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SAN LUIS OBISPO, CALIFORNIA
THURSDAY, MARCH 15, 2012, 2:15 P.M.
MR. YOUNG: Folks, it's 2:15. We're continuing
Agenda Item Number 4, which is the proposed Conditional
Waiver of WDRs for irrigated agriculture. This has been
continued from yesterday's session.
Dr. Wolff.
MR. WOLFF: Yes. Mr. Chair, I will recuse myself
at this time from participating to Item 4 due to conflict
of interest being an agriculture discharger.
MR. YOUNG: Thank you.
All right. Mr. Briggs, so we are now at the five
minute rebuttal period?
MR. BRIGGS: Right. The Ag representatives had
their 60 minutes allocated to them, and they chose to save
the last five minutes for response to everything that they
heard yesterday. And I understand that's going to be Tess
Dunham.
MS. DUNHAM: Thank you.
For the Reporter's purposes, Tess, T-e-s-s,
Dunham, D-u-n-h-a-m, with Somach, Simmons \& Dunn
representing Farmers For Water Quality.
I just obviously not going exactly what will be
in the Staff response so making some guesses and trying to
address some issues that I think would be of interest to the Board. We heard pretty frequently yesterday the need to trust and verify. And I think -- in wanting to clarify some components with respect to what could be added into the Ag Proposal to maybe provide the Board members with that sense of verification and trust would be appropriate that an independent audit that has been done would be part of the farm plan or be a required element of the farm plan that is to be remained on site. If Staff comes to inspect the farm plan, as they are allowed under the Draft Order, that they would then be able to review the audit that was done by the independent auditor through the third party group.

In an effort to try to provide some additional, you know, trust and verification to the process, that would be an element that we think would be appropriate and would not be one that we would be opposed to. So we put that forward in the form of clarification here today as something else for the Board to consider should they decide to consider the Ag Proposal, you know, looking for that trust and verification process.

The only other thing I really wanted to touch upon here today is really talking about what we mean by individual reporting or group reporting or watershed reporting. There's obviously been significant discussion Page 4
with respect to what is the legal standard and the legal requirement.

Well, Water Code Section 13269 with respect to monitoring says a couple of basic things. One, it says that you must have monitoring with a Conditional Waiver, and that that monitoring may be individual, it may be group, or it may be watershed based.

It also says that the monitoring must support the development and implementation of the Waiver, and it must verify the adequacy and the effectiveness of the Waiver's conditions and that those monitoring results must be made public.

We, of course, would contend that what we are proposing does comply with all three of those elements. Specifically, what we were talking with respect to the reporting is group reporting that does verify and provide the effectiveness of the Waiver. If you recall, the box plats that Dr. Los Huertos put forward that really showed and compared growers and really determined whether management practices are working or not is a form of verification in order to make those determinations to see if the Waiver is working or not.

And, of course, those public reports or those summaries that would be given to the regional Board would absolutely be public. This is absolutely consistent with
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how it is done in regions five, regions four, and regions six. This is a form, a standard, a process that the State Water Board approved in its 2004 Order when it reviewed the Conditional Waiver for the Central Valley. And it is a format and a process that is allowed under the Water Code.

So we hope that as you work on all this today, you take all of that into consideration with respect to the reporting, its group format, and that it does meet the legal standards within the Water Code.

Now, policy decision. If the Board decides that it wants something more different, to me that is a different question with respect to whether does it meet the legal standard.

That's the main points we wanted to leave with you as you start your deliberations today. And if there are any questions, of course.

MR. YOUNG: Any Board questions?
MS. HUNTER: No.
MR. YOUNG: Thank you. One thing I'd like to just alert you to, I know you lodged some objections yesterday --

MS. DUNHAM: Yes.
MR. YOUNG: -- at the beginning of our session.
I just wanted to remind you to take the opportunity right
Page 6
now during your rebuttal period if there's anything that you heard that you had objected to that this would be an opportunity for you to rebut what you heard.

