



Marina Coast Water District

Regular Board Meeting/Groundwater Sustainability Agency Board Meeting
February 20, 2018

Draft Minutes

1. Call to Order:

President Moore called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. on February 20, 2018 at the Marina Council Chambers, 211 Hillcrest Avenue, Marina, California.

2. Roll Call:

Board Members Present:

Thomas P. Moore – President
Jan Shriner – Vice President
Bill Lee
Howard Gustafson
Herbert Cortez

Board Members Absent:

None

Staff Members Present:

Keith Van Der Maaten, General Manager
Roger Masuda, Legal Counsel
Kelly Cadiente, Director of Administrative Services
Mike Wegley, District Engineer
Brian True, Capital Projects Manager
Jean Premutati, Human Resources/Customer Relations Manager
Derek Cray, Operations and Maintenance Superintendent
Paula Riso, Executive Assistant/Clerk to the Board

Audience Members:

Andrew Sterbenz, Schaaf & Wheeler
Philip Clark, Seaside Resident
Denise Duffy, Denise Duffy & Associates
Therese Kollerer, Citizens for Just Water
Molly Erickson, Stamp/Erickson Law Offices

3. Public Comment on Closed Session Items:

No comments.

The Board entered into closed session at 6:32 p.m. to discuss the following items:

4. Closed Session:

A. Pursuant to Government Code 54956.9

Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation

- 1) Ag Land Trust v. Marina Coast Water District, Monterey County Superior Court Case No. M105019; Sixth Appellate District Court of Appeals Case Nos. H038550 and H039559
- 2) In the Matter of the Application of California-American Water Company (U210W) for Approval of the Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project and Authorization to Recover All Present and Future Costs in Rates, California Public Utilities Commission No. A.12-04-019 & A.13-05-017 Settlement Agreement
- 3) Marina Coast Water District v. California Public Utilities Commission, California Supreme Court Case No. S230728, Writ of Review
- 4) California-American Water Company vs Marina Coast Water District; Monterey County Water Resources Agency; and Does 1 through 10, San Francisco Superior Court Case No. CGC-13-528312 (Complaint for Declaratory Relief); First Appellate District Court of Appeals Case No. A145604, A146166, A146405
- 5) Marina Coast Water District vs. California-American Water Company, Monterey County Water Resources Agency; and, California-American Water Company, Monterey County Water Resources Agency vs Marina Coast Water District, San Francisco Superior Court Case Nos. CGC-15-547125, CGC-15-546632 (Complaint for Breach of Warranties, etc.)
- 6) Marina Coast Water District v. California State Lands Commission (California-American Water Company, Real Party in Interest), Santa Cruz County Superior Court Case No. CV180895 (Petition for Writ of Mandate)
- 7) Marina Coast Water District v. California Coastal Commission (California-American Water Company, Real Party in Interest), Santa Cruz County Superior Court Case No. 15CV00267

- B. Pursuant to Government Code 54956.8
Conference with Real Property Negotiator
Property: Sewer Infrastructure
Negotiating Parties: Howard Gustafson, Thomas Moore
Under Negotiation: Price and Terms
- C. Pursuant to Government Code 54956.9 (d)(2)
Conference with Legal Counsel – Anticipated Litigation
Significant exposure to Litigation – One Potential Case

The Board ended closed session at 6:58 p.m.

President Moore reconvened the meeting to open session at 7:00 p.m.

5. Reportable Actions Taken during Closed Session:

Mr. Roger Masuda, Legal Counsel, stated that there were no reportable actions taken during Closed Session.

6. Pledge of Allegiance:

Director Lee led everyone present in the pledge of allegiance.

7. Oral Communications:

Ms. Molly Erickson, Stamp/Erickson Law Office, stated that she was there on behalf of Keep Fort Ord Wild. She said that she was here to talk about an item not on the agenda, and that item would be approval of the annexation. Ms. Erickson said other things were on the agenda related to the annexation, but not the annexation. She handed over a letter and CD for the Board claiming that action on the annexation item would be a Brown Act violation.

