffbclid%3DlwAR0iPG5wq1_ajH9bl7SUEz5aK4gVtpEBDm2G9VbYbqtik1-0nYUwGHBoLQ&h=AT26n6ldBnGdb0zlc82ewA778ENK80kIVXs2IEHoJ4LFRU4f0M7paaGoPIYIFMjW-1OpwqMYREQIVxqHFbb0gl75J7xUaGwBvXjPNeM_j3LmempUd0yaxMmyjXIPAVE7MNeFj72lrsPOZl7_uBBHvw&_tn__=UK-R&c\[0\]=AT1xxrHu9L.S0-eOEEFwQw-0RWLUdXcft735kAWBXzil4olmVf47Y2xNXWxBjVM2XCpnMVJGT964tV5nVGHgOZFrkZKRIS-00MrV6ICDG2oZwr8nM4WQOOMW9PZIk7HGDCtGvND04_Lo8b3jdDTHLSEL-cljYuKpqrAye7GMPJNccDxbUGxYhe9Vgvc7kZISP3NDQXMAAH5wt1](https://l.facebook.com/l.php?u=http%3A%2F%2Fmontereyonewater.org%2Ffacilities_tertiary_treatment.html%3Ffbclid%3DlwAR0iPG5wq1_ajH9bl7SUEz5aK4gVtpEBDm2G9VbYbqtik1-0nYUwGHBoLQ&h=AT26n6ldBnGdb0zlc82ewA778ENK80kIVXs2IEHoJ4LFRU4f0M7paaGoPIYIFMjW-1OpwqMYREQIVxqHFbb0gl75J7xUaGwBvXjPNeM_j3LmempUd0yaxMmyjXIPAVE7MNeFj72lrsPOZl7_uBBHvw&_tn__=UK-R&c[0]=AT1xxrHu9L.S0-eOEEFwQw-0RWLUdXcft735kAWBXzil4olmVf47Y2xNXWxBjVM2XCpnMVJGT964tV5nVGHgOZFrkZKRIS-00MrV6ICDG2oZwr8nM4WQOOMW9PZIk7HGDCtGvND04_Lo8b3jdDTHLSEL-cljYuKpqrAye7GMPJNccDxbUGxYhe9Vgvc7kZISP3NDQXMAAH5wt1)>

... , has the ability to produce over 31,000 acre feet per year of recycled tertiary treated water per year at it's plant, built in 1998 for around \$75 million in Castroville. This 31,000 acre feet/yr of water will be repurposed to urban use, further cleaned, processed, and distributed regionally and will easily supply and service all current and future Monterey Bay regionally urban water needs.

This will be accomplished by using the 12000 acres of land associated with this 31000 a/f/yr of water to it's highest and best use.