MS. DUNHAM: The only thing I would add is, there's been a lot of obvious reference and a lot of press media to the recent U.C. Davis report that's come out. And I think it's important for everybody to understand that that report was released on Tuesday. It is over 1300 pages. And it's going to take time for everybody to review and comprehend the extent of what that report says and what it means.

As with any report, we're all going to pick and
choose elements out of it that we like and those that we
don't like as it is with any scientific or technical report.

I think it may have been mentioned earlier today that the State Water Board is holding a workshop with respect to that report on May 23rd. And from there, we'll be looking to give guidance to the regional Boards, as well. So I think we all need to sit back, take some time, review it ourselves, understand it ourselves, and make our own determinations and conclusions with respect to the information and then participate in the State Board's Hearing.

MR. YOUNG: I'm sure you can appreciate that we
haven't read the report.
MS. DUNHAM: Neither have I, Chairman Young, so I can appreciate that.

MR. YOUNG: There's nothing that we -- we haven't considered it because it's not part of the evidence on this matter.

MS. DUNHAM: Understood.
MR. YOUNG: Yeah. Okay. Thank you.
MS. DUNHAM: Thank you.
MR. YOUNG: All right. Mr. Briggs.
MR. BRIGGS: So the Order of events, if I've got
it right, is that the Staff will have an opportunity to provide their response to comments yesterday, as well as the summary and then back to me for final recommendation.

MR. YOUNG: Okay. Can everybody speak up loudly and clearly.

MS. McCANN: Good afternoon. Again, I'm Lisa McCann, M-c-C-a-n-n, environmental program manager. I brought my suitcase today in case you make me sleep over again. Just kidding.

Last night, we successfully, and you patiently got through all the public comment. And you also gave us a homework assignment. And we took that seriously.

And, Mr. Johnston, you specifically asked, What is the most effective Order that you, the Board, can pass Page 8
to improve water quality which meets legal standards. And you also asked what legal and policy issues need to be resolved to make the proposed edits and alternative from Farmers For Water Quality work.

We reviewed the proposed edits from Farmers For Water Quality and the additional issues that were raised yesterday during comments and during your various questions, and we've prepared responses that we will present to you in -- next slide -- in this Order. This is generally what we're going to address. So it would be the responses to the edits as proposed from Farmers For Water Quality, some other suggested edits in response to comments, and then just, if we have time, interest and response to some of the other issues that were discussed, and then as Roger mentioned, make a recommendation.

I do want to assure you that our responses represent the best way to advance water quality improvements so that aquatic habitat becomes healthier and drinking water becomes safe for the communities on the central coast.

MS. SCHROETER: I think the easiest way to go through is to actually go through the presentation provided by Ms. Dunham yesterday and talk a little bit about what our response is to the information.

