

From: Becky Steinbruner <ki6tkb@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2024 4:42 PM
To: bod; Emma Western
Cc: Peisch Amanda@DWR; Sierra Ryan; Heide Luckenbach
Subject: Re: Please Provide Explanation Why Water Optimization Report is Excluded From

Dear Ms. Western,
Thank you for responding to my query, however, you did not answer my question.

Why was the presentation of the Water Optimization Report on the Board agenda calendar for February, then March, and now has seemingly disappeared from future calendars?

This is important information due the ratepayers who are funding the PureWater Soquel Project benefit to the basin, reflected in the new rate changes that became effective March 1, 2024. However, without the data and analysis as to how the benefit will be verified, or that the rate changes are justified, no one will know for sure what benefit the PureWater Soquel Project will actually provide.

Recent District Board discussions have projected the PureWater Soquel Project will become operational in the autumn of this year.

When will the District provide the Water Optimization Report to assure the public and the State Water Board, financial benefactor agency providing the public money for the Study's grant funding, that the PureWater Soquel Project will accomplish what has been promised it would provide the basin?

Please respond. Thank you.


Sincerely,
Becky Steinbruner

On Monday, March 11, 2024 at 11:43:27 AM PDT, Emma Western <emmaw@soquelcreekwater.org> wrote:

Hello Ms. Steinbruner,

Thank you for email recognizing that the Optimization Study Report may provide "meaningful information." Reports are presented at the appropriate time.

Sincerely,

Emma Western (she/her) | 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: Monday, March 4, 2024 7:50 PM
To: Board of Directors <bodgroup@soquelcreekwater.org>; Emma Western <emmaw@soquelcreekwater.org>
Cc: Peisch Amanda@DWR <amanda.peisch@water.ca.gov>; Sierra Ryan <sierra.ryan@santacruzcountyca.gov>; Heide Luckenbach <hluckenbach@cityofsantacruz.com>; Becky Steinbruner <ki6tkb@yahoo.com>
Subject: Please Provide Explanation Why Water Optimization Report is Excluded From

Dear Soquel Creek Water District Board of Directors,

The Santa Cruz MidCounty Water Optimization Analysis Report that will provide meaningful information regarding use of the PureWater Soquel Project and City of Santa Cruz Water Dept. Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR), funded by the State Dept. of Water Resources Board, has been promised for presentation since February 6, 2024 but still has not materialized.

<https://www.soquelcreekwater.org/DocumentCenter/View/2038/RFP-Santa-Cruz-Mid-County-Regional-Water-Optimization-Study-PDF?bidId=>

It was rescheduled for presentation to your Board on March 5, but the Board agenda packet does not include it.

<https://www.soquelcreekwater.org/AgendaCenter/ViewFile/Item/541?fileID=1967>

Furthermore, in checking the future Board agenda items on calendar, I do not see that this vital information is scheduled for public presentation in April or May. (pages 11 and 12)

Can you please explain why the District is not providing this critical information to the public, especially since the new rates imposed on customers, effective March 1, 2024, is based on the benefit of the PureWater Soquel Project to the basin.

Please respond. Thank you.

Sincerely,


Becky Steinbruner

From: Emma Western
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2024 11:36 AM
To: Becky Steinbruner; bod
Subject: RE: Questions RE: Cunnison Lane Well Addendum #1

Hello Ms. Steinbruner,

Thank you for your email. Please find the Well Master Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR) on the District's website at <https://www.soquelcreekwater.org/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/143>. Careful review should help provide responses to your questions.

Sincerely,

Emma Western (she/her) | 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: Tuesday, March 5, 2024 5:43 PM
To: bod <bod@soquelcreekwater.org>; Emma Western <emmaw@soquelcreekwater.org>
Cc: Becky Steinbruner <ki6tkb@yahoo.com>
Subject: Fw: Questions RE: Cunnison Lane Well Addendum #1

Dear Board of Directors,
Mr. Pollard did not respond to my message and questions. Can you please direct staff to answer my questions regarding the Cunnison Well Project?

