Subject: Fwd: Re: 21000 acre Monterey Bay Estuarine National Monument including 31k/a/f/yr Castroville Reclamation Plant and all distribution facilities repurposed to urban from ag use

Date: Wednesday, October 14, 2020 4:27:03 AM

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

Subject: Re: 21000 acre Monterey Bay Estuarine National Monument including 31k/a/f/yr Castroville Reclamation Plant and all distribution facilities repurposed to urban from ag use

Date: Tue, 13 Oct 2020 18:07:46 -0700

From: Douglas Deitch <ddeitch@got.net>

To: Padilla, Stephen@Coastal <Stephen.Padilla@coastal.ca.gov>, Groom, Carole@Coastal <carole.groom@coastal.ca.gov>, Brownsey, Donne@Coastal <donne.brownsey@coastal.ca.gov>, Turnbull-Sanders, Effie@Coastal <effie.turnbull-sanders@coastal.ca.gov>, Uranga, Roberto@Coastal <roberto.uranga@coastal.ca.gov>, Howell, Erik@Coastal <erik.howell@coastal.ca.gov>, Wilson, Mike@Coastal <mike.wilson@coastal.ca.gov>, Escalante, Linda@Coastal <linda.escalante@coastal.ca.gov>, Aminzadeh, Sara@Coastal <sara.aminzadeh@coastal.ca.gov>, 'David Wardwell' <sage1@shaw.ca>, Rice, Katie@Coastal <katie.rice@coastal.ca.gov>, Luce, Shelley@Coastal <shelley.luce@coastal.ca.gov>, Faustinos, Belinda@Coastal <belinda.faustinos@coastal.ca.gov>, Ainsworth, John@Coastal <John.Ainsworth@coastal.ca.gov>, bruced@soquelcreekwater.org <bruced@soquelcreekwater.org>, Bruce Daniels <bruce.daniels@alum.MIT.edu>, Ddeitch <ddeitch@pogonip.org>, Luster, Tom@Coastal <Tom.Luster@coastal.ca.gov>, gapatton@stanfordalumni.org, Mark Primack <mark@markprimack.com>, Becky Steinbruner <ki6tkb@yahoo.com>, citycouncil@cityofsantacruz.com, Godwin, Timothy@DWR <Timothy.Godwin@water.ca.gov>, swrcb <jeanine.Townsend@waterboards.ca.gov>, jgoldstein@ci.capitola.ca.us, citycouncil@ci.capitola.ca.us, bod@soquelcreekwater.org, melanies@soquelcreekwater.org, Zach Friend <Zach.Friend@santacruzcounty.us>, bruce.mcherson@co.santa-cruz.ca.us, john.leopold@co.santa-cruz.ca.us, greg.caput@co.santa-cruz.ca.us, Neal Coonerty <nealcoonerty@hotmail.com>, district1@co.monterey.ca.us, district2@co.monterey.ca.us, district3@co.monterey.ca.us, district4@co.monterey.ca.us, 100-District 5 (831) 647-7755 <district5@co.monterey.ca.us>

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

Subject: Re: 21000 acre Monterey Bay Estuarine National Monument including 31k/a/f/yr
Hi Mr. Deitch,

Please excuse my delay in getting back to you, and thanks for the information about your proposal. I remember you bringing this up at some previous Coastal Commission meetings.

We at staff generally get involved later in the planning process for this type of proposal -- most likely during the CEQA/NEPA review when we'll provide comments to the lead agency. It's not clear to me who would be your lead agency in this case, as your proposal would be located within several local jurisdictions and possibly within the jurisdiction of the State Lands Commission. Once you find out which agency would take the lead and start the review process, we'd start to be involved.

Hope this helps for now,

Tom Luster
and all other projects: The 21000 acre Monterey Bay Estuarine National Monument including 31k/a/f/yr Castroville Reclamation Plant and all related distribution facilities repurposed to urban from ag use

Dear CCCCommissioners, Bruce Daniels-SqCWD, and Tom Luster-CCC,
Please see/review fb page @ www.dougdeitch.info for a run down of this minimally 63,000 a/f/yr in perpetuity ground water conservation and defacto aquifer(s) recharge and 21000 acre coast front Monterey Bay regional estuarine habitat rehabilitation and conservation project including @ $75 million online since 1998 31k/a/f/yr urban water reclamation/recycling plant in Castroville, the water from which will be repurposed to Monterey Regional wide urban water use and needs from ag, ... with a 43 acre 25 y/o perfectly successful also coast front "Pilot Project" proving the concept Farmlands back to Wetlands @ Zmudowski Beach run down @ fb page @ www.dougdeitch.com

Check it out. No better plan is possibly conceivable? It's $100k per acre or $2.1 billion of OPM-other people's money, specifically a few billion of reallocated unused rail bond and some Prop1 money, including the Castroville's plant water, all of it.... Monterey County and City of Santa Cruz, Central, and SqCWD's water would ALL come from this water, piped there and up here.

THIS SYSTEM WOULD BE DPR, DIRECT POTABLE REUSE, so regs have to be developed by SWRCB.

https://www.facebook.com/photo/?fbid=2514433888604966&set=pcb.2514411368607218

Tom, Do you know about this 180 acres of new farmland, relative to Pure Water Monterey? @

Do the water math. 42 inches of slr in 30 years will wipe out all these coast aquifers. Stopping all pumping is best we can do to buy time.

Also, COVID19 contamination in injected waters is still an ongoing and unresolved concern @ https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2020/04/200403132347.htm

DPR avoids this conclusively.

Science News

Removing the novel coronavirus from the water cycle @
https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2020/04/200403132347.htm...

At least we don't have to worry about the massive California wide water, food, real estate security project for the vast majority of the water, food, and real estate resources in the fifth biggest economy in the World I have been trying to run down for you Folks @
www.sipodemos.democrat /www.thebestthatmoneycantbuy.com and 
www.dougieforcongress.com etc ...

Que suerte!
Douglas Deitch
Monterey Bay Conservancy
476-7662
Dear Board,

I received a newsletter from Vision Recycling today, describing their donation of wood chips near Soquel Creek Water District offices as part of the planned Vai Campbell Memorial Garden. I am really pleased the District is doing this and would like to help in any way possible.

Vai was a wonderful person, and was always so kind to me. I miss her and would like to help honor her by working in the garden project if possible. Please let me know how I can help.