In some cases, it's -- a legal response is going
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to be required, so I'll defer to Frances for those.
    We didn't have the opportunity to prepare a
handout to go with these slides. So what I'm going to do
I'm going to put it in the format where there's notes on
the bottom of this presentation. And you can just read
off the notes as we entered them last night and this
morning.
    Can you read where it says -- no, no, no, no.
Let's just do it the other way, slide view.
    (Discussion held off the record.)
    MS. McCANN: I just want to clarify what we're
trying to show you here. We put the notes in some of the
responses to the edits that were proposed in the notes
area in the PowerPoint, so we don't want to use the slide
view because then we won't be able to show you the notes.
    MR. BRIGGS: It's going to be down here.
    MS. McCANN: So it's going to be a little bit
less than the full view of the slides. But hopefully
you'll be able to follow along and see exactly what we're
trying to help you see.
    MS. SCHROETER: What I suggest you do is to use
your handout yesterday that Ms. Dunham provided to you to
go ahead and do your markups.
    In general, our review focused on all of these
items in the presentation but especially in areas where
```
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there were suggested changes. And we'll go through specifically how we responded to the specific changes or not, and provide you with our justification

This first one is a statement here that growers are treated differently, however the treatment is not necessarily based upon the threat to water quality but size of operation. What I wanted to remind you -- if I can pull up -- let's see if I can pull up my presentation -- but with a tiering, the criteria for each of the tiers.

In response to comments both in November, as well as in March 2011, we proposed tiers that were based upon threat to water quality. Tier 1 , which is the lowest threat. Tier 2, the water threat. Tier 3 is the higher threat.

We did evaluate all sources of information in terms of what was causing the impairments in the region for toxicity as well as for groundwater. And we knew that the major drivers for both those items were pesticide use and specific pesticides were causing much of the toxicity.
We knew that fertilizer application, specifically excessive fertilizer application was causing the impairments to groundwater.

What we tried to do in terms of taking a reasonable approach in advancing the current Order was to

Page 11
apply this tier criteria.
I'm just going to jump down to Tier 3. I think that's where there is a lot of concern about whether or not this really is an indicator of risk. So Tier 3 is those farms that use chlorpyrifos or diazinon and discharge to an impaired surface water, impaired specifically for toxicity and pesticides.

So in our Staffs' opinion and judgment, there is no other better indicator for threat to water quality. The use of chemicals known to cause toxicity, specifically diazinon and chlorpyrifos, and the actual discharge to a water body that's already impaired for pesticides and toxicity. Simply that

The second one is nitrogen loading crop type and an acreage grid of 500 acres. It's important to look at how the tiers relate to each other. Remember, again, this is relative threat. In this case, the acreage for Tier 3 is 500 acres and the acreage for Tier 1 is 50 acres.

All things held the same, for example, a lettuce crop, the potential risk or threat to water quality for a 500-acre farm is much, much different than a 50 -acre farm.

We'll show you also in a moment when we get to other issues how we build the conditions from Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 based upon that risk. So it's not that the Tier 1 farms don't have any conditions, for example, Page 12
related to nutrients, they just have lesser than those in Tier 3.

MS. HUNTER: Angela, so what -- if I can just restate what you just said. You're saying it's the size of the operation, but also the type of pesticide they're using and the higher crop potential for nitrogen loading to the groundwater?

MS. SCHROETER: Right.
MS. HUNTER: So it's not one size fits all?
MS. SCHROETER: It's not one size fits all. It's doesn't mean that no one in Tier 1 or Tier 2 have any risk. It's relative risk and the balancing of reasonable requirements relative to that risk.

MS. HUNTER: Okay.
MS. SCHROETER: The second one is requesting -or is talking about this Ag report in terms of the Executive Officer elevating into Tier 1 and Tier 2. And that you may require also looking at the specifics of operations in farms in terms of the tiering.

In response to these, what we're suggesting here is to also address -- I can't remember the gentleman's name -- about the smaller farms. He talked about smaller farms and the 300 -- was it Sanchez? I can't remember his name.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Sanchez.
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MS. SCHROETER: Mr. Sanchez -- and whether or not we -- how we were going to deal with those smaller farms. And one of the suggestions that we are suggesting in the Order -- I don't know if it's an appropriate time to pass out these -- is to look at those specific farms that have a specific disadvantage. So USDA actually has a definition for limited resource farmers and to prioritize compliance assistance for those types of farms.