At present, this water is dedicated to exclusively ag use on 12,000 coastal ag acres at the mouth of the Salinas Valley to use instead of well water pumped at this location to protect the Salinas Valley from further salt water intrusion. As farmland, this land is FMV worth around \$50,000 per acre as farmland (<<https://www.santaacruzsentinel.com/.../retired-federal...> <[https://l.facebook.com/l.php?u=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.santaacruzsentinel.com%2F2014%2F02%2F27%2Fretired-federal-judge-buys-borina-farmland-in-major-pajaro-valley-deal%2F%3Ffbclid%3DlwAR0iPG5wq1_ajH9bl7SUEz5aK4gVtpEBDm2G9VbYbqtik1-0nYUwGHBoLQ&h=AT3YecrWVKElAlw3-1GxnAnnqV4UuoZx_Tit6USATYxDoxiGe4pu-98MRZXB5XyD2GpC0kImePbJOt_7OoeAEF7Fu88SpYsZL1Jcqe6waigtuvDRSU5PKxElfbdAwBEPYsjiDvnCpbPtxVgV5SY5Ug&_tn__=UK-R&c\[0\]=AT1xxrHu9L.S0-eOEEFwQw-0RWLUdXcft735kAWBXzil4olmVf47Y2xNXWxBjVM2XCpnMVJGT964tV5nVGHgOZFrkZKRIS-00MrV6ICDG2oZwr8nM4WQOOMW9PZIk7HGDCtGvND04_Lo8b3jdDTHLSEL-cljYuKpqrAye7GMPJNccDxbUGxYhe9Vgvc7kZISP3NDQXMAAH5wt1](https://l.facebook.com/l.php?u=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.santaacruzsentinel.com%2F2014%2F02%2F27%2Fretired-federal-judge-buys-borina-farmland-in-major-pajaro-valley-deal%2F%3Ffbclid%3DlwAR0iPG5wq1_ajH9bl7SUEz5aK4gVtpEBDm2G9VbYbqtik1-0nYUwGHBoLQ&h=AT3YecrWVKElAlw3-1GxnAnnqV4UuoZx_Tit6USATYxDoxiGe4pu-98MRZXB5XyD2GpC0kImePbJOt_7OoeAEF7Fu88SpYsZL1Jcqe6waigtuvDRSU5PKxElfbdAwBEPYsjiDvnCpbPtxVgV5SY5Ug&_tn__=UK-R&c[0]=AT1xxrHu9L.S0-eOEEFwQw-0RWLUdXcft735kAWBXzil4olmVf47Y2xNXWxBjVM2XCpnMVJGT964tV5nVGHgOZFrkZKRIS-00MrV6ICDG2oZwr8nM4WQOOMW9PZIk7HGDCtGvND04_Lo8b3jdDTHLSEL-cljYuKpqrAye7GMPJNccDxbUGxYhe9Vgvc7kZISP3NDQXMAAH5wt1)>

However, this 12,000 acres highest and best use is not as farmland but instead as a ground water conservation/aquifer recharge/ and estuarine habitat conservation/rehabilitation project, which actually doubles the FMV of this land to \$100,000 per acre or \$1.2 billion. This land comprises roughly something under 5% (?) of irrigated farmland in the "Salinas Valley"

If this 12000 acres was publicly acquired and allowed/or all well pumping ceased, along with another tract of 9000 acres of irrigated farmland at the mouth of the Pajaro Valley running from approximately Elkhorn Slough to Manresa Beach on the ocean side of Highway One in Santa Cruz County for 21000 acres in total to protect the Pajaro Valley from salt water intrusion in the same way, ag well pumping would stop on this 21000 acres and, @ 3 a/f/yr per acre for ag water, 63,000 a/f/yr of ground water, would be CONSERVED annually per year in perpetuity. Additionally, wouldn't this 63,000 a/f/yr be also de facto RECHARGED at these two most hydrologically critically important locations with the highest quality recharge water possibly available with the lowest cost and best "GREEN tech" water available possible anywhere, in perpetuity as well, ... the recharge water produced and recharged naturally by our best water purveyor named Ms. Mother Nature?

Correct.

This is what I call the "Monterey Bay Estuarine National Monument", and it is truly a national monument with the highest concentration of critically threatened critical estuarine resources and habitat of ANY LOCATION ANYWHERE IN THIS COUNTRY !!! Here's my already successful 25 year old "Pilot Project" @ "Willoughby Ranch" @ Zmudowski Beach @ to check out @ www.dougdeitch.com <[https://l.facebook.com/l.php?u=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.dougdeitch.com%2F%3Ffbclid%3DlwAR30AocM3SWRkbiWnBOD1KvixZXWxahNfxQEP80HeTfULSS-U-6jamngU&h=AT1GfqrTRW8OTKYU7OQkYk9M8xgTd_OBnVoz16z2NpBUhrC10z2b2T9k8w66CWR6jaeMs_t06kUmGubUvPlxy95p1VzTWOV4b3e_fO-kWZvnCpqtqHkHqSkhTHUTNDbbtIo4XUJ1SqaoXSNZmOYkw&_tn__=UK-R&c\[0\]=AT1xxrHu9L.S0-eOEEFwQw-0RWLUdXcft735kAWBXzil4olmVf47Y2xNXWxBjVM2XCpnMVJGT964tV5nVGHgOZFrkZKRIS-00MrV6ICDG2oZwr8nM4WQOOMW9PZIk7HGDCtGvND04_Lo8b3jdDTHLSEL-cljYuKpqrAye7GMPJNccDxbUGxYhe9Vgvc7kZISP3NDQXMAAH5wt1](https://l.facebook.com/l.php?u=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.dougdeitch.com%2F%3Ffbclid%3DlwAR30AocM3SWRkbiWnBOD1KvixZXWxahNfxQEP80HeTfULSS-U-6jamngU&h=AT1GfqrTRW8OTKYU7OQkYk9M8xgTd_OBnVoz16z2NpBUhrC10z2b2T9k8w66CWR6jaeMs_t06kUmGubUvPlxy95p1VzTWOV4b3e_fO-kWZvnCpqtqHkHqSkhTHUTNDbbtIo4XUJ1SqaoXSNZmOYkw&_tn__=UK-R&c[0]=AT1xxrHu9L.S0-eOEEFwQw-0RWLUdXcft735kAWBXzil4olmVf47Y2xNXWxBjVM2XCpnMVJGT964tV5nVGHgOZFrkZKRIS-00MrV6ICDG2oZwr8nM4WQOOMW9PZIk7HGDCtGvND04_Lo8b3jdDTHLSEL-cljYuKpqrAye7GMPJNccDxbUGxYhe9Vgvc7kZISP3NDQXMAAH5wt1)>