8. Presentation:

- A. Consider Adoption of Resolution No. 2018-08 in Recognition of Paula Riso, Executive Assistant/Clerk to the Board, and Awarding a Plaque and Gift Certificate for 20 Years of Service to the Marina Coast Water District:

Director Gustafson made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 2018-08 recognizing and appreciating Paula Riso for 20 years of service to the Marina Coast Water District and awarding a plaque and gift certificate. Vice President Shriner seconded the motion. The motion was passed.

Director Gustafson	-	Yes	Vice President Shriner	-	Yes
Director Lee	-	Yes	President Moore	-	Yes
Director Cortez	-	Yes			

9. Consent Calendar:

Director Gustafson made a motion to approve the Consent Calendar consisting of: A) Receive and File the Check Register for the Month of January 2018; B) Receive the Quarterly Financials for October 1, 2017 to December 31, 2017; and, C) Approve the Draft Minutes of the Joint Board/GSA Meeting of January 22, 2018. Director Lee seconded the motion. The motion was passed.

Director Gustafson	-	Yes	Vice President Shriner	-	Yes
Director Lee	-	Yes	President Moore	-	Yes
Director Cortez	-	Yes			

10. Action Items:

- A. Consider Adoption of Resolution No. 2018-09 to Adopt the Public Draft Initial Study/Negative Declaration for the Ord Community Sphere of Influence Amendment and Annexation; Find that the Ord Community Sphere of Influence Amendment and Annexation is not subject to CEQA and is exempt from CEQA under CEQA Guidelines sections 15301 (Existing Facilities), 15319 (Annexations of Existing Facilities and Lots for Exempt Facilities), and 15061, subd. (b)(3) (the “common sense” exemption); and Direct Staff to File an Application with the Local Agency Formation Commission:

Mr. Michael Wegley, District Engineer, introduced this item. He explained that the action tonight would be to adopt the Final Initial Study/Negative Declaration for the Ord Community Sphere of Influence Amendment and Annexation. He noted that this action does not approve any new developments and it doesn't require construction of new infrastructure. Mr. Wegley stated that it only moves the boundaries to include areas where the District already serves and development has already been approved. He added that with or without annexation, the District is still required to provide sewer and water to the Ord Community. Mr. Wegley gave a brief presentation showing what this item entailed.

Vice President Shriner asked if the agenda item correctly describes the action being requested, or is it not agendized correctly as per Ms. Erickson's claim. Mr. Masuda stated that not only did his office review this item, but the District's CEQA attorney, Chip Wilkins with Remy, Moose and Manley, also reviewed this item and believed it to be correct.

Director Gustafson commented that if the District didn't take over the annexation of the Ord Community, Cal Am would. He also said that there would be no change in the water use if the District annexed. Director Gustafson also said that there would be no ability to develop or make land use decisions, thus the District does not have the ability to pump more water unless the County, a City or FORA says so.

Ms. Therese Kollerer, East Garrison resident, voiced approval from East Garrison for the annexation.

President Moore noted that they would return to this item later in the meeting to allow staff to review the information provided by Ms. Erickson.

B. Consider Adoption of Resolution No. 2018-10 to Amend a Professional Services Agreement with Denise Duffy & Associates for Annexation of the Ord Community into the Marina Coast Water District:

Mr. Brian True, Capital Projects Manager, introduced this item. President Moore clarified that Denise Duffy & Associates was required to do some additional work to address the comments received on the annexation.

Director Gustafson made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 2018-10 to amend a Professional Services Agreement with Denise Duffy & Associates for Annexation of the Ord Community into the Marina Coast Water District. Director Lee seconded the motion. The motion was passed.

Director Gustafson	-	Yes	Vice President Shriner	-	Yes
Director Lee	-	Yes	President Moore	-	Yes
Director Cortez	-	Yes			

C. Receive the Marina Coast Water District FY 2017-2018 Mid-Year Report:

Ms. Kelly Cadiente, Director of Administrative Services, introduced this item noting that although the accounts look pretty healthy right now, there is a debt service payment that is due soon. She stated that although all four of the cost centers may not have sufficient reserves, in total, the District does meet the requirements. Vice President Shriner inquired if the debt service payment was a specific amount. Ms. Cadiente answered that it was. President Moore asked for clarification on the debt service and how the State Revolving Fund would reimburse the District.

Director Gustafson made a motion to receive the FY 2017-2018 Mid-Year Report. Vice President Shriner seconded the motion. The motion was passed.