Thank you.
Sincerely,
Becky Steinbruner

**********

Vision Recycling Assists the Soquel Creek Water District with an Outreach Program by Members of the Santa Cruz Community

Vision Recycling donated some of the mulch and compost used at the Soquel Creek Water District on Friday October 1st as part of a memorial landscape for Vai Campbell who passed away one year ago in a dive boat accident off the coast of southern California. On this one year anniversary of Vai's passing, the CLCA Central Coast Chapter, Soquel Creek Water District, Ecology Action and the Water Conservation Coalition of Santa Cruz County collaborated to revive a low-water use demonstration garden that Vai started 15 years ago on the corner of Soquel Dr. and Rosedale Ave. According to Sherry Bryan with EA, "Vai always wished the Water District's Soquel Drive landscape was a more beautiful demonstration of a Monterey Bay Friendly Garden. There is no group of landscape contractors better suited than our Central Coast CLCA members to step up and honor that wish".

Vai Campbell at Earth Day
Ms. Steinbruner,

On behalf of Soquel Creek Water District’s General Manager Ron Duncan, please see the District’s response below:

EIR Section 4.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, identifies the potential for the existing structures at the Chanticleer site to include asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint, and discusses the mandatory requirements for handling such materials. Based on an evaluation of building materials conducted in 2019, it was determined that the structures likely included asbestos containing materials and lead-based paint. Thus, as required, all demolition work was conducted by a State-certified asbestos-containing material and lead-based paint professional who undertook removal activities following approved and required methods. Wastes from abatement and demolition activities were disposed of at a landfill permitted to accept such waste.

Advanced notice was provided to adjacent properties/property owners on June 18, 2020, and included information about both the well and building demolition activities.

Sincerely,

Emma Olin
Please respond in writing. Thank you.
Sincerely,
Becky Steinbruner
From: Emma Olin
To: Becky Steinbruner
Cc: Board of Directors
Subject: RE: Significant Drilling Effluent Spill at Willowbrook Well Construction Site

Date: Monday, October 12, 2020 2:58:00 PM

Ms. Steinbruner,

On behalf of Soquel Creek Water District’s General Manager Ron Duncan, please see the District’s response below:

Thank you for your email acknowledging the rapid clean-up. Just for clarity, the District should point out that the District did not make any public statements regarding the incident. The District’s statement was that the spill was bentonite-based, and indeed it was a mix of water, soil, and bentonite (a type of clay). It did not include any petroleum or other construction materials.

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: Thursday, October 1, 2020 11:13 PM
To: bod <bod@soquelcreekwater.org>; Emma Olin <emmao@soquelcreekwater.org>
Cc: Becky Steinbruner <ki6tkb@yahoo.com>
Subject: Significant Drilling Effluent Spill at Willowbrook Well Construction Site

Dear Board,

I am glad that Zim Industries and Brown & Caldwell quickly reported the drilling effluent accident at Willowbrook Well ... Health and State Water Resources Control Board staff quickly investigated the problem and monitored the clean-up.

I am glad for that.

Sincerely,

Becky Steinbruner

All,

As discussed below, this morning there was a spill of drilling fluids (bentonite-based) from the Willowbrook SWIP well ... in the attached figure. The end point of the spill (shown on the figure) resulted in an approximately 10' x 6' pond.

The source of the leak has been identified and fixed. We are currently working with the drilling contractor on a cleanup ... hour or so. Please let me know if you have any questions. I will keep the group informed of activities as they progress.

Best Regards,

Bill Leever, PG, CHg, ENV SP
Brown and Caldwell | Irvine, CA
T | 714.689.4835 | C | 949.292.3994

Download all attachments as a zip file

09-17-20, 20-3000 (5).jpg 4.1MB

CORRESPONDENCE - 10/20/20
ITEM 5.0 - ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS
Hi All,

Sorry for the delay, but we had just received the cleanup report from the contractor, and there were some items that we ... and collect the water from the point where is daylights. I'll confirm with you once I get a response from the contractor.

Below is a summary of what has already occurred:

The morning of 9/17/2020 there was a spill of drilling fluids (potable water with bentonite) from the Willowbrook SWIP ... vacuuming the impacted driveway, parking area, curb, and street (see photos - 20200918 Post-spill cleanup 1, 2, and 3).

The drilling contractor also contracted with Pacific Petroleum, Inc. (PPI) to clean the portion of the storm drain system that was impacted.

On 9/18/2020 the cleanup contractor used a vac truck to remove all spilled drilling fluid from above ground areas, ... homeowner dumping a barrel of spoiled wine into the storm drain during cleanup activities near the last portion of storm

...wine had flooded the portion of the storm drain being cleaned and we did ... wine made its way through the rest of the below ground portion the storm drain and ponded (see photo – 20200919 wine 2).

The following agencies were notified of the spill and a spill report was filed with CalOES (Report No. 20-5216) on 9/17/20:

1. Phil Hammer, Harvey Packard, and James Bishop – Central Coast Regional Board
2. Rachel Fatoohi, Vance Wagner, and Alex Sandoval – Santa Cruz County
3. Department of Fish and Wildlife, via CalOES report

Best Regards,

Bill Leever, PG, CHg, ENV SP
Brown and Caldwell | Irvine, CA
714.689.4835 | 949.292.3994
ITEM 5.0 - ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

CORRESPONDENCE - 10/20/20

EMERGENCY RESPONSE ACTION REPORT

Customer: Pacific Petroleum / Zim Industries
Site Name: Ruben Juarez / memo
Site Address: 2500 Willowbrook Lane, Norval CA
Onsite Contact: Ruben Juarez / memo
Contact Phone: (559) 351-3426

Job Number: 20-15333
Date: 09-19-2020
PO/Ref: #

Arrival Time: 08:00
Departure Time: 17:30

Activity Summary and General Remarks

Date | Time | Activity
--- | --- | ---
09-19-20 | 05:30 | Start time at Benicia ponds yard
08:00 | | Arrived at job site and met with Memo & Ruben from Zim Industries, then start cleaning the curb
| | by washing with a 1" hose /hose nozzle and collected the waste at the first storm drain catch basin.
| | Stage the Jetter truck at the 2nd catch basin and jet the storm drain line across Willowbrook LN.
| | With a 2500 psi jetter / vacuum system, we jet it until clean water came out.
| | Repeat same procedure along the line (5 staging areas total)
| | Around 1330 I was jetting from staging area #5 and saw some white foam coming out.
| | I stop jetting and call Memo from Zim Industries.

Off load jetter truck at 2505 chesapeake ave. into frac tank.

The white foam was coming from the wine that was dump in the storm drain #3 one of the residents that lives in front of storm drain and washed it down with water from the garden hose. We were cleaning storm drain #5 and saw some white foam coming out and red wine it's smelled like wine so Ruben and Jose Colin walked towards willowbrook LN and saw blue barrel flight by the storm drain, the man that lives there said he had some bad wine that he dumped Ruben called Bill Leon and told Bill what was going on we could not mix the wine with the drilling fluids so we stopped.