& www.dougdeitch.info <http://www.dougdeitch.info/?fbclid=IwAR2SXYte0ZdtqBj13ed5xq-sGxDE5ALQkO37TWKKwARA6fdm-f8eRms_Y> (this page)...

"Farmlands back to wetlands"

Query: Where's the \$2.1 billion?

Response: Reallocated rail bond money billions to "water/habitat/environmental projects" aka "OPM" (...other people's money) and INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING.

2. "I wonder what the latest SCIENCE is today re: "Removing the novel coronavirus from the water cycle" & our ground water injection of "cleaned"? recycled/injection water projects like "Pure Water Soquel"? Monterey San Diego etc? @ <https://twitter.com/DouglasDeitch/status/1426593026571313152>, which have already been approved and are in progress? <https://twitter.com/DouglasDeitch/status/1426593026571313152/photo/1> ?

3. SWRCB must intervene in Monterey Bay immediately to achieve sustainability and proper, legal, and responsible water management in the entire Monterey Bay @ <https://twitter.com/DouglasDeitch/status/1375814806364594178/photo/1>

Respectfully submitted,
Douglas Deitch

ED/Monterey Bay Conservancy

540 Hudson Lane, Aptos, Ca., 95003

831.476.7662"

Question #2: This 2018 Monterey County Weekly article @ https://www.montereycountyweekly.com/news/local_news/as-seawater-intrusion-advances-new-farmland-pun-marina-s-water-supply-in-peril/article_b35ea7e0-f66e-11e7-b541-57771b472126.html#comments cites around 1800 +/- new acres of ag & new well pumping @ 5400 a/f/yr which seems to approximately cancel/use up all the new Monterey One ASR water? ... Any unanticipated problems, present or future conflicts/miscalculations, etc in this regard here or not?

Please watch my most recent and 5th request for SWRCB INTERVENTION IN THE ENTIRE MONTEREY BAY water management and "control" just on August 3, 2021 @ 9:48 @ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=A9KTIa0RDu8&t=919s> and @ <https://twitter.com/DouglasDeitch/status/1422889479061196803>, my first request @ 11:21 @ www.thebestthatmoneycantbuy.org pictured below from April/2015, over SIX years ago, and please REVIEW the documents I am holding in my hand I presented and went through w/ SWRCB 4/16/15 during my presentation and first request for SWRCB INTERVENTION then @ <http://www.dougforassembly.com>,

CORRESPONDENCE - 10/19/21

ITEM 5.0 - ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

which only ONE current SWRCB board MEMBER then, Ms. Doreen D'Adamo, was present for?