Director Gustafson	-	Yes	Vice President Shriner	-	Yes
Director Lee	-	Yes	President Moore	-	Yes
Director Cortez	-	Yes			

D. Consider Providing Direction to the Board President Regarding Voting for Election of One Regular Special District Representative to LAFCO:

President Moore introduced this item.

Director Gustafson made a motion to vote for Director Cortez as the Regular Special District Representative to LAFCO. Director Lee seconded the motion. The motion was passed.

Director Gustafson	-	Yes	Vice President Shriner	-	Yes
Director Lee	-	Yes	President Moore	-	Yes
Director Cortez	-	Yes			

11. Staff Reports:

A. Receive the 4th Quarter 2017 MCWD Water Consumption and Sewer Flow Reports:

Ms. Cadiante introduced this item. Vice President Shriner inquired on the increase in usage for the Bay View and CSUMB. President Moore inquired on the increased usage for Fitch Park. He also suggested staff give thought to a policy for jurisdictions on how to notify them when they get close to their limit of water use. Director Lee asked if the sewer flows could be measured in acre feet like the water consumption to make it easier to follow.

B. Receive the Developer Account Update Through December 31, 2017:

Mr. True introduced this item. President Moore asked about the Charter School and Mr. True answered that he was pretty sure they would be catching up real soon.

12. Informational Items:

A. General Manager's Report:

Mr. Van Der Maaten commented on the RUWAP Groundbreaking, how it attracted lots of media attention, and that it showed the District is involved in many wonderful things.

B. Counsel's Report:

No report.

C. Committee and Board Liaison Reports:

1. Water Conservation Commission:

Vice President Shriner gave a brief update.

2. Joint City District Committee:

President Moore stated the next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, February 28th.

3. Executive Committee:

Vice President Shriner gave a brief update.

4. Community Outreach Committee:

Director Gustafson gave a brief update.

5. Budget and Personnel Committee:

Director Gustafson gave a brief update.

6. M1W Board Member:

President Moore said the next meeting was February 26th.

7. LAFCO Liaison:

Director Cortez said the next meeting was February 26th.

8. FORA:

Vice President Shriener gave a brief update.

9. WWOC:

Mr. Van Der Maaten said the next meeting is February 28th.

10. JPIA Liaison:

No report.

11. Special Districts Association Liaison:

The next meeting is April 17th.

12. SVGSA Liaison:

No report.

13. Board Member Requests for Future Agenda Items:

President Moore noted that any requests could be emailed to staff.

President Moore returned to Item 10-A.

- A. Consider Adoption of Resolution No. 2018-09 to Adopt the Public Draft Initial Study/Negative Declaration for the Ord Community Sphere of Influence Amendment and Annexation; Find that the Ord Community Sphere of Influence Amendment and Annexation is not subject to CEQA and is exempt from CEQA under CEQA Guidelines sections 15301 (Existing Facilities), 15319 (Annexations of Existing Facilities and Lots for Exempt Facilities), and 15061, subd. (b)(3) (the “common sense” exemption); and Direct Staff to File an Application with the Local Agency Formation Commission:

Agenda Item 10-A (continued):

Mr. Wegley stated that staff met and reviewed the information submitted by Ms. Erickson and that Ms. Denise Duffy, Denise Duffy & Associates, would address the letter submitted by Keep Fort Ord Wild (KFOW).

Ms. Duffy stated that the comments were similar to previous comments and responses already provided in the Final Initial Study/Negative Declaration (IS/ND) to the LandWatch letter. She said that additional responses to a February 19th LandWatch comment letter have been provided in a letter on the dais, and the responses in that letter will answer the KFOW questions. Ms. Duffy stated that the KFOW and LandWatch comments were not understanding of the project description. She said that the water and wastewater services are as they are today and will be provided to all the jurisdictions within the former Fort Ord are under the existing agreements regardless of a boundary adjustment that LAFCO approves or not. Ms. Duffy stated that the project does not result in any physical impact in the environment. She stated that KFOW and LandWatch both attempt to put the project in a category as if it was a development project and removing an obstacle to growth.