Prepared by: Jose Colin
Title: Sup.
Ms. Steinbruner,

On behalf of Soquel Creek Water District’s General Manager Ron Duncan, please see the District’s response below:

On June 4, 2020, project notification letters were sent to area residents within 500 feet of the project site. The District conducted a virtual community meeting on June 18, 2020 for residents within 200 feet of the project site. The meeting provided an overview of the project purpose, schedule, impacts, and mitigation measures for project impacts, including the availability of accommodations for those disturbed by night time noise. The District also maintains a “hotline” telephone number which is monitored by the District’s noise disturbance coordinator, who is responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. Since construction began, the District has heard from 4 nearby residents through the hotline, and 2 nearby residents have requested and received hotel accommodations.

The District installed a construction noise barrier (sound wall) around the perimeter of the site. While the sound wall is closed during most construction activities, there are limited times that the sound wall must be opened to allow equipment and materials to move in and out of the site.

The District has updated the Project website, including updates to the expected construction schedule for the Willowbrook site.

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.

Dear Board,

I noted that the Zim Industries crew is working tonight, October 1, 2020. The sound curtain was open, directing loud noise toward the homes across the street.

I have been talking with many District customers lately, including some who live near the Willowbrook Well construction site. They all remarked about the noise at night from the construction work. None seemed to know that the District must pay for hotel accommodations for those who are disturbed by the construction noise.
The District website information likewise does not let people know this relief is available. Also, the information available is not current or accurate. The last update was over one month ago. That information claimed the 24-hour construction operations would be complete by September 23. The crews were working tonight, October 1, and it was very loud.

How is the District accommodating those area residents? Is anyone contacting them to ask if they are disturbed by the District construction project noise?

Please respond.

Sincerely,
Becky Steinbruner

Willowbrook SWIP Well

Construction Updates

Latest Update – 08/28/20: Due to the fires and a state-wide concrete shortage, 24-hour construction has been delayed until Wednesday, September 9th, with the commencement of well reaming. 24-hour construction operations are anticipated to continue for another two weeks after the 9th.

08/14/2020: The District team has completed the drilling of the pilot hole and geophysical surveys at the Willowbrook site. Construction crews have temporarily pulled off of the site while the well design is completed and the project contractor is procuring materials needed for well construction. 24-hour construction is anticipated to start back up on the site on Monday, August 24th, with the commencement of well reaming. 24-hour construction operations are anticipated to continue for another two weeks after the 24th.

08/07/2020: The work crew has completed the sound wall barrier and will begin drilling. This will be drilling 24/7 until they reach a depth of approximately 800 feet and should last until Tuesday. Please use extra caution when driving or walking on Willowbrook Road in the vicinity of the worksite, and be aware of trucks and equipment entering and leaving the site. We apologize for the inconvenience this may cause.

Construction Noise line: 831-295-8879
Construction Updates Latest Update – 08/28/20: Due to the fires and a state-wide concrete shortage, 24-hour cons...
Dear Mr. Rappoport,

On behalf of the District and our Board of Directors, thank you for your recent email presented below. You posed an excellent question – a question that comes up often in the community. To paraphrase: with the Mid-County groundwater basin in a state of critical overdraft, why is development that adds water users to the already over-burdened water system allowed to continue?

I appreciate that your question clearly recognizes the extremely serious water supply issues we’re facing as a community. The District is working diligently to address the overdrafting of our groundwater supply and the resulting seawater contamination through our many water conservation programs and our Pure Water Soquel groundwater replenishment project. It is important to note that recent development has not caused the overdraft (created in the 1980s) but could exacerbate it.

To be clear, the Soquel Creek Water District does not have control over approvals of new land developments; that responsibility is with the governing jurisdictions that enforce land-use regulations – primarily cities and counties – not water districts. Since the District does have some control over new water connections, we created our Water Neutral Program (also called Water Demand Offset Program) in 2003. This Program requires all new development, from homes to commercial projects, to offset the amount of water they are expected to use by 200% as a condition for water service. This allows development to continue without increasing water demand on our groundwater basin.

How does the Program work? Water connection fees collected by the District through the Water Neutral Program have funded a number of water-saving programs, including the installation of thousands of high-efficiency toilets, urinals, showerheads, turf replacements, and our i-Meter program, which will install state-of-the-art intelligent meters to help alert customers of leaks. The Program saves millions of gallons of water annually, more than new development uses.

We’re very proud of our Water Neutral Program – and pleased that it won the Theodore Roosevelt Environmental Award for Excellence in Natural Resources Management from the Association of California Water Agencies. This program has been called, “...one of the most comprehensive water demand offset programs in the United States,” (Alliance for Water Efficiency paper), and “...one of the best-documented water neutral programs in the California sample described in this Article” (J.L. Harder paper on water neutral development in California).

The District’s Water Neutral Program and its many water conservation programs are only part of the solution to address the groundwater crisis. Our Pure Water Soquel project will play the most significant role by providing a drought-proof supply of purified recycled water to replenish the
groundwater basin and prevent further seawater contamination of our community’s drinking water supply.

Pure Water Soquel is an investment in our water system infrastructure and natural resources, estimated to cost $90 million. In addition, we are prudently planning for project cost contingencies, as you may do when remodeling your home, for example. On behalf of our ratepayers, we were fortunate to be awarded a $50 million grant from the State Water Board, along with tens of millions of dollars in very low-interest loans from the state and the US EPA to help fund the rest of the project costs and contingencies. In this way, we are effectively leveraging the rates you pay, and this will reduce pressure on the need for future rate increases.

We are grateful to work together with the community on water conservation efforts at every level – from households and yards, to the Water Neutral Program – and we appreciate the support that’s been shown for Pure Water Soquel, both from our local community and from the state and federal funding/loan agencies. It’s these kinds of partnerships which will solve our community’s complex challenges, such as our water supply shortage, and create a sustainable water supply for today and the future.

Note that since you posed such an important question (and in a thoughtful manner), I have also submitted an Op/Ed piece (similar to the text above) to the Sentinel in hopes that they will publish your letter to the editor and my Op/Ed response. I feel many other members of our community probably have a similar question as you and would appreciate a better understanding. However, I also wanted to provide you this personalized response. The District’s Board of Directors is also copied on this email.

If you want to discuss further, please feel free to call me at my direct line 475-8501 ext. 144.

Thank you very much.

Ron Duncan | General Manager
Soquel Creek Water District | 5180 Soquel Dr., Soquel CA 95073 | www.soquelcreekwater.org
direct 831-475-8501 x144 | main 831-475-8500

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.