Please acknowledge receipt of this message. Thank you.
Sincerely,
Becky Steinbruner

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

From: Becky Steinbruner <ki6tkb@yahoo.com>
To: Connor Pollard <connorp@soquelcreekwater.org>
Cc: Becky Steinbruner <ki6tkb@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, February 23, 2024 at 08:56:05 AM PST
Subject: Questions RE: Cunnison Lane Well Addendum #1

Dear Mr. Pollard,
Thank you for sending notice of the Addendum #1 of the Cunnison Lane Well Project. I found a Technical Specification Report for the project and see that the well will be 310' deep and capable of pumping 1,000gpm.
https://www.soquelcreekwater.org/DocumentCenter/View/2445/02_Technical-Specifications-PDF?bidId=

I have the following questions for which I would appreciate your answers:

1) Can you please provide the EIR for this project? Is it or any other project information going to be available at the Capitola Library?

2) Will the impacts of this new 1000 gpm well on neighboring private wells be evaluated and monitored?

3) What is the time frame for the Cunnison Lane Well construction project?

4) What volumes of well development water do you anticipate to be discharged? I note that the development water necessary for the well development will be discharged (page 5: https://www.soquelcreekwater.org/DocumentCenter/View/2445/02_Technical-Specifications-PDF?bidId=

1.10 Discharge of Generated Groundwater Pumped groundwater discharges are allowed under the Statewide Permit for Drinking Water System Discharges to Waters of the United States, Order WQ 2014-0194-DWQ (NPDES permit). Discharges shall be conveyed to the storm drain inlet on Cunnison Lane that flows to the unnamed tributary to Noble Gulch located to the west of the property

5) page 32 / 33: Variable Pumping Tests will seemingly generate great volumes of water. Can the District collect this water for groundwater recharge or will it simply be released into the unnamed Stream 584 and Noble Creek?

The temporary pump used for well development shall be used for performance testing unless other pumps and equipment are necessary to satisfy the requirements of this specification or as determined by the OWNER. CONTRACTOR is responsible to ensure that no erosion or nuisance conditions result from pumping discharges.

The well shall be tested at rates of approximately ½, ¾, 1, 1¼, and 1 ½ times the design capacity of 550 gpm, or as directed by OWNER. The variable rate pumping test shall be performed for a total duration of 10 hours (120 minutes each step)

6) Will the water be dechlorinated before injected? Will there be Baker tanks on site to achieve dechlorination?

Page 31:

2.16.2 Execution Potable water shall be continuously added to the feed tube during pumping development operation by use of a potable water hose or similar.

7) What is the source of the potable water for injection? Will this cause disturbance in area customer service water supply or quality?

On page 47 of this Report, Figure 2 shows the location of the well site and the unnamed Stream 584 that flows to Noble Creek.

8) What volumes of water do you anticipate will be released into this stream?

Page 26 describes 1000gpm discharge but how long will this pumping be conducted?

2. Discharge Piping: a) Size and length to conduct not less than 1,000 gpm water to discharge location and be approved by OWNER b) Provide in-line meter with 6-digit, straight reading totalizer, registering in units of gallons, together with a rate of flow indicator dial, which reads in units of gallons per minute and capable of measuring pump discharge within plus or minus 5% of true flow rate.

9) Will there be an onsite generator? How large? Will diesel exhaust and contamination be monitored for air quality compliance?

Page 26:

3. *Well Development Discharge:*

a) *Tank: Provide sufficient size and construction to accommodate development discharge.*

b) **Pump: Provide sufficient size and horsepower to continuously pump stored discharge water as required from tank(s) to discharge point.**

c) *Discharge Piping: Provide sufficient size and length to pump water to discharge point, including any necessary road crossings.*

Page 34:

2.18.2 *Materials* **The temporary pump used for well development shall be used for performance testing unless other pumps and equipment are necessary to satisfy the requirements of this specification or as determined by the OWNER.**

10) What will be done with the resulting effluent from the Jetting Well development described on page 28?