Ms. Duffy said that LandWatch states in their letter that under the project description it is unclear what the proposal is versus the alternative. She answered that it is called a "Project Refinement" and it is found under the IS/ND Appendix D Section. Ms. Duffy stated that, since 2011, the District has been through a number of iterations of the project and it is all explained in the Appendix D Section. As to the Cumulative Projects, Ms. Duffy said there are two approaches under CEQA: the List of Projects approach; and, the General Plan approach. In the IS/ND, there are tables 2 and 3 that discuss the different projects that are ongoing and currently there, as well as each General Plan and Master Plan that have been approved by FORA. Ms. Duffy said that the KFOW letter said that the areas that are not going to be served would be growth inducing and these areas do not have service or service capacity. She answered that there are certain areas within the annexation area, and certain areas without, and they are in the future study area for a reason. These are all areas that are planned for services at one time or another, by MCWD, as considered in all the different FORA Reuse Plans, all the EIR's, all the different WSA's, and everything that is referenced in the IS/ND.

Ms. Duffy said that the letter states additional water demand is not being addressed. The IS/ND is very clear that the project does not cause additional demand and the IS/ND discusses the Urban Water Management Plan which talks about all the areas that will be served, capacity, service, conservation, plans for drought, and sea water intrusion. Ms. Duffy added that the letter also states there are no foreseeable groundwater supplies that would add to the existing supplies from which MCWD pumps now and any non-groundwater supplies are highly speculative at best. Ms. Duffy reminded everyone, that MCWD held a groundbreaking ceremony earlier that day for their recycled water project, so obviously, non-groundwater supplies are not speculative and everyone has been working diligently on water supply projects.

Agenda Item 10-A (continued):

Director Gustafson stated that there is no change in water use and the District has no ability to make water use decisions for developments. Those decisions are made by FORA and the land use jurisdictions that the District serves.

President Moore noted that the word “project” might be understood by some that the District is building something and asked for an explanation why the word “project” is being used. Ms. Duffy answered that the term “project” under CEQA does not necessarily mean a built structure or built facility and the IS/ND specifically states that there are no structures being built. Ms. Duffy stated that CEQA has a specific definition for “project.” She said that this “project” is an application for annexation and boundary adjustment from another agency. President Moore added that this needs to be done before the dissolution of FORA since the District serves that area under contract. Mr. Masuda stated that because the District already owns the infrastructure and water rights to serve, they do not need a new contract to supersede the FORA contract. Discussion followed.

Director Cortez asked if there was a monetary cost to the District going above and beyond in putting together this annexation. Ms. Duffy answered that anytime staff, consultants and legal counsel have to get together to respond to questions and comments, there will be a cost. Director Cortez stated that the District is trying to be as transparent as possible, and keeping customers up to date with the information does have a monetary cost. He added that the District respects everyone’s opinion, even when they have to respectfully disagree.

Mr. Wegley clarified that although LandWatch sent a letter on February 19th, and KFOW submitted a letter tonight, the District has reviewed and considered these late comments. He noted that the majority of comments have already been addressed in responses to previous comments. Mr. Wegley stated that the new comments do not raise any issues or affect the analysis the conclusions in the IS/ND. He thanked Ms. Duffy and her team for going the extra mile to make a pretty strong document.

For the record, Mr. Wegley submitted a letter to the Board as to respond to LandWatch’s February 19th letter:

On February 19, LandWatch submitted an additional comment letter on the proposed Ord Community Sphere of Influence Amendment and Annexation Project (Project) and the associated Initial Study/Negative Declaration (IS/ND), along with a thumb drive that purportedly contains 37 additional documents. MCWD could not access the files on the thumb drive provided by LandWatch because the drive was defective, but it is generally familiar with the referenced documents based on the listing included in the comment letter.

Agenda Item 10-A (continued):

MCWD has reviewed and considered LandWatch's comments. The comments do not raise any issues that were not already addressed in the IS/ND or in responses to previous comments and do not raise any issues that affect the analysis and conclusions in the IS/ND. Nevertheless, the following responses are provided for clarification.