This e-mail message, including any attachments, may be confidential and exempt from disclosure, may contain work product and/or confidential communications, and may be subject to other privileges and restrictions as well. IF YOU ARE NOT AN INTENDED RECIPIENT, PLEASE REPLY BY E-MAIL THAT YOU RECEIVED THIS MESSAGE IN ERROR, DELETE THIS MESSAGE FROM YOUR SYSTEM, AND DELETE, PURGE, AND/OR DESTROY ALL COPIES.

---------------
From: jerry rappoport <jrappoport@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, September 23, 2020 2:50 PM
Hi,

It is not my intention to minimize all that's being done by the water company. My concern has to do with the blind eye regarding the politician's OKing projects that add water users to an already overly burdened water system. When I was still in industry, management had a mantra that went "If you're not growing, you're dying". Tell that to cancer. This logic applies as well to our 30 trillion dollar national debt, while half the country is still clamoring for open borders.

We definitely do have a water issue and the company is doing every darn thing to address it. But, whose responsibility is it to address the obvious overdraft due to too many people being crammed into a locale that cannot support the "intrusion" of people, let alone sea water.

I'd certainly like someone in authority to respond to my inquiry. I'm not trying to be difficult, but ever since I was a child, questions like this were always ignored. Now that I'm 81, I'm still running into the same sticky issues that were always responded to with "let's move on".

Looking forward to a reasoned response,

Jerry Rappoport
3551 Vienna Dr.
Aptos, CA

688-1979
Dear Board,

I attended the July 6, 2020 City of Santa Cruz Water Commission meeting and found the information presented during Agenda Item #3 relating to your PureWater Soquel Project interesting.

Here is a link to the meeting notes from the website: https://ecm.cityofsantacruz.com/OnBaseAgendaOnline/Meetings/ViewMeeting?id=1395&doctype=2

Here is a link to the meeting agenda packet with documentation (see pages 16-32 for Item #3): https://ecm.cityofsantacruz.com/OnBaseAgendaOnline/Documents/ViewDocument?meetingId=1395&documentType=AgendaPacket&itemId=0&publishId=0&isSection=false

Below is the pertinent information from the staff report on page 25, and the replies to the questions Commissioners asked. Your Board has not publicly discussed the necessity of the additional nBAF treatment facility for PureWater Soquel Project, due to the increasing levels of nitrite, ammonia and total organic carbon in the influent at the City Wastewater Treatment Facility, and how that will alter the PureWater Soquel Project design.

Please do so, for the sake of transparency to District ratepayers.

Is the District considering a partnership with the City to provide irrigation water from Chanticleer to DeLaveaga Golf Course, or Pasatiempo Golf Course? Doing this with the recycled water, rather than injecting it into the aquifer, would be environmentally beneficial, and exhibit responsible leadership on your part. It could also open the door to better jurisdictional cost sharing of the substantial recycled water treatment project construction and operation costs burdening District ratepayers.

Please discuss this publicly as an agenda item next month.

Sincerely,
Becky Steinbruner

EXCERPT FROM PAGE 25:
The implications for Santa Cruz's use of recycled water include the following:

• Recycled Water Direct from Santa Cruz WWTF: The PWS is planning to construct a separate 300afy tertiary treatment and disinfection system (e.g. granular media filter and ultraviolet (UV) light) at the Santa Cruz WWTF to serve recycled water to La Barranca Park, a truck fill station and for in-plant uses. The Recycled Water Feasibility Study (RWFS) will evaluate the cost-effectiveness of increasing the capacity of this system to serve other non-potable customers directly from the Santa Cruz WWTF.

• Tertiary Water from the PWS Pipeline: The tertiary water in the PWS pipeline would not meet Title 22 disinfected requirements for non-potable reuse because nBAF is not an approved Title 22 tertiary treatment process and the chlorine residual would not meet Title 22 disinfection requirements. The RWFS will evaluate the cost-effectiveness of a turnout along the PWS pipeline to send tertiary water to Pasatiempo, where their existing satellite treatment facilities could be used to produce recycled water for golf course irrigation. No other users are identified along the PWS pipeline because of the need for costly satellite treatment systems, and Pasatiempo currently receives source water from the City of Scotts Valley. This alternative would be practical only with regional partnerships in North Santa Cruz County.

• Recycled Water Direct from Chanticleer Site: The microfiltration system at the PWS’s advanced water treatment plant at the Chanticleer site could be expanded to produce tertiary Title 22 disinfected water for non-potable reuse or purified water for indirect potable reuse. The RWFS is evaluating options to serve nearby customers or recharge the groundwater basin in the Beltz Wellfield.

The District and their consultant team are working to complete a 30% design of treatment facilities by mid-July and a 100% draft Title 22 Engineering Report by August that defines treatment facilities to meet regulatory requirements for non-potable reuse in Santa Cruz and indirect potable reuse in the Mid-County Groundwater Basin. The City and District continue to work closely on all aspects of the PWS project to increase future opportunities for interested parties.

Figure 1 of Attachment 2 includes an updated market assessment of potential irrigation sites, with modified infrastructure to reflect the need to achieve additional pretreatment at the Chanticleer site to meet Title 22 requirements for irrigation. As described above, Phase 1A projects would build on the small Title 22 disinfected system at the WWTF: Phase 1B projects would require a satellite treatment system to meet Title 22 requirements and therefore are only including Pasatiempo and Scotts Valley. Phase 3 would require expansion of the microfiltration system at the Chanticleer site to meet Title 22 disinfected requirements and could then be used for irrigation at DeLaveaga Golf Course, etc.

Based on preliminary estimates, the current cost of potable water for Pasatiempo Golf Course and DeLaveaga Golf Course is greater than the estimated life cycle unit cost for recycled water. Serving recycled water to these golf courses would offset approximately 335 afy of potable water with a local, drought-resistant supply. Depending on the future rates for recycled water, these customers may realize cost savings over time if connected to recycled water. Pasatiempo could utilize its existing satellite facility to store and treat tertiary water from the PWS pipeline. DeLaveaga could be served by a new pipeline from the Chanticleer site, assuming expansion of the PWS MF system with the addition of disinfection (e.g. UV).

In addition to using recycled water for irrigation, the project team is currently evaluating three alternatives that would build on the PWS Program by constructing additional groundwater injection wells with, or without, an ASR project. See Figure 2 in Attachment 2. There may be efficiencies in this type of partnering and, as will be informed by the work of Drs. Raucher and Brown, there may be a point in time when recycled water is more abundant and reliable than surface water. Below are the details of the three alternatives being considered in the MCGB.