2.13 *Jetting Well Development (Bid Item 13)* **CONTRACTOR shall furnish all material and equipment and provide all labor necessary to develop the well by jetting. This activity shall commence within 5 calendar days after completion of initial mechanical well development**

11) Will the chloride disinfection solution for final well development be dechlorinated before discharge into the unnamed Stream 584 and Noble Creek?

Page 29 / 30:

After reaching the bottom of the well, a chlorine solution shall be swabbed into the screen sections from the bottom to the top as the dual swab tool is removed at a rate of 15 minutes for each 20 feet of screen. Chlorine solution shall be sufficient to achieve a concentration of 1,000 ppm throughout the well screen.

Upon reaching the uppermost screen section, the development tools shall be left in the well for a minimum period of 12 hours.

Page 30 describes further well development effluent and injection of potable water:

12) I see on page 12 that 24' tall soundwalls will be constructed prior to well drilling. What is the design for the rigid panel soundwalls? Will there be pile driving activity to construct the soundwalls?

13) Will the 24' tall soundwalls also shield neighboring residences from nighttime lighting necessary for the 24-hour work that must be non-stop until completed?

page 26:

2.12 *Initial Mechanical Well Development (Bid Item 12)* **CONTRACTOR shall furnish all material and equipment and provide all labor necessary to perform initial well development by means of open-ended airlifting and swabbing with airlifting. Activities performed under this bid item shall be completed with the drilling rig prior to its removal from the site. This activity shall be completed on a 24-hour working schedule until complete.**

14) I see on page 13 that :

Equipment needed for the first 30 days of work shall be on site at start of the Work.

Will this include a Baker tank and generator?

15) Page 14 describes Formation Sampling:

ITEM 5.0 ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATION

2.4.2 Formation Sampling CONTRACTOR shall collect and preserve 1 set of drill cutting samples at 5-foot intervals during the drilling of the pilot borehole. Samples shall be placed in 1-gallon, heavy weight, re-sealable plastic bags and labeled with the sample depth interval. Collected samples shall be stored in a manner to prevent breakage or loss.

The bore hole will be 17.5" in diameter. **Where will the drill cutting material not collected in representative sampling be stored? On site or trucked away?**

16) Page 14 also describes Drilling Fluids to be used:

2.4.3 Drilling Fluids **Potable water shall be used to mix a bentonite-based drilling fluid** designed to adequately maintain bore wall, minimize invasion of drilling fluid into the formation, and permit recovery of representative samples of cuttings. Soda ash may be used to increase pH of the water used to mix drilling fluids. The drilling fluid shall possess such characteristics that it can be readily removed from the borehole during development of the well. **Drilling with clear water alone shall not be permitted.**

Excavation of pits on site for drilling fluids are prohibited, and surface containment (i.e., tanks and/or bins) of drilling fluids are required.

Will the project include any Baker tanks necessary for dechlorination of potable water used in drilling fluids and well development?

17) Page 35 describes water quality sampling, and provides a table on page 36 listing chemical and mineral testing. I do not see MTBE included in the analysis list. **Given this well is near the site of the historic Quik Stop Market contamination plume of MTBE which threatened the District's wells in 2002, why isn't the Cunnison Well water going to be tested for MTBE?**

https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/profile_report?global_id=T0608700177

Minutes of February 19, 2002

Page 4

5.A. 5) APPROVALS/ACCEPTANCES – APPROVE CONTINUATION OF CONSULTING SERVICES WITH KOMEX H2O SCIENCE, INC., FOR QUIK STOP MARKET NO. 78 MTBE CONTAMINATION: Considered the proposal from KOMEX H2O Science, Inc., to continue providing consulting services related to the MTBE Investigation and Cleanup Plans for the Quik Stop Market No. 78 in Soquel at a cost not to exceed of \$12,000. President Kriege noted that the Quik Stop Market has been very cooperative. Director Daniels stated that he would like KOMEX to look at other contaminated sites besides monitoring the Quik Stop Market for a portion of this proposal. O&M reported that he could have KOMEX provide a proposal to look at the other sites. Director Hazelton concurred stating he would rather have the costs separated. Director Daniels listed the other contaminated sites, and Director Hazelton noted that some were not in the District. After a discussion by the Board on this matter, it was decided to have KOMEX provide a proposal to look at contaminated sites that could contaminate a District well even if it is not within the District's boundaries.