In the interest of time, do you think I should just --

I'm wondering if I should just jump to those that speak to specific edits.

MR. THOMAS: Yes.
(Discussion held off the record.)
MS. HUNTER: Are you done, then, with that particular issue of the E.O. having the ability to elevate to a higher tier an individual operation?

MR. YOUNG: Monica, how about if I suggest this that maybe we all hold our questions, write them down, so we can have Staff tell us what they want to tell us, and then we'll launch in with our questions. That might just help get through this point.

MS. HUNTER: Yes. You asked me that yesterday, and I forgot.

MR. YOUNG: That's okay.
Page 14

MS. HUNTER: Thank you.
MS. SCHROETER: What I'm doing now is going to their first slide of suggested edits.
(Discussion held off the record.)
MS. SCHROETER: Starting on Page 18, the Farmers For Water Quality start suggesting specific edits. For example, here their suggestion is related to
Attachment 1B. Attachment 1B includes 140 findings. And the solution was not to adopt Attachment 1B.

Attachment $1 B$ basically is the attachment to the Order which includes all of the findings about the rationale for conditions in the Order. Staff included these to be transparent about the justification and rationale for those conditions. So we do not agree with the suggestion to not adopt or not include Attachment 1B.

There's no page numbers. Sorry. It has the heading here Attachment 1 B .

Got it? Okay. So next page.
MR. JEFFRIES: You're not going page by page?
MS. SCHROETER: In the interest of time, since
this presentation was 66 slides, I'm going straight to the
ones where there was suggested modification to the Order
MRP. And then we can go back if you want to discuss any of the other items.
(Discussion held off the record.)

MR. YOUNG: Okay. Go ahead.
2 MS. SCHROETER: The second one relates to Table 1 A and Attachment 1 B . And that, if you recall, is a table of Water Quality Standards. They're specifically culling out the narrative objective for biostimulation. The objection is is that -- we included language here at the bottom which is the water Board Staff estimates that one milligram per liter nitrate is necessary to protect aquatic life.

We agree that that's not an adopted standard. We have a suggestion -- or we agree with the edit to delete that.

MR. DELGADO: You're agreeing to delete Table 1A?
MS. SCHROETER: No, no, no. Just this piece
of -- just the sentence in 1 A .
What Michael is handing out is a supplemental sheet which actually summarizes all of the proposed edits.

MS. McCHESNEY: Angela, do have copies for people in the audience, too?

MS. SCHROETER: I'm not sure how much admin made, but I think there's a lot of extras there.

MR. YOUNG: We need to make sure everybody who wants a copy gets a copy.

MS. SCHROETER: You can make as many copies as you want.

Page 16
(Discussion held off the record.)
MS. SCHROETER: We can go to the page. Let's do that.

MS. HUNTER: I just want to clarify which sentence is being deleted in Table 1 A .

MS. McCHESNEY: It's on your yellow sheet right there, number one.

MS. SCHROETER: So in front of you, you have a supplemental sheet. What it includes is all of the edits suggested by Staff in response to both the information presented by Farmers For Water Quality as well as some issues that were brought up by the Board members themselves yesterday.

If I can just make a suggestion or give you some options for how to go through this. So we have the slides in front of us from Farmers For Water Quality, we have the edits here in the yellow sheet, and we also have the Order itself. So I can connect back to the Order. We can go to the page and we can look at that specific change.

MR. JORDAN: On the yellow sheet, Angela, when you don't say Attachment A, does that mean we're back in the Order? Like the second item.

MS. SCHROETER: Yes.
MR. JORDAN: Okay.
MR. YOUNG: Are you ready for the second change
Page 17
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you're going to tell us about or --
    MR. THOMAS: Yes.
    MR. YOUNG: -- or proposed change that you
addressed and have a response to?
    MS. SCHROETER: Yes.
    MR. YOUNG: Go ahead.
    (Discussion held off the record.)
    MS. SCHROETER: Just to clarify, our comments
relate to specific changes as well as to the general
concept described as Part E. And Part E is very large. I
think it's going to be an involved discussion. So I'm
going to defer the Part E discussions until the very last.
    Is that okay?
    (Discussion held off the record.)
    MR. YOUNG: Okay. Let's continue.
    MR. THOMAS: I have a suggestion, Mr. Chairman
that -- we have }66\mathrm{ pages that were submitted in the form
of slides with recommended changes. Some of those are
edits, some are policy things, some are rebuttal. What
I'm proposing is that instead of the Board trying to
follow along in the Order or in the attachments or even in
this sheet that we just handed out, that we just stick to
the issue that's on the Board, the slide that's up here,
where we are recommending an edit. We'll stop at each one
where we are recommending an edit in response to the
```