Here are the answers to Commissioners’ questions:

3. WSAS Quarterly Work Plan Update

Why was an older climate change scenario GFDL2.1 A2 used for the ASR modeling work for scenarios 8.1 – 8.3?
• The groundwater model covering the mid-county basin is currently set up with two climate models: GFDL2.1 A2, which was the climate model used by the Water Supply Advisory Committee, and the “Climate Catalog”, which was the climate scenario used by the Mid-County Groundwater Sustainability Agency. The first 9 groundwater scenarios run by the City for ASR and In Lieu projects used the former, and scenarios 10 and 11 use the latter. Because of the work the City is currently doing with the UMass/Raucher group (in terms of incorporating a myriad of climate futures into the decision scaling process) no plan has been developed to incorporate newer climate models (e.g., CMIP5) in to the groundwater model.

• What’s the distance between Beltz 8 and the new monitoring wells, and can you tell us more about the high arsenic levels that have been found in recent samples from Beltz 8 and the new monitoring wells? They are approximately 40 feet apart. While the
arsenic levels in Beltz 8 were within the range of historical values and below the maximum contaminant level, the arsenic concentrations in the new monitoring well were unexpectedly high, although they did decrease towards the end of Cycle 2. Cycle 3 was canceled to better understand if elevated levels are a result of leaching or a dissolution reaction occurring in the basin. Pueblo will continue to collect more data, analyze the aquifer mineralogy, and perform geochemical modeling to better understand the origin of the arsenic and implications for further piloting at Beltz 8. Pueblo is expected to submit preliminary findings in August.

The modeling of ASR in the Mid-County Basin showed that half of the scenarios are unfeasible due to water levels rising above the ground surface. How do these results inform our work on identifying and evaluating a Beltz focused ASR moving forward?

- Many of these modeling scenarios were infeasible because the initial injection rate levels for some of the wells were too high. In addition, some of the initial scenarios were also run with the assumption of the Pure Water Soquel project being operational and this may have influenced and increased water levels in the vicinity of some of the City’s wells, reducing available room for additional water to be stored.

On page 24, what is the reason that tertiary water from the City’s Wastewater Treatment Facility (WWTF) would not be treated to Disinfected Tertiary (sometimes referred to as Title 22 unrestricted recycled water) requirements before it would be sent to the Pure Water Soquel Chanticleer site?

- Ongoing source water monitoring of the influent to the City’s WWTF has shown increasing concentrations of nitrite, ammonia and total organic carbon. The original Title 22 unrestricted recycled water treatment processes (i.e., granular media filtration followed by UV) is not capable of removing these constituents without the addition of more treatment components such as ozone. The nBAF system will remove these constituents.

How would water be transferred from the Chanticleer site to the Scotts Valley WRF in Alternative 3.B as stated in the graph on page 32?

- This graphic was taken from the July 2018 Phase 1 Recycled Water Feasibility Study and is not a specific proposal being evaluated at this time.

One member of the public commented.

Commissioner Mekis moved the staff recommendation on Item 3 as amended. Commissioner Schwarm seconded.

VOICE VOTE: MOTION CARRIED
AYES: All
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
From: Becky Steinbruner<br>To: Emma Olin<br>Cc: Board of Directors; Joshua Nelson; Ron Duncan; Neil McCormick<br>Subject: Re: District Response to Email regarding 9-15-2020 Board Packet<br>Date: Thursday, October 1, 2020 11:24:46 PM<br>Attachments: image003.png; image001.png; image002.png

Dear Ms. Olin,

Thank you for your reply. However, I cannot accept the explanation of large redacted sections of the agenda material. There is no reason to redact material that has already been publicly available at Board meetings, other than to prevent the public from referring to the content.

I have reviewed the District’s materials extensively over the past year and have never seen such redaction. It is curious and hardly speaks of transparency to the people.

Sincerely,
Becky Steinbruner

---

On Monday, September 21, 2020, 04:24:43 PM PDT, Emma Olin <emmao@soquelcreekwater.org> wrote:

Ms. Olin,

On behalf of Soquel Creek Water District’s General Manager Ron Duncan, please see the District’s response below:

Thanks for your retraction acknowledging that the District has not and does not have a “practice of secretly altering critical documentation,” and did not secretly censor information presented in the 9/15/2020 board packet.

Please note that the information blacked out in the materials for the December 5, 2017 board packet is not critical ratepayer information – as you state. It is irrelevant material to what the memo was presenting. Thus, the irrelevant text was blacked out for the reader’s benefit. The excerpt presented and the material blacked out are part of a publicly available study supported by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Water Research Foundation and others. The study is titled, “Defining a Resilient Business Model for Water Utilities.”

The District anticipates that these responses quell your concerns and will prevent any potential future false allegations regarding the veracity of the Board of Directors materials.

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 | P |
| Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail. |

---

From: Becky Steinbruner <ki6tkb@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, September 18, 2020 9:48 PM
To: Emma Olin <emmao@soquelcreekwater.org>
Cc: Board of Directors <bodgroup@soquelcreekwater.org>; Joshua Nelson <Joshua.Nelson@bbklaw.com>; Ron Duncan <RonD@soquelcreekwater.org>
Subject: Re: District Response to Email regarding 9-15-2020 Board Packet

Dear Ms. Olin,

I would like to clarify that I did not accuse staff of redacting material from Item 7.3 packet materials. I did inquire on 9/13/2020 about redaction of website materials from the December 5, 2017 agenda, Item 3.2.

That communication was not included in the 9/15/2020 Board Correspondence, so I have copied and pasted it below. The redactions are still there on the website, obscuring information regarding your Board’s consideration of rate increase scenarios: https://www.soquelcreekwater.org/sites/default/files/documents/board-meeting/packets/12-05-17%20Board%20Packet_redacted.pdf

I would appreciate additional information about the redactions from the December 5, 2017 Board agenda packet, and explain why this information was removed in the first place.

Sincerely,
Becky Steinbruner

---

On Monday, September 21, 2020, 04:24:43 PM EDT, Emma Olin <emmao@soquelcreekwater.org> wrote:

Ms. Steinbruner,

On behalf of Soquel Creek Water District’s General Manager Ron Duncan, please see the District’s response below:

Thanks for your retraction acknowledging that the District has not and does not have a “practice of secretly altering critical documentation,” and did not secretly censor information presented in the 9/15/2020 board packet.

Please note that the information blacked out in the materials for the December 5, 2017 board packet is not critical ratepayer information – as you state. It is irrelevant material to what the memo was presenting. Thus, the irrelevant text was blacked out for the reader’s benefit. The excerpt presented and the material blacked out are part of a publicly available study supported by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Water Research Foundation and others. The study is titled, “Defining a Resilient Business Model for Water Utilities.”