It was moved by Director Hazelton, seconded by Director Beebe, to approve the scope of services from KOMEX H2O Science, Inc., to continue to monitor the Investigation and Remediation of the MTBE Contamination at the Quik Stop Market No. 78 at a cost not to exceed \$12,000, CWO 01-133. MOTION CARRIED. All ayes. Voice vote.

It was moved by Director Hazelton, seconded by Director Beebe, to solicit a proposal from KOMEX H2O Science, Inc., to review other contaminated sites in and around the District. MOTION CARRIED. All ayes. Voice vote.

<https://www.soquelcreekwater.org/sites/default/files/documents/board-meeting/archived/02-19-02m.pdf>

The District received a 28-page report by KOMEX regarding the MTBE problem and production wells.

CORRESPONDENCE - 03/05/24
ITEM 5.0 ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATION

18) Where will construction crews park their vehicles during the project? Cunnison Lane is a narrow thoroughfare.

Thank you for helping me understand this project, which I believe is funded by a State grant.


Sincerely,
Becky Steinbruner

From: Emma Western
Sent: Thursday, March 14, 2024 12:33 PM
To: Kristen Sandel; bod
Cc: Steve Bakaley; sierraclubsanacruz@gmail.com
Subject: RE: Sierra Club comments re: Laurel St. bridge/Pure Water Soquel Conveyance Project Habitat Impact

Dear Mr. Guth,

On behalf of the Soquel Creek Water District Board of Directors, we want to acknowledge receipt of your letter dated March 4, 2024, concerning the Pure Water Soquel Conveyance Project. We have read your letter with careful consideration, and we appreciate you sharing your input regarding cliff swallow activity at the Laurel Street Bridge. Environmental stewardship remains a core value for the Soquel Creek Water District, so we appreciate your intentions, and thank you for your letter.

Sincerely,

Emma Western (she/her) | 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: Kristen Sandel <krsandel@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 4, 2024 9:56 AM
To: bod <bod@soquelcreekwater.org>
Cc: Steve Bakaley <slbakaley@gmail.com>; Kristen Sandel <krsandel@gmail.com>
Subject: Sierra Club comments re: Laurel St. bridge/Pure Water Soquel Conveyance Project Habitat Impact

Good morning, attached please find Sierra Club comments regarding the Laurel St. bridge/Pure Water Soquel Project. Please confirm receipt of this email. Thank you!

Kristen Sandel
Conservation Committee
Sierra Club Santa Cruz County Group



**SANTA CRUZ COUNTY
GROUP**

**Of The Ventana Chapter
P.O. Box 604, Santa Cruz, CA 95061**

<https://www.sierraclub.org/ventana/santa-cruz>
email: sierraclubsantacruz@gmail.com

Soquel Creek Water District
5180 Soquel Drive
Soquel, CA 95073
bod@soquelcreekwater.org

Re: Laurel St. Bridge/Pure Water Soquel Conveyance Project Habitat Impact

March 4, 2024

Dear Soquel Creek Water District Board Members,

The Sierra Club is contacting you to share our concerns regarding impacts of the Pure Water Soquel Conveyance Project on the breeding habitat of migratory insectivorous cliff swallows beneath the ledge of the Laurel St. bridge. This area is a long documented breeding habitat for up to 50 migratory cliff swallow nests, and it appears that the current installation of the architectural covers will prevent access for future nest building by the swallows. Further, observation of the cliff swallow population since the PWS Project began strongly indicates that impacts of the project have been more severe than those anticipated in the 2018 EIR, and that additional mitigations are now necessary and should be undertaken to prevent subsequent losses.