... to be continued.
Respectfully,
Douglas Deitch/MBC
siddhartha1002@gmail.com

File Upload [Screen Shot 2015-12-21 at 8.00.03 AM.png](#)
[Screen Shot 2021-01-25 at 4.48.24 AM.png](#)
[Screen Shot 2021-02-05 at 9.56.19 AM.png](#)
[Screen Shot 2021-08-31 at 6.43.55 AM.png](#)
[Screen Shot 2021-09-24 at 2.11.08 PM.png](#)
[Screen Shot 2021-09-24 at 2.12.54 PM.png](#)
[Screen Shot 2021-09-24 at 2.13.03 PM.png](#)
[Screen Shot 2021-09-24 at 6.17.06 AM.png](#)
[Screen Shot 2021-09-24 at 6.28.29 AM.png](#)
[Screen Shot 2021-10-14 at 5.29.07 AM.png](#)
[Screen Shot 2021-10-15 at 4.12.41 AM.png](#)
[Screen Shot 2021-10-15 at 5.12.08 AM.png](#)
[Screen Shot 2021-10-15 at 5.39.48 AM.png](#)
[Screen Shot 2021-10-15 at 5.40.44 AM.png](#)
[Screen Shot 2021-10-15 at 5.50.19 AM.png](#)
[ccc 3.5 feet.png](#)

Now create your own JotForm - It's free!

Create a JotForm

CORRESPONDENCE - 10/19/21
ITEM 5.0 - ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

From: [Becky Steinbruner](#)
To: [bod](#); [Emma Olin](#)
Cc: [Rebecca Rubin](#)
Subject: What is the District's Real Policy on Public Participation at Standing Committee and Board Meetings?
Date: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 11:45:43 AM

Dear Board of Directors,
I attempted today to participate in the District's Public Outreach Standing Committee meeting. I pressed *9 multiple times throughout the meeting, as is supposedly permitted for the public's participation. **No one ever permitted me to speak.**

Here is what the Standing Committee website:

*"Request to Speak Form for Remotely Conducted Standing Committee Meetings To facilitate effective and efficient remote standing committee meetings, people wishing to address the Committee, (Oral Communications – Item 2.0) should submit a Request to Speak Form by 3 pm, on the Monday of the week of the standing committee meeting. **The District will also permit public comment through the "raise hand" feature on zoom. If you are dialing in by phone, you may "raise your hand," by dialing *9. Once District staff allows you to speak, then you may unmute yourself by dialing *6.**"*

https://ca-soquelcreekwaterdistrict.civicplus.com/AgendaCenter/ViewFile/Agenda/_10122021-265?packet=true

What is the real policy for public participation?

Please respond. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Becky Steinbruner

From: [Emma Olin](#)
To: ["Becky Steinbruner"](#)
Bcc: ["Joshua Nelson"](#); [Ron Duncan](#)
Subject: RE: Problems With Soquel Creek Water District's Standing Committee Meeting Notifications and Agendas on New Website
Date: Wednesday, October 13, 2021 9:11:00 AM

Hello Ms. Steinbruner,


This email responds to your emails dated 10/7/21 and 10/10/21 regarding the 10/12/21 Public Outreach Committee Meeting and Water Resources Management and Infrastructure Committee Meeting.

Both committee agendas were posted in compliance with the Brown Act. The agendas published online and in the District Office window on Thursday, 10/7/21 (well before the 72-hour requirement).

You can find the agendas of particular interest to you by accessing the District's agenda center (<https://www.soquelcreekwater.org/AgendaCenter>) and scrolling down the webpage to the committee. Additionally, you may access the agendas by the following direct links:

- Public Outreach Committee Agenda:
<https://www.soquelcreekwater.org/AgendaCenter/ViewFile/Item/341?fileID=1052>
- Water Resources Management & Infrastructure Committee Agenda:
<https://www.soquelcreekwater.org/AgendaCenter/ViewFile/Item/342?fileID=1053>

Sincerely,

Emma Olin | Executive Assistant/Board Clerk
Soquel Creek Water District | 5180 Soquel Dr., Soquel CA 95073 | www.soquelcreekwater.org
direct 831-475-8501 x126 | main 831-475-8500
 Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.

From: Becky Steinbruner <ki6tkb@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 10, 2021 1:42 PM
To: Emma Olin <emmao@soquelcreekwater.org>; bod <bod@soquelcreekwater.org>
Cc: Becky Steinbruner <ki6tkb@yahoo.com>
Subject: Problems With Soquel Creek Water District's Standing Committee Meeting Notifications and Agendas on New Website

Dear Ms. Olin,

The District's new website is challenging to navigate when searching for information about Standing Committee meetings and agendas. The notation for the Committee meetings are labelled as "Board Meetings", and are confusing.