The District anticipates that these responses quell your concerns and will prevent any potential future false allegations regarding the veracity of the Board of Directors materials.

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 | P |
| Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail. |

---

Dear Ms. Olin,

Thank you for the response from Mr. Duncan to my communication regarding the curious issues within the 9/15/2020 Board agenda packet.

I would like to clarify that I did not accuse staff of redacting material from Item 7.3 packet materials. I did inquire on 9/13/2020 about redaction of website materials from the December 5, 2017 agenda, Item 3.2.

That communication was not included in the 9/15/2020 Board Correspondence, so I have copied and pasted it below. The redactions are still there on the website, obscuring information regarding your Board’s consideration of rate increase scenarios: https://www.soquelcreekwater.org/sites/default/files/documents/board-meeting/packets/12-05-17%20Board%20Packet_redacted.pdf

This reply fulfills Mr. Duncan’s stated demand for my response by October 1, 2020.

Sincerely,
Becky Steinbruner

---

Becky Steinbruner <ki6tkb@yahoo.com>
To: bod, Emma Olin
Cc: Neil McCormick, Becky Steinbruner

Sun, Sep 13 at 8:21 AM

Dear Soquel Creek Water District Board of Directors.

In reviewing materials on your website, I note large portions of the Raftelis Consultant report regarding initial analysis to support a rate increase, presented to you on December 5, 2017 as Item 3.2 have been redacted. See pages 7 and 9: https://www.soquelcreekwater.org/sites/default/files/documents/board-meeting/packets/12-05-17%20Board%20Packet_redacted.pdf

I have attached screen shots of the redacted pages 7 and 9.

Why has the District removed critical information for the public regarding the calculations and justification for rate increases?

The District is not demonstrating transparent governance by hiding critical information from ratepayers and the general public.

Please restore the redacted portions of the December 5, 2017 Board agenda packet, and explain why this information was removed in the first place.

Please respond.

Sincerely,
Becky Steinbruner

***********

Becky Steinbruner <ki6tkb@yahoo.com>
To: bod, Emma Olin
Cc: Neil McCormick, Becky Steinbruner

Sun, Sep 13 at 8:21 AM

Dear Soquel Creek Water District Board of Directors.

In reviewing materials on your website, I note large portions of the Raftelis Consultant report regarding initial analysis to support a rate increase, presented to you on December 5, 2017 as Item 3.2 have been redacted. See pages 7 and 9: https://www.soquelcreekwater.org/sites/default/files/documents/board-meeting/packets/12-05-17%20Board%20Packet_redacted.pdf

I have attached screen shots of the redacted pages 7 and 9.

Why has the District removed critical information for the public regarding the calculations and justification for rate increases?

The District is not demonstrating transparent governance by hiding critical information from ratepayers and the general public.

Please restore the redacted portions of the December 5, 2017 Board agenda packet, and explain why this information was removed in the first place.

Please respond.

Sincerely,
Becky Steinbruner

***********

Becky Steinbruner <ki6tkb@yahoo.com>
CustomerSelect Model

The second alternative pricing model studied was the CustomerSelect Model. This alternative pricing model offers customers the flexibility to select an amount of use that meets their needs and charges a fixed amount for that allotment for all use under it. If the customer exceeds the allotment in a given month, the utility charges a passover charge. In many ways, the CustomerSelect Model is similar to a budget-based rate structure, but rather than establishing the budget parameters for customers, it gives customers autonomy to choose their own budget. Potential benefits of this model include increased revenue stability because customers commit to plans. In addition, by giving customers the choice, the utility does not have the administrative burden of assigning customers to budgets, as they would with a budget-based rate structure. It promotes water usage efficiency and reduces administrative costs for both the customer and the utility.
On Friday, September 18, 2020, 04:32:18 PM PDT, Emma Olin <emmao@soquelcreekwater.org> wrote:

Ms. Steinbruner,

Please see the attached response to your email dated 9-16-20.

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.
September 18, 2020

Ms. Becky Steinbruner
3441 Redwood Drive
Aptos, CA 95003
Email: ki6tkb@yahoo.com

SUBJECT: Clarification to Email dated September 16, 2020

Dear Ms. Steinbruner,

The District is in receipt of your email to the Board of Directors dated September 16, 2020. Please see the District’s responses below.

**District Website**
The District regularly updates its website to include information that is up-to-date and easily understandable and navigable. Maintaining our website is crucial for understanding and transparency.

Your claim that redactions were made to the website is false, as set forth below.

**Board Packet Distribution**
Pursuant to Brown Act requirements, electronic copies of the agendas and agenda packets (board packets) are provided by direct link access on the District’s website: [https://www.soquelcreekwater.org/who-we-are/board-meetings-standing-committees](https://www.soquelcreekwater.org/who-we-are/board-meetings-standing-committees). They are available to the public at least 72 hours prior to regular meetings and at least 24 hours prior to special meeting; and can be downloaded at no cost. Archived board packets are also available on the District’s website.

The District makes at least one printed copy of the board packet available for review by all public members at the information table near the entrance of the Capitola City Council Chambers during Board Meetings at no cost. In an effort to protect public health and in compliance with applicable health orders, this practice has been paused since April 2020 due to COVID-19 (Board Meetings are held virtually at this time).

Additionally, the District offers a “library approach,” which allows members of the public to “check out” the District’s printed hard-copy of the board packet for up to three (3) hours. While this is not required by the Brown Act, transparency is a core value of the District and paper copies assist those that may not have electronic access to materials. Again, in an effort to protect public health and in compliance with applicable health orders, this service has been paused since April 2020 due to COVID-19.

**9/15/2020 Board Packet – Item 7.3 Attachment 3**
Your claim that the District redacted or otherwise modified Item 7.3 Attachment 3 (Preliminary Official Statement) of the 9/15/2020 Board Packet is false. Staff published the 9/15/2020 Board Packet on Friday, September 11, 2020 at 3:52 pm, and no changes have been made since that time.

You erroneously cite the incorrect page numbers for the statements in your email that you highlighted in yellow. You claim that the excerpts are from Pages 185-187 of the Board Packet; however, that is incorrect.
Clarification to Email dated September 16, 2020

The excerpts in yellow and associated text are from Pages 199-200 of the 9/15/2020 Board Packet. Please review the entire document for clarification.

Accordingly, your language accusing the District of having a “practice of secretly altering critical documents” is false, and is a calumny of the District. Similarly, your allegation that “critical information [was] removed, and other wording substituted” is false.