It has been brought to our attention that community members repeatedly voiced concerns to CDFW and the Soquel Creek Water District about the Project's disturbance of the nesting site in 2022 and 2023. Both agencies' responses left open questions. The Santa Cruz Bird Club has contacted numerous personnel connected with the project in 2023 about the concerns noted below and has received responses from Skyler Murphy, Water Resources Planner with your district. However, although we appreciate the responses given, we believe it is incumbent upon the Water District to begin researching appropriate mitigations to address the observed changes in breeding habitat and effects on the cliff swallows displaced from their nesting sites.

Although correspondence dated 10/31/23 with the Project lead states that "The PWS Project elements do not restrict cliff swallows from nesting on the bridge and abundant nesting opportunities on the bridge remain," our observation (see photo, and that of the Santa Cruz Bird Club, indicates that the current installation of the project's pipe covers *does* eliminate access for the location-faithful cliff swallows. Observation indicates a steep drop in swallow nests beneath the Laurel St. bridge since the Pure Water Soquel installation work began, from an annual average of 50 nests to approximately 15 after implementation of the PWS Project.



In reference to 10/31/23 Project input, we point out that any relocation of the Laurel St. bridge breeding population is hindered by the occupation of other location-faithful cliff swallows at the other potential sites, blocking those sites from use by displaced birds. Additionally, the swallows' nest building requires particular material, which is only available in specific river areas.

As it now appears clear that the 2018 EIR did not adequately assess either the project scope or long-term disturbances to the cliff swallows, we are interested in what mitigations are in place for the loss of the cliff swallows' breeding location, and what future mitigations may be desirable to allow and encourage the return of the displaced population.

The mitigations should factor in that:

- (1) the riparian corridor of the San Lorenzo River is in the protected Pacific Flyway of migratory birds, whose population is steeply declining;
- (2) restoration and protection of riparian corridors is a key aspect of federal and state directives, due to the 90% loss of those corridors;
- (3) mitigations should address cumulative impacts that extend beyond the duration of construction;

- (4) the 2018 Project EIR Biological Resources (Section 4.4) acknowledges that 'project construction could disrupt breeding and foraging habitat for nesting birds, raptors and bats, and disrupt overwintering habitat for monarch butterflies';
- (5) Section 30240 of the 1976 California Coastal Act governs development in environmentally sensitive habitat areas: “(a) Environmentally sensitive habitat areas shall be protected against any significant disruption of habitat values, and only uses dependent on those resources shall be allowed within those areas.
- (6) (b) Development in areas adjacent to environmentally sensitive habitat areas and parks and recreation areas shall be sited and designed to prevent impacts which would significantly degrade those areas, and shall be compatible with the continuance of those habitat and recreation areas.”
- (7) the 2018 Project EIR does not include site specific evaluation of the Laurel St. bridge;
- (8) the Laurel St. bridge pipeline construction specifications should contain a Best Management Plan (BMP) for the protected cliff swallows breeding habitat that includes the 9/21/21 restored Migratory Bird Treaty Act and CA Assembly Bill 454, as well as integrating the 2003 San Lorenzo Urban River Plan (SLURP), Santa Cruz City Parks & Recreation Master Plan, e-bird records and the Lower San Lorenzo River 2015 Fall Migration Bird Surveys, thus incorporating bird species now omitted from the Project's EIR (Cooper’s hawk, great blue heron, osprey).

In view of these concerns, we strongly urge your Board to research and implement more extensive mitigations of the Pure Water Soquel Project to return more complete use of this fragile and valuable urban habitat to the cliff swallows, a protected species under the 1918 Migratory Bird Treaty Act (restored to full enforcement in 2021). Use of appropriate mitigations would help to restore the significantly degraded 5% to 10% riparian corridor remaining in California.

Thank you for your consideration of these concerns; we would welcome an opportunity for you to discuss these issues and potential solutions with both Sierra Club and Santa Cruz Bird Club members, and we look forward to productive conversations on how to best protect, restore and conserve the San Lorenzo River riparian corridor, as an extraordinary and critical natural resource.