I was able to find the District calendar and see that the Outreach Committee and Supply Committee will meet on October 12, but there is no agenda provided. It is within 72 hours of the Committee meeting, and the Brown Act requires all agendas to be posted at least 72 hours in advance of such a meeting.

Outreach Committee:

<https://www.soquelcreekwater.org/Calendar.aspx?EID=520&month=10&year=2021&day=10&calType=0>

Supply Committee

<https://www.soquelcreekwater.org/Calendar.aspx?EID=467&month=10&year=2021&day=10&calType=0>

I hope that this problem will be quickly remedied, especially given the Board's recent significant approval to major PureWater Soquel Project modifications and a 30% cost increase for the Design-Build contractor.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Becky Steinbruner

CORRESPONDENCE - 10/19/21
ITEM 5.0 - ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

Indian Wells
(760) 568-2611

Irvine
(949) 263-2600

Los Angeles
(213) 617-8100

Manhattan Beach
(310) 643-8448

Ontario
(909) 989-8584



BEST BEST & KRIEGER
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

3390 University Avenue, 5th Floor, P.O. Box 1028, Riverside, CA 92502
Phone: (951) 686-1450 | Fax: (951) 686-3083 | www.bbklaw.com

Riverside
(951) 686-1450

Sacramento
(916) 325-4000

San Diego
(619) 525-1300

Walnut Creek
(925) 977-3300

Washington, DC
(202) 785-0600

Charity B. Schiller
(951) 826-8223
charity.schiller@bbklaw.com
File No. 30814.00001

October 13, 2021

VIA U.S. MAIL AND E-MAIL (KI6TKB@YAHOO.COM)

Rebecca (Becky) Steinbruner
3441 Redwood Drive
Aptos, CA 95003

Re: October 6, 2021 Email Concerning October 5, 2021 Soquel Creek Water
District Board Meeting Item 5.0 Statements

Ms. Steinbruner:

The District has received your October 6, 2021 email containing various assertions regarding Mr. Ron Duncan's statements during Item 5 of the Board's October 5, 2021 meeting. Best Best & Krieger, on behalf of the District, has carefully reviewed your email and responds as follows:

1. You express concern that Mr. Duncan indicated that you owe the District \$3,200. To be clear, \$3200 is actually *less* than the current amount you owe. As you know, on March 13, 2020, the Court denied your Motion to Strike and awarded the District's Memorandum of Costs in full, which at the time was \$2,845.86. Since then, the judgment has been accruing interest at the annual rate of 10%. (Code of Civil Procedure §685.010.) Thus, the total amount of interest that has accrued so far is \$467.15, making the outstanding amount you owe to the District **\$3,313.01**.
2. You assert that the District has never asked you to pay the March 13, 2020 Judgment. The District has no obligation to request that you pay the judgment, either through a demand letter or any other method. Once the judgment was entered, it was immediately enforceable and must be satisfied by the judgment debtor. (Code of Civil Procedure §§ 683.010, 664.) Nevertheless, the District did request, on at least two occasions, that you pay the Judgment, first on April 5, 2021 during a meet and confer call with the District's attorney, Ms. Charity Schiller, and a second time, via the District letter to you dated April 8, 2021, which stated that the Judgment "plus interest, is still outstanding and must be paid immediately." You responded to neither of these requests.



BEST BEST & KRIEGER
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Rebecca Steinbruner
October 13, 2021
Page 2

Resolving this matter outside of the courtroom is always, and has always been, the preferable and least costly method. However, as explained above, your failure to respond to the District's requests to satisfy the Judgment has unfortunately left the District with no other alternative but to exercise its rights as a judgment creditor. The District remains open to working out a payment plan for you, as it has indicated even as far back as 2019, when Ms. Michelle Ouellette sent you a December 9, 2019 e-mail, stating, "Alternatively, we are happy to work out a payment plan for you. . . ."

Accordingly, and although not required, the District will be providing you, under separate cover and at your request, an invoice for the current total due.