The District and its staff take pride in providing full, complete, and accurate information to its Board of Directors and the public. You made some very serious allegations that were completely baseless. As such, we request that you provide a written retraction to our Board of Directors and others that may have received your initial email after you have reviewed the Board Packet pages identified above. We assume that you share the District’s goal of ensuring that any written record is accurate and truthful, so we would appreciate receiving that retraction no later than October 1, 2020. Please note that if a timely retraction is not received, the District reserves all rights it may have.

Sincerely,
SOQUEL CREEK WATER DISTRICT

Ron Duncan
General Manager

Cc: Joshua Nelson, General Counsel
Dear Board of Directors,

I participated in your remote September 15, 2020 Board meeting last night. I publicly testified during Item 7.4 regarding the importance of the District supplying a hard copy of the Board meeting packets because I have noted that the District redacts information available on the website that is critical for ratepayer understanding and transparent governance. I have written you recently about this issue.

Your Board did not respond to my comment and request that the District make hard copies of the Board meeting packets available at the public library, and create a compendium of the documents. No one has responded to my written correspondence regarding the redaction of public information about recent rate increases on the website.

Last night, after your Board meeting, I continued to review the lengthy documentation Item 7.3 bond refinancing. I wanted to try to find the answers to the questions I asked your Board during my public testimony during the meeting, but for which no response was given.

I copied some of the text of the document that described PureWater Soquel Project to send to a friend who is also interested in the Project. This morning, when I returned to the website agenda packet information to verify an issue, I found that the information on the pages had been altered. I was shocked to see critical information removed, and other wording substituted.

There had been no public discussion about the changed language during your Board's discussion of Item 7.3.

This clearly supports the need for your Board to require that staff provide a hard copy to the public in advance of your meetings. The practice of secretly altering critical documentation that is available on your website is less than transparent and fosters mistrust by your customers.

I have provided the original text of pages 186 and 187 that I copied and pasted from your website in an e-mail after last night's meeting. Following that is the current text from the altered document on pages 186 and 187. Please note that the language I highlighted in yellow last night has been completely removed this morning on your website.

Please respond. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Becky Steinbruner

*****

TEXT COPIED AND PASTED FROM ITEM 7.3 PAGES 185 through 187 ON SEPTEMBER 15, 2020:

Sources of Water Supply
The District obtains 100% of its water supply by pumping water from its 15 active production wells from two groundwater aquifers, the Purisima Aquifer and the Aromas Red Sands Aquifer. The Purisima Aquifer provides approximately 2/3 of the District’s water supply for the northwestern part of its service area, which includes Capitola, Soquel, and Aptos. The Aromas Red Sands Aquifer provides the remaining 1/3 of the District’s annual production for the southeastern region of its service area, which includes the communities of Seascape, Rio Del Mar, and La Selva Beach.

After treatment, water pumped from the District’s groundwater wells meets all current State and Federal safe drinking water standards, with the exception of the District’s County Club Well which does not meet
the State’s current standard for maximum contaminant levels (“MCLs”) for 1,2,3-Trichloropropane (“TCP”). The State established a new MCL for TCP levels in 2017, which the water from the Country Club Well did not meet. Accordingly, in 2017, the Country Club Well was taken offline and the District is undertaking to construct a treatment plant at the Country Club Well to enable the well to be placed safely back in service.

While the District is the primary user of the Purisma Aquifer and Aromas Red Sands Aquifer, they are also shared with other pumpers, including the City of Santa Cruz, Central Water District, City of Watsonville, Pajaro Valley Water Management Agency, a few small water mutuals, and private well owners. Over the decades, more water has been extracted from this shared groundwater basin than has been naturally replenished by rainfall, causing a state of critical overdraft that leaves the basin vulnerable to seawater intrusion along the coastline. Seawater intrusion has been detected in coastal monitoring wells in Aptos, Seascape, La Selva Beach, and Pleasure Point. If the overdrafting of the basin continues and seawater is allowed to move further inland, it will contaminate production wells and destroy what is currently the District’s only source of water supply. For this reason, the District has embarked on the “Pure Water Soquel” project described below.

Water Supply Issues;
Pure Water Soquel
The District is entirely dependent on local groundwater for its water supply. Beginning in the early 1980’s, the District assumed responsibility for groundwater management within its service area in addition to its role as a water purveyor and installed a series of coastal monitoring wells. The District’s monitoring well program was initiated and includes monthly data collection and hydrogeological analysis to aid in early warning and detection of conditions conducive to seawater intrusion, which is the biggest threat to its water supply.

In response to the issues with seawater intrusion and the requirements imposed by SGMA discussed above, the District has embarked on the Pure Water Soquel project. Pure Water Soquel is intended to help increase the sustainability of the District’s groundwater supply, reduce the degree of overdraft conditions in the Mid-County Groundwater Basin, protect against, and aid in preventing further, seawater intrusion into the basin, and promote beneficial reuse of water resources by reducing discharge of treated wastewater to the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary by 25%.

No assurance can be given the project will solve the problems the District is facing in its groundwater basin. **The District’s current estimate of the overall cost of the Pure Water Soquel project is $90 to $142 million, net of contingencies, and it anticipates completion in 2022.** To date, the District has been secured over $2 million dollars in grants for planning efforts, a $50 million from a Prop. 1 grant from the State, a $36 million State Seawater Intrusion Control low-interest loan from the State, and is negotiating a $78 million low-interest loan from the federal government’s WIFIA program. The District is still waiting to hear on whether it has been awarded a U.S. Bureau of Reclamation Title XVI Program grant for which it applied in an amount of up to $20 million. No assurance can be given that the Pure Water Soquel project will be completed by the projected 2022 completion date or in accordance with the currently anticipated budget.
reduce the degree of overdraft conditions in the Mid-County Groundwater Basin, protect against, and aid in preventing further, seawater intrusion into the basin, and promote beneficial reuse of water resources by reducing discharge of treated wastewater to the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary by 25%. The project includes facilities in portions of the cities of Santa Cruz and Capitola, and in the Live Oak, Soquel, and Aptos communities of unincorporated Santa Cruz County. The treatment process is planned to be split: tertiary treatment of wastewater collected and treated by the City of Santa Cruz at its Wastewater Treatment Facility and advanced water purification at a specialized facility to be built by the District nearby. In addition, the District will construct three seawater intrusion prevention wells at Monterey Avenue, Willowbrook Lane, and Cabrillo College Drive.

The District’s current estimate of the overall cost of the project is $90 to $142 million, net of contingencies, and it has been actively pursuing grants and low-cost borrowing options. To date, the District has been secured over $2 million dollars in grants for planning efforts, a $50 million from a Prop. 1 grant from the State, a $36 million State Seawater Intrusion Control low interest loan from the State, and is negotiating a $78 million low-interest loan from the federal government’s WIFIA program. The District is still waiting to hear on whether it has been awarded a U.S. Bureau of Reclamation Title XVI Program grant for which it applied in an amount of up to $20 million. For additional information on some of the improvements being undertaken by the District as part of Pure Water Soquel, see “–Capital Improvement Plan.” For additional information on some of the anticipated financing sources for Pure Water Soquel, see “– Long-Term Obligations.”