Michael Guth,
Executive Committee Chair
Sierra Club, Santa Cruz County Group

CORRESPONDENCE - 03/05/24
ITEM 5.0 ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATION

From: Becky Steinbruner <ki6tkb@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 23, 2024 9:49 PM
To: bod; Emma Western
Cc: Leslie Strohm; Joshua Nelson
Subject: Re: Please Remedy Credit Card Bill Payment Subsidies in Soquel Creek Water District Finances

Dear Ms. Western,
Thank you for your response and explanation. What is the cost of accepting and processing bill payment by check or cash as compared to the per-customer electronic fee?

It still seems that those who use checks and cash are subsidizing the cost of those who pay electronically at the rate of \$14,000/month in credit card fees.

Sincerely,
Becky Steinbruner

On Monday, March 11, 2024 at 11:43:25 AM PDT, Emma Western <emmaw@soquelcreekwater.org> wrote:

Hello Ms. Steinbruner,


We made the decision years ago to assume the processing fees for electronic payments for a number of reasons.

- Online payments require less manual work to process, saving about 20 hours a month in payment related workload and thereby reducing the need for additional staff.
- WaterSmart enrollment is driven mainly by those who wish to pay their bill online, and we are trying to remove any barriers to enrollment in WaterSmart because of the conservation benefits to both the basin and our customers.
- Less than 10% of Americans prefer to pay their bill by cash or check, which means the predominant payment method is now electronic. We strive to meet the needs of our customers as much as possible.
- We want to encourage our customers to utilize our online bill payment service rather than their banking institution's online bill pay because our payments post within 24 hours, reducing customer late fees and shut offs.
- Online bill pay results in faster turnover of accounts receivable, improving cash flow and taking advantage of the time-value of money.
- Online bill pay also reduces paper bills and deposit slips, saving the District money in postage and in-person visits to the bank.

The benefits of encouraging customers to utilize electronic payments far outweigh the fees charged for that service. We want to encourage electronic payments, not discourage them.

Research shows that enrollment in autopayments, one-time online payments, and payments by phone decreases when the customer has to pay an additional fee to use those services. Since processing cash and check payments is so much more labor intensive, there is significant cost savings to the District when our customers pay electronically.

Sincerely,

Emma Western (she/her) | 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: Monday, February 26, 2024 11:06 AM
To: bod <bod@soquelcreekwater.org>; Emma Western <emmaw@soquelcreekwater.org>
Cc: Leslie Strohm <leslies@soquelcreekwater.org>; Joshua Nelson <Joshua.Nelson@bbklaw.com>
Subject: Re: Please Remedy Credit Card Bill Payment Subsidies in Soquel Creek Water District Finances

Dear Soquel Creek Water District Board of Directors,

I am still thinking about the District paying more than \$14,000 every month in credit card fees.

As a follow-up to my correspondence suggesting the Board discuss implement a fee for credit card payment, I want to let you know that Central Water District in Aptos has the following policy, according to their website:

Also, please note that for any transaction processed through this website, including Autopay, there is a credit card processing fee of \$3.05 or 3% of the bill (whichever is greater).

This policy assigns the cost burden of paying with a credit card to the person who chooses to pay with a credit card, and does not make those who pay with cash or check subsidize the convenience of others.

Sincerely,

Becky Steinbruner

On Friday, February 23, 2024 at 04:23:27 PM PST, Becky Steinbruner <ki6tkb@yahoo.com> wrote:

Dear Board of Directors,

I respectfully request that the Board consider discussion about adding a surcharge to customers using credit cards to pay their water bills because of the substantial monthly fees the District incurs as a result, and that are being subsidized by those who choose to pay their water bills with cash or check, causing no service fees to the District.

I was curious about the \$14,183.50 entry in the January, 2024 Board meeting agenda packet Financial information, but did not have sufficient time to ask the question in the two minutes I was allowed to speak.