                            Page 18
    suggestion. We'll just focus on that to try and simplify
this.
MR. YOUNG: I thought that's what we were trying
to do.

MR. THOMAS: I think what happened is, when we passed out the yellow sheet -- and I can see the Board members trying to follow along with the yellow sheet and with the Order itself trying to match things up. I think it's too complex

MR. YOUNG: Okay. So we'll stick to what's on the screen. Right?

MR. THOMAS: Yes.
(Discussion held off the record.)
MR. DELGADO: Since the audience only has the yellow sheet, perhaps, then maybe you could tell them each slide where it is on the yellow sheet that we're talking about.

MS. McCHESNEY: Just to clarify, all the public comment has occurred. Now you're hearing from the Staffs' rebuttal. The Staff needs to communicate with you what they want to communicate. The public isn't going to have an opportunity to say more. The Staff can clarify to the extent they can, but --

MR. DELGADO: I understand. But it helps everyone if the public can follow along.

Page 19

MS. McCHESNEY: I apologize if I sound like the public doesn't need to understand. It's important that you understand and not to get distracted by lots of different things. But just make sure the Board understands the Staffs' responses.

MR. THOMAS: I think that these are self-explanatory when we look at them. The Order requires -- currently requires as this states -- I'm going right to the part where it has red text. Organic materials, such as organic pesticides, and we're going to -- we agree that we should cross that out. And registered pesticides that may. We agree to add that language with the exception of taking out the word registered so that it's just pesticides. We're agreeing with most of that edit in that part of the Order.

MR. DELGADO: I just want to note that on the yellow sheet, the word registered is not there. That's your point.

MR. THOMAS: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: That the yellow sheet is what you want to suggest to us?

MR. THOMAS: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Okay.
MR. THOMAS: Next slide?
MR. YOUNG: Yes, next slide.
Page 20

MR. THOMAS: Next slide, it's slide 28. I'm sorry the slides are not numbered.

We agree with this edit as it is presented here.
We're agreeing to make this change to the Order.
I'm going to keep going unless you stop me.
MR. YOUNG: That's fine. Just make sure we find the page before you advance.

MR. DELGADO: I'm sorry. I hate to bugger up the process. It would be nice if you would justify the change or the disagreement. On the previous slide, you did not agree to the word registered. And I know that that makes a big difference, whether you talk about registered pesticides or all pesticides. And you're recommending all pesticides.

MR. THOMAS: Yes
MR. DELGADO: So that's a big enough difference that I'd like you to explain the justification.

MR. THOMAS: The reason that we took out registered is we thought -- it's possible that pesticides might be used that are not registered. That's all. We don't want to --