- LandWatch claims that the IS/ND does not provide adequate environmental analysis of increased pumping to support future Ord community development and that increased pumping caused by the annexation will result in a considerable contribution to cumulatively significant groundwater impacts. All of LandWatch's comments, as well as the comments from its purported expert, are based on the inaccurate assumption that the Project will result in increased groundwater pumping. As explained in the IS/ND, the Project will not result in any changes to groundwater pumping, and therefore, the Project would not cause any change in the physical environment directly, indirectly, or cumulatively. MCWD currently serves all of the areas that are proposed for annexation and would continue to do so with or without the annexation using its existing infrastructure. Moreover, the annexation only includes parcels that are developed or have received entitlements for development, which have all received CEQA clearance from the relevant land-use jurisdictions that approved the development/ entitlements. Because these are already developed or have been approved for development, it is not reasonable foreseeable that groundwater demand will increase for these areas as a result of the Project. In sum, the annexation would have no impact on groundwater in these areas because it would not directly or indirectly cause any increase in pumping. Thus, the IS/ND properly concludes that the Project would not cause any change in groundwater pumping compared to existing conditions. LandWatch's comments ignore this critical fact. As LandWatch's comments, including those of its purported expert, are based on erroneous assumption that the project will result in increased pumping of groundwater, they do not present any evidence that supports a fair argument that the Project may have significant environmental effects.

Under CEQA, a project's contribution to a significant cumulative impact may be considered significant if it is cumulatively considerable. But where, as here, the project itself would have zero impact, it would not contribute to a cumulative significant impact. (See CEQA Guidelines, § 15130.) Thus, the IS/ND properly concludes that the Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a cumulatively significant impact.

- LandWatch claims that MCWD must analyze groundwater impacts that may occur after FORA is dissolved. The IS/ND thoroughly explains the governance structure for the Ord community, including water service, and acknowledges that FORA may dissolve when the FORA Act sunsets in 2020. MCWD is contractually obligated to serve the areas included in the annexation and it is expected that MCWD will

Agenda Item 10-A (continued):

continue to serve those areas even if FORA is dissolved in 2020. In any event, the fate of FORA is irrelevant for purposes of the analysis. Regardless of whether FORA dissolves in 2020, the Project will not cause or allow any increase in groundwater pumping, and therefore, the Project would not cause any change in the physical environment.

LandWatch speculates that the governance structure would change after FORA is dissolved in 2020 and that MCWD would have authority to establish rules and regulations for water distribution. LandWatch ignores the fact the Project will not change the future governance structure. (See *Simi Valley Recreation & Park Dist. v. Local Agency Formation Com.* (1975) 51 Cal.App.3d 648, 666 [LAFCO approval was not a project under CEQA where the property was within the zoning jurisdiction of the another agency and the land use therein permitted by the county was unchanged].) As explained in the IS/ND, the proposed annexation would not cause or lead to any changes in groundwater pumping that would not otherwise occur, with or without the annexation. Prior to approving any development, any public agencies with discretionary approval authority are required to comply with CEQA, including identifying any future project's water-supply needs and sources, and adopt feasible mitigation measures or alternatives to mitigate or avoid any environmental impacts, including impacts to groundwater resources. Although not anticipated at this time, and not a result of the annexation, any future development that may necessitate increased groundwater pumping would be required to comply with CEQA, as well as any applicable groundwater laws and regulations. For purposes of CEQA, MCWD would likely serve as a "responsible agency" for such future projects, if any. But again, any proposed future development, could occur with or without the annexation.

- LandWatch incorrectly claims that the project description is unclear due to "last minute revisions." The IS/ND clearly describes the project, including the areas that are included in the proposal. The Final IS/ND clearly identifies the parcels that have been removed from the proposal based on the proposed revisions to the project. Further, contrary to LandWatch's argument, the project refinement was not developed to mitigate any potentially significant effects. As explained in the IS/ND, both the original proposal and the refinement would not cause or lead to any physical change in the environment. Notably, the minor project revisions were developed in response to requests from LandWatch that the annexation area be reduced.

Agenda Item 10-A (continued):

- LandWatch inaccurately claims that the IS/ND “disavows any actual reliance” on the previous environmental documents cited in the IS/ND. As explained in the IS/ND, the previously-certified environmental documents provide background information and information about the environmental setting and are incorporated by reference. The IS/ND, however, reaches its own conclusion that the proposed annexation would not result in any physical change in the environment.
- The IS/ND explains why the Project is not subject to CEQA and also qualifies for three exemptions: (1) the “Class 19” exemption for “Annexations of Existing Facilities and Lots for Exempt Facilities”; (2) the “Class 1” exemption for Existing Facilities; and (3) the “common sense” exemption. LandWatch wrongly claims that the Project does not qualify for these exemptions and that, even if it did, MCWD is precluded from relying on an exemption due to the “cumulative impacts” and “unusual circumstances” exceptions. None of the exceptions cited by LandWatch apply.