3. You note that the Judgment has been accruing for 18, not 36 months. You are correct that the Judgment has been accruing for 18 months; it is the lawsuit that resulted in the Judgment that was filed 36 months ago. Nevertheless, whether it has been 18 months or 36 months, you still have not paid the Judgment, which continues to accrue interest by the day.
4. You summarize some of your legal claims and your belief that you brought your lawsuits "for the public benefit." To be clear, while the public has every right – which the District supports and welcomes – to vigorously participate and be informed about a project, it is a matter of public record that, of your four lawsuits to date challenging the Pure Water Soquel Project (and while the fourth lawsuit is still in early stages), no trial or appellate court has ever ruled in your favor, or found any of your claims to have merit.

Further, the District does not accept with your assertion that the Sixth District Court of Appeal agreed that "Judge Gallagher should have recused himself before making his determinations regarding [your] case," if not for the fact that you failed to include enough citations to the record to support your argument. Nowhere in the Opinion of the Sixth District Court of Appeal did the Court state this, nor did any of the justices in the Sixth District Court of Appeal make such a statement during oral argument.

CORRESPONDENCE - 10/19/21
ITEM 5.0 - ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS



BEST BEST & KRIEGER 
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Rebecca Steinbruner
October 13, 2021
Page 3

To be clear, Mr. Duncan has made no negligent, reckless, or intentionally false statements, and the District remains committed to vigorously defending any challenges to its comprehensive environmental review of the Pure Water Soquel Project.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Charity B. Schiller".

Charity B. Schiller
of BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP

cc: Ron Duncan, General Manager, Soquel Creek Water District
Members of the Soquel Creek Water District Board
Joshua Nelson, General Counsel, Soquel Creek Water District

CORRESPONDENCE - 10/19/21
ITEM 5.0 - ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

From: [Becky Steinbruner](#)
To: [bod](#); [Emma Olin](#)
Cc: [Ron Duncan](#); [Charity Schiller](#); [Becky Steinbruner](#)
Subject: Please Retract Damaging Claims Made by Ron Duncan During October 5, 2021 Soquel Creek Water District Board Meeting Public Comment Item 5.0
Date: Wednesday, October 6, 2021 1:57:42 PM

Dear Board of Directors,

During the October 5, 2021 District Board meeting, before the Board entered Closed Session, I spoke about the litigation issues listed on the Item 1.0 Closed Session Agenda relating to the nearly four-hour judgment enforcement Examination the District had imposed upon me earlier in the day. Mr. Duncan said he wanted to provide further information on the issue, but would wait to do so until after Closed Session.

Mr. Duncan did indeed present statements about the judgement enforcement action, but waited until Item 5.0, Public Comment period to do so, and after I had already spoken on this item. What he said was incorrect and very damaging to my character. It is troubling that Mr. Duncan waited to make his statements about me until further into the meeting, after Closed Session, when there were apparently other members of the public logged into the virtual meeting, and after I had spoken on Item 5.0 and could not rebut his claims.

Subsequently, when I next had the opportunity to speak, I did notify the Board that Mr. Duncan's claims were incorrect, and that I would send written communication regarding the matter. Below are my comments regarding Mr. Duncan's erroneous public claims.

1) Mr. Duncan claimed the judgment amount is "\$3200." That is incorrect. The amount of the judgment at issue in yesterday's Examination enforcement action is \$2845.

2) Mr. Duncan said "Ms. Steinbruner refused to pay this." This is incorrect. I never refused a request to pay because the District never did ask me to pay.

I filed a Motion to Strike or Tax Costs in Santa Cruz County Superior Court after the District's Counsel, Ms. Michelle Ouellette of Best, Best & Krieger, filed Memorandum of Costs on December 5, 2019, which I disputed several claim amounts. The motion was heard on March 9, 2019 by Judge Timothy Schmal and denied, awarding costs to the District.

The Order was entered on March 19, 2020. The Order did not include language demanding that I pay the amount. **The District never sent a Demand Letter asking me to pay the amount of the judgment.**

3) Mr. Duncan claimed "We have informed Ms. Steinbruner to pay, but she refuses," and that it "has been three years" that the District has attempted to get me to pay the debt. This is incorrect. The District received the award of judgment upon entry March 19, 2020. That is 18 months, NOT three years.