MR. DELGADO: That's because not all pesticides need to be registered. There's a lot of things that you use to address pests that are not toxic enough to require registration; right? Like safe soaps. There's lots of
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things that you can use to kill pests.
MR. YOUNG: Hold on one second.
Folks, it is hard for us up here to hear clearly when there's mumbling in the background. I would encourage you, please don't do it.
MR. DELGADO: My question is: Are there pesticides that are legal to use that are not required to be registered?
MS. SCHROETER: We were just intending it to be inclusive of any type of pesticide used, registered, unregistered. Any type of thing, chemical, that you would use to control pests.
MR. DELGADO: Right. So my question is: Are there pesticides that are legal to use in this context that are not required to be registered with the EPA?
MS. SCHROETER: I'm not certain of that answer.
What I'm thinking of, for example, are examples like the bait traps that currently -- I'm not sure that's a registered pesticide. That would be an example of what we were thinking of.
MS. McCHESNEY: And just to clarify the point of this particular provision is that it's saying what is covered. So the Waiver is covering the discharge of those things. Whether it's a, quote, "registered pesticide" or not, it's just saying that's the scope of this provision.
```
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It's not saying that they're discharging unregistered pesticides just. It's just, this Waiver applies to things that constitute waste, and waste includes pesticides whether they're registered or not. It doesn't really matter if they're registered or not. For this purpose, it's just the scope of the Waiver so that they can be allowed to discharge that. Otherwise, if it doesn't cover it, they would have to go get some other permit to discharge.

MR. DELGADO: So Staff is considering this to be in the favor of the growers by expanding the kinds of things that they can apply if it ever is needed to include things that are not registered pesticides?

MS. SCHROETER: No. The context of this requirement is to talk about what can be discharged to water, what's covered by this Order.

MR. DELGADO: You're thinking that deleting the word registered -- or leaving that word out is favorable to the growers because it allows them to discharge more?

MS. McCHESNEY: No. It's not favorable or unfavorable. This is just a general statement that these kinds of things are the kinds of things that could be discharged under the Waiver. So, you know, it's --

MS. SCHROETER: The language used to say, "such as organic pesticides. Tess, yesterday suggested that

Page 23
that language be removed and added registered pesticides.
We agree with that statement and just are simply saying
that we want to remove the word registered. That might preclude some pesticides that are not --

MR. DELGADO: Registered.
MS. SCHROETER: -- registered.
MR. JEFFRIES: I'm a little confused. I was under the impression that all pesticides are registered.

MS. SCHROETER: That's not my understanding, but I am not an expert on pesticides.

MR. JEFFRIES: Because homemade ones may not be.
But, also, my understanding is before a farmer can apply
pesticides, he has to file. He does not? I see people shaking their heads. They don't have to file that they're using that application on their particular farm?

MS. SCHROETER: They -- I believe that they have to file if they're using a registered pesticide.

MR. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman.
MR. YOUNG: Let me just say something. We're getting bogged down on the trees and losing -- you know, we're losing sight of the forest here. This is just describing waste kind of generally. Whether it's registered or not, I don't think is really an issue. Pesticides. It's a type of waste that's involved in this. So there may be some that aren't; there may be some that Page 24
are. For this purpose, I don't think it's going to make any difference at all. It is definitional.

MR. JEFFRRIES: It is definitional. And if it becomes an issue, it can be brought back to the Board and reconsidered.

MR. YOUNG: Okay. Yeah. Like anything can be.
MR. THOMAS: Next slide is Slide 28.
MS. McCANN: They don't have the numbers.
MS. HUNTER: We don't have the numbers.
MR. THOMAS: I know. I thought that you might count them.

MR. YOUNG: We don't have the numbers.
MR. THOMAS: We agree with this change. So we're going to make this change.

MR. JEFFRIES: As is?
MR. THOMAS: As is.
MR. JEFFRIES: This is a little easier to follow, this way.

MR. THOMAS: We're not agreeing with this change on this next slide.

MR. YOUNG: And why?
MR. THOMAS: We don't think it's necessary to add the language, quote, "to the extent feasible," unquote.

MR. DELGADO: For purpose of the audience, I'm not seeing this in the yellow sheet.
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 change.MR. DELGADO: I want to back up on this because Tess was recommending the words, "to the extent feasible" be added to "Dischargers must to the extent feasible do X , Y, and $Z$ regarding vegetative cover on the creeks, et cetera.

To me, they're saying, to the extent feasible, give some wiggle room so that things considered infeasible would not be required of them to do. I think Staff is probably saying that that wiggle room is not room that they want to allow to be put into this language.

I just wanted to make sure that that's the justification for not agreeing to this

MS. SCHROETER: There's two main reasons. One, it's difficult to define what is "to the extent feasible." It's an ambiguous term. The other reason is, that's a consideration with all of the requirements. So if a grower has difficulty implementing something because of feasibility, that would be a consideration. So we don't generally apply that to every single condition that we --