First, the “unusual circumstances” exception does not apply because the Project is not unusual compared to other projects in the exempt classes. The fact that the current governance structure within the Project area may change is not an unusual circumstance. This could occur for any project that is covered under the cited exemptions. It is not unusual for local governance to change and, regardless of whether FORA dissolves, there will always be an authority that governs land uses within the Project area. The Project does not change this fact. Moreover, even if this was an unusual circumstance, LandWatch has not identified any potential environmental impacts that could result from the Project due to any potential future governance changes. MCWD’s staff and environmental consultants have not identified any potential impacts either.

Second, the “cumulative impacts” exception does not apply here. As explained above and in the IS/ND, the Project would not have any contribution to any cumulative impacts. Moreover, there are no other foreseeable projects of the same type (e.g., annexations) that could result in any cumulatively significant impacts. Again, the project does not propose any development or expanded water uses. Therefore, even if there were other similar projects, it would not change the IS/ND’s conclusion that the Project does not result in or contribute to any direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts.

Further, the exceptions cited by LandWatch apply only to categorical exemptions, and therefore, are not relevant to MCWD’s determination that the Project is either not subject to CEQA or is exempt under the “common sense” exemption.”

Agenda Item 10-A (continued):

Mr. Van Der Maaten stated that staff has been working with Seaside County Sanitation District (SCSD) and asked that the Board direct staff to hold off on filing the application for 30 days to allow more discussion between staff and SCSD to see if anything can be resolved. He added that, if approved, the Notice of Determination would still be filed, even if the application goes in 30 days later.

President Moore stated that a revised Resolution No. 2018-09 was on the dais. The revision added two paragraphs with the 14th WHEREAS reading:

WHEREAS, there are no “exceptions” to the categorical exemptions that would remove the Ord Community Sphere of Influence Amendment and Annexation from the exempt classes of projects; the “unusual circumstances” exception does not apply because the project is not unusual compared to other projects in the exempt classes and the project would not result in any significant impacts due to any unusual circumstances; the “cumulative impacts” exception does not apply because the project would not cause or contribute to any cumulatively significant impacts and there are no successive projects of the same type in the same place that will result in a significant cumulative impact; and,

And the 7th FURTHER RESOLVED reading:

FURTHER RESOLVED, that, are no “exceptions” to the categorical exemptions that would remove the Ord Community Sphere of Influence Amendment and Annexation from the exempt classes of projects; there are not unusual circumstances that distinguish this proposal from other projects covered under the categorical exemptions and the proposal would not cause any significant impacts due to any unusual circumstances; the proposal would not cause or contribute to any cumulatively significant impacts and there are no successive projects of the same type in the same place that will result in a significant cumulative impact; and,

President Moore reiterated Mr. Wegley’s statement that the KFOW comments do not raise any issues or affect the analysis the conclusions in the IS/ND.

Director Gustafson made a motion to adopt the revised Resolution No. 2018-09 to adopt the Public Draft Initial Study/Negative Declaration for the Ord Community Sphere of Influence Amendment and Annexation; Find that the Ord Community Sphere of Influence Amendment and Annexation is not subject to CEQA and is exempt from CEQA under CEQA Guidelines sections 15301 (Existing Facilities), 15319 (Annexations of Existing Facilities and Lots for Exempt Facilities), and 15061, subd. (b)(3) (the “common sense” exemption); and Direct Staff to File an Application with the Local Agency Formation Commission. Director Lee seconded the motion. The motion was passed.

Director Gustafson	-	Yes	Vice President Shriner	-	Yes
Director Lee	-	Yes	President Moore	-	Yes
Director Cortez	-	Yes			

14. Director's Comments:

Director Cortez, Director Lee, Director Gustafson, Vice President Shriner, and President Moore made comments.

15. Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:34 p.m.

APPROVED:

Thomas P. Moore, President

ATTEST:

Paula Riso, Deputy Secretary