The District has never informed or requested me to pay, other than the legal Memorandum of Costs filed but that I disputed. I have searched all of my e-mail correspondence sent from Best, Best & Krieger staff at the time that included Michelle Ouellette, Monica Castanon, and Tammy Ingram, but there is no Demand Letter, and no letter simply asking me to pay or to suggest a payment plan option with the District.

Please send me a copy of any and all requests the District has sent me regarding payment of this judgment. Perhaps I am in error.

4) Mr. Duncan expounded upon the legal actions I have taken and quoted an unidentified person who supposedly said "Ms. Steinbruner is just one person, using the justice system to create injustice." He further claimed my actions were " a constant barrage of suits to stop the project."

I am shocked by Mr. Duncan's lack of respect for the public, and the public's right to seek civil due

CORRESPONDENCE - 10/19/21
ITEM 5.0 - ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

process to resolve disputes. The only remedy the public has in CEQA matters is to file a Petition for Writ of Mandate, simply asking that the lead agency follow the law. Mr. Duncan is not a judge, and has no legal authority to judge the merits of my intentions.

When I did file for injunctions, it was to try to convince the District to follow CEQA laws. While my appeal in the Sixth District Court of Appeals was denied, the Justices did agree that Judge Gallagher should have recused himself before making his determinations regarding my case, but that I had not included enough citations to the Record to build a convincing, supportive argument.

Your Board approved the Twin Lakes Church Injection Well Project one month before the Draft EIR for the PureWater Soquel Project was complete and certified. I attempted to stop that because of the 20 oak trees that would be cut down that potentially harbored hibernating solitary bats that would be killed.

Your Board approved a five-year annual rate increase schedule designed by Raftelis consultants that was calculated to pay for the PureWater Soquel Project one month before you certified the Draft EIR for the Project. I tried to stop that, on the merits of violating CEQA law by taking actions to support a project before it is approved.

Your Board certified the Draft PureWater Soquel Project EIR but failed to notify in writing, 30 days in advance, any of the four schools located within 0.25 mile of the treatment facility sites where hazardous chemicals would be stored and used, You approved use of a large diesel-powered generator that fouled the air for many months at the Twin Lakes Baptist School adjacent.

Your Board has consistently turned a deaf ear to requests from me and other members of the public that you conduct a Final Anti-Degradation Analysis, as is required by the State Waterboard in Resolution 68-16 to prove that injecting treated sewage water effluent into the Purisima Aquifer would not degrade the high-quality groundwater.

Your Board has consistently ignored my requests that your agency work with California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife, as is required by CEQA law, to develop enforceable mitigations for the multiple stream crossings, which include the San Lorenzo River, against contamination and environmental degradation during construction. As of last month, Fish and Wildlife staff who would be responsible for this collaboration knew nothing of the Modified PureWater Soquel Project and had received no correspondence from your District on the Project.

A Public Records Act request at the state level for evidence that your District or your agents have submitted requests for mitigation collaboration yielded no responsive materials.

I want to make it clear that all actions I have taken and continue to take are on behalf of the Public's Benefit and the environment. I speak for many, many people who are concerned about this Project and the manner in which the District is proceeding to implement it.

Many are simply so worried the Project cost to build and operate the system have bloated, and will continue to soar beyond the financial reality of what most customers will be able to pay for their water, and that the District ratepayers as a whole will be burdened by this well-meaning but extravagant Project producing relatively little water for a relatively small customer revenue base. Your Board was warned of this concern by the NWRI expert panel in September, 2017.

In closing, I have outlined for your Board the incorrect information that Mr. Duncan stated publicly last night, with baseless accusations, smearing my personal character at a point in the meeting when virtual attendance was at it's peak. This was intentional character defamation, and I demand that Mr. Duncan issue a public apology and correction of the erroneous information at the next Board meeting, during Item 5.0 Public Comment.

Please acknowledge receipt of this message. Thank you.

Sincerely,

CORRESPONDENCE - 10/19/21
ITEM 5.0 - ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

Becky Steinbruner