Sources of Water Supply
The District obtains 100% of its water supply by pumping water from its 15 active production wells from two groundwater aquifers, the Purisima Aquifer and the Aromas Red Sands Aquifer. The Purisima Aquifer provides approximately 2/3 of the District’s water supply for the northwestern part of its service area, which includes Capitola, Soquel, and Aptos. The Aromas Red Sands Aquifer provides the remaining 1/3 of the District’s annual production for the southeastern region of its service area, which includes the communities of Seascape, Rio Del Mar, and La Selva Beach.

After treatment, water pumped from the District’s groundwater wells meets all current State and Federal safe drinking water standards, with the exception of the District’s County Club Well which does not meet the State’s current standard for maximum contaminant levels (“MCLs”) for 1,2,3-Trichloropropane (“TCP”). The State established a new MCL for TCP levels in 2017, which the water from the Country Club Well did not meet. Accordingly, in 2017, the Country Club Well was taken offline and the District is undertaking to construct a treatment plant at the Country Club Well to enable the well to be placed safely back in service.

While the District is the primary user of the Purisima Aquifer and Aromas Red Sands Aquifer, they are also shared with other pumpers, including the City of Santa Cruz, Central Water District, City of Watsonville, Pajaro Valley Water Management Agency, a few small water mutuals, and private well owners. Over the decades, more water has been extracted from this shared groundwater basin than has been naturally replenished by rainfall, causing a state of critical overdraft that leaves the basin vulnerable to seawater intrusion along the coastline. Seawater intrusion has been detected in coastal monitoring wells in Aptos, Seascape, La Selva Beach, and Pleasure Point. If the overdrafting of the basin continues and seawater is allowed to move further inland, it will contaminate production wells and destroy what is currently the District’s only source of water supply. For this reason, the District has embarked on the “Pure Water Soquel” project described below.

Water Supply Issues;
Pure Water Soquel Project
Background. The District is entirely dependent on local groundwater for its water supply. Beginning in the early 1980’s, the District assumed responsibility for groundwater management within its service area in
addition to its role as a water purveyor and installed a series of coastal monitoring wells. The District’s monitoring well program was initiated and includes monthly data collection and hydrogeological analysis to aid in early warning and detection of conditions conducive to seawater intrusion, which is the biggest threat to its water supply.

In the mid-1990s, groundwater levels began declining and were not recovering to above sea level as necessary to maintain a barrier against seawater intrusion. In response to this change in groundwater conditions, the District developed an Integrated Resources Plan ("IRP") to define the water supply shortage and actions for addressing it, including diversifying the water supply portfolio. The District simultaneously implemented an aggressive conservation program with the goal to minimize demand and avoid further exacerbating groundwater conditions as the result of growth in the District’s service area.

In 2003, the District adopted a Water Demand Offset policy to avoid a moratorium on development in the District and to extend existing groundwater sources until a supplemental water supply could be developed. This policy requires applicants for new water service to offset 120 percent of the amount of water the new development is projected to use so that there is a “zero impact” on the District’s water supply.

In March 2006, the draft IRP was revised and adopted to reflect updated information that included revisions to the demand projections and conservation savings, and the results of evaluating previously identified and new supplemental supply options. The adopted IRP adopted in 2006 included a multi-faceted plan with the following components:

• Demand management: Continue and increase conservation efforts and evaluate site specific recycled water for irrigation use;

• Groundwater management: Limit groundwater pumping to no more than 4,800 acre-feet per year ("AFY") and continue monitoring of coastal groundwater levels and water quality, redistribute groundwater pumping inland, support groundwater recharge protection and enhancement projects and policies;

• Conjunctive Use Supply Project: Develop a regional seawater desalination facility with the City of Santa Cruz; and

• Local Supplemental Supply Alternatives: Further evaluate the feasibility of a modified Soquel Creek diversion project or a local-only desalination facility.

In September 2012, the District incorporated up-to-date information and new developments since 2006 and approved an update to the IRP, which included updates to all four elements of the 2006 IRP.

In 2013, the IRP evolved to be renamed the “Community Water Plan.” The Community Water Plan serves as the District’s roadmap to protect the endangered groundwater resources, ensure water supply reliability and resiliency to its customers, and prepare for climate change and other future challenges. The Community Water Plan promotes water conservation and water neutral development, and evaluates new potential water supply options, with the ultimate goal of achieving State-mandated basin sustainability by 2040.

Pure Water Soquel.
In response to the issues with seawater intrusion and the requirements imposed by SGMA discussed above, the District has embarked on the Pure Water Soquel Advanced Purified Groundwater Replenishment Project (“Pure Water Soquel”). Pure Water Soquel will use advanced water purification methods to purify recycled water for replenishing the Mid-County Groundwater Basin to increase protective water levels and prevent seawater intrusion from moving further inland. The project is currently in its 5th year of development, with the certification of the environmental impact report and initial project approvals having been obtained in 2018 and a preliminary design initiated in 2019. The District’s goal is to complete the Pure Water Soquel Project by 2022.
Pure Water Soquel is intended to help increase the sustainability of the District’s groundwater supply, reduce the degree of overdraft conditions in the Mid-County Groundwater Basin, protect against, and aid in preventing further, seawater intrusion into the basin, and promote beneficial reuse of water resources by reducing discharge of treated wastewater to the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary by 25%.

The project includes facilities in portions of the cities of Santa Cruz and Capitola, and in the Live Oak, Soquel, and Aptos communities of unincorporated Santa Cruz County. The treatment process is planned to be split: tertiary treatment of wastewater collected and treated by the City of Santa Cruz at its Wastewater Treatment Facility and advanced water purification at a specialized facility to be built by the District nearby. In addition, the District will construct three seawater intrusion prevention wells at Monterey Avenue, Willowbrook Lane, and Cabrillo College Drive.

The District’s current estimate of the overall cost of the project is $90 to $142 million, net of contingencies, and it has been actively pursuing grants and low-cost borrowing options. To date, the District has been secured over $2 million dollars in grants for planning efforts, a $50 million from a Prop. 1 grant from the State, a $36 million State Seawater Intrusion Control low-interest loan from the State, and is negotiating a $78 million low-interest loan from the federal government’s WIFIA program. The District is still waiting to hear on whether it has been awarded a U.S. Bureau of Reclamation Title XVI Program grant for which it applied in an amount of up to $20 million.