Therefore, I filed a Public Records Act request to explain the cause of such a high "credit card" cost for the Cloud Inc Credit Card Fees reported on page 45 of the January 16, 2024 District Board packet: <https://www.soquelcreekwater.org/AgendaCenter/ViewFile/Item/518?fileID=1837>

*DFT0002386 11/10/2023 12/11/2023 11:14:24 AM INVOICE CLOUD INC CREDIT CARD FEES
14,183.50
Vendor INVOIC001 - INVOICE CLOUD INC
Total: 14,183.50*

Subsequently, thanks to Ms. Western providing documents and me conversing with friends, I came to understand that the \$14,183.50 charge is a MONTHLY expense to the District related people using credit cards to pay their water bills. I did not understand that the District is charged monthly by Invoice Cloud Inc. when customers pay their bills with an electronic transfer.

I see the charge again reported in the February 20, 2024 Financial Report on page 36 for the District's monthly fee paid in December, 2023:

*Vendor: INVOIC001 - INVOICE CLOUD INC
DFT0002409 12/10/2023 INVOICE CLOUD INC CREDIT CARD FEES 14,032.26
Vendor INVOIC001 - INVOICE CLOUD INC Total: 14,032.26
<https://www.soquelcreekwater.org/AgendaCenter/ViewFile/Item/539?fileID=1919>*

At the rate of \$14,000 each month, the cost to rate payers is more than \$168,000 each year.

I am told that most businesses charge a small fee to customers who choose to use a credit card payment. Why doesn't Soquel Creek Water District do the same?

As it is now, those who pay their water bills with cash or check are subsidizing the cost of those who choose to use credit cards to pay their water bills.

CORRESPONDENCE - 03/05/24
ITEM 5.0 ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATION

Please respond in writing. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Becky Steinbruner

From: [Becky Steinbruner](#)
To: [bod](#); [Emma Western](#)
Cc: [Leslie Strohm](#); [Joshua Nelson](#); [Becky Steinbruner](#)
Subject: Please Remedy Credit Card Bill Payment Subsidies in Soquel Creek Water District Finances
Date: Friday, February 23, 2024 4:23:31 PM

Dear Board of Directors,

I respectfully request that the Board consider discussion about adding a surcharge to customers using credit cards to pay their water bills because of the substantial monthly fees the District incurs as a result, and that are being subsidized by those who choose to pay their water bills with cash or check, causing no service fees to the District.

I was curious about the \$14,183.50 entry in the January, 2024 Board meeting agenda packet Financial information, but did not have sufficient time to ask the question in the two minutes I was allowed to speak.

Therefore, I filed a Public Records Act request to explain the cause of such a high "credit card" cost for the Cloud Inc Credit Card Fees reported on page 45 of the January 16, 2024 District Board packet: <https://www.soquelcreekwater.org/AgendaCenter/ViewFile/Item/518?fileID=1837>

*DFT0002386 11/10/2023 12/11/2023 11:14:24 AM INVOICE CLOUD INC CREDIT CARD FEES
14,183.50
Vendor INVOIC001 - INVOICE CLOUD INC
Total: 14,183.50*

Subsequently, thanks to Ms. Western providing documents and me conversing with friends, I came to understand that the \$14,183.50 charge is a MONTHLY expense to the District related people using credit cards to pay their water bills. I did not understand that the District is charged monthly by Invoice Cloud Inc. when customers pay their bills with an electronic transfer.

I see the charge again reported in the February 20, 2024 Financial Report on page 36 for the District's monthly fee paid in December, 2023:

*Vendor: INVOIC001 - INVOICE CLOUD INC
DFT0002409 12/10/2023 INVOICE CLOUD INC CREDIT CARD FEES 14,032.26
Vendor INVOIC001 - INVOICE CLOUD INC Total: 14,032.26
<https://www.soquelcreekwater.org/AgendaCenter/ViewFile/Item/539?fileID=1919>*

At the rate of \$14,000 each month, the cost to rate payers is more than \$168,000 each year.

I am told that most businesses charge a small fee to customers who choose to use a credit card payment. Why doesn't Soquel Creek Water District do the same?

As it is now, those who pay their water bills with cash or check are subsidizing the cost of those who choose to use credit cards to pay their water bills.

Please respond in writing. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Becky Steinbruner