MR. DELGADO: And I agree with this because I
think that every time you have a shall or a must throughout this Ag Order, you could add those words, "to the extent practical, feasible," et cetera. And it

Page 26
doesn't really change much. But if we're going to change it in one place, we'd want to wholesaley change it everywhere throughout the document. Right? Everywhere you had a must or a shall, we could be at this place of considering this addition.

MR. THOMAS: The existing language also says, "in aquatic habitat areas as necessary to minimize." So we already have language in there that provides wiggle room.

MR. DELGADO: That's wiggle room in a different way; right?

MR. THOMAS: Uh-huh
MR. DELGADO: "As necessary" is different than feasible.

MR. THOMAS: Uh-huh.
MS. McCHESNEY: No. I think the wiggle room is "minimize." You're not stopping it, just minimizing. So, you know, that's -- the feasibility fits into that.

MR. DELGADO: You've got two wiggles. You don't need three

MS. McCHESNEY: Exactly.
MR. YOUNG: Okay. Next one.
MR. THOMAS: Next one, we don't agree with the change. My intent in going through these was actually to stop on the ones where we agree with changes and not spend a lot of time on the ones where we don't agree with the
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changes. I wanted to just go to the ones that we do. But we are --

MR. YOUNG: I think we want -- I'd like to know which ones you're not agreeing to so we can just take a quick look at it.

MR. THOMAS: Okay.
MR. YOUNG: Read it quickly and then we can move on if we have no questions on it.

MR. THOMAS: The next slide indicates where disturbance of aquatic habitat is necessary for the purposes of water quality improvement or restoration activities, Dischargers must implement appropriate and practical measures

We disagree with the deletion. We think that is necessary and reasonable language.

MS. SCHROETER: But we also added language to clarify that it relates to the other permitted activities. So things like the 40, the stream alteration agreements actually the 401 certifications. So the change would be in a case where disturbance of aquatic habitat is necessary for the purposes of water quality improvement or restoration activities or other permitted activities. So just to clarify that it wasn't only for those water quality improvement

MR. THOMAS: If that makes sense, we're saying Page 28
that there can be disturbance of aquatic habitat. And it could be done as part of a stream alteration agreement or a 401 certification program -- or 401 certification. And there are requirements associated with those. For whatever reason the farmer would need to create that disturbance, they can get a permit to do it

MS. McCHESNEY: Angela, it looks like you skipped over Paragraph 35, Page 19, the one --

MS. SCHROETER: It's going to come up
MS. McCHESNEY: Okay. Sorry
MR. DELGADO: We have a question to the Chair. Do we care about grammar or English details at this point or does that get cleaned up later by Staff?

MR. YOUNG: It doesn't get cleaned up later.
MR. DELGADO: Okay.
MR. YOUNG: When we vote on something --
MR. DELGADO: Okay. So normally when you say "or," you only say it once. So I would say purposes of water quality improvement, comma, delete the first or, restoration activities or other permitted activities. Just like an and. You wouldn't use an and over and over.

MS. McCHESNEY: What I would suggest for that is you note it. And then if the Board ends up choosing to make those revisions, then we can correct all that then. We can identify the ones.
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MR. DELGADO: Is somebody logging all these little details?
MS. McCHESNEY: Yeah.
MR. DELGADO: I hate to get to this level. I just wanted to ask the Chair what he thought about grammar, small details.
MR. YOUNG: I haven't been concerned with grammar up until now. I hate to admit that. If I can read it and understand it, you know, I'm usually good with that.
MS. McCHESNEY: If it's a non-substantive
grammar, that can be corrected without needing a Board's vote.
MR. YOUNG: If there's confusion to the way it's written, yes, we've got to get it corrected.
MR. DELGADO: Thank you.
MR. YOUNG: Tell me what page we're on.
MR. THOMAS: 31, Slide 31.
MR. YOUNG: What paragraph number is that in -okay. Page 43.
Okay.
MR. THOMAS: This suggestion is to add language.
Farm plans must be kept current, kept on the farm, and a current copy must be made available to Central Coast Water Board Staff upon request. The edit is to -- recommended edit is to add the language "should Central Coast Water
```
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Board Staff conduct an inspection of the farm or ranch.
MR. YOUNG: Right.
MR. THOMAS: We don't agree with that edit. That information should be made available upon represent, not based on a visit.

MR. YOUNG: Right.
MR. DELGADO: Okay. So comment here. It's obviously a big trust issue. They don't want a document leaving the site because it could be copied, distributed, to who knows -- as far as their perspective, to who knows who. So this is a pretty big issue. Right?

We shouldn't be making it up one way or the other. What's the industry standard? How do other regions handle farm plan --

MS. McCHESNEY: I can answer that.
First of all, under the Water Code, the Board has the authority to require the submittal of technical reports. My recommendation on this is that I can't advise you to accept this edit because the Board has the right and responsibility to have technical reports submitted to them so that they can evaluate water quality

This would, then, preclude the Board from getting information. It's already in the current Order. The Central Valley Order requires these kinds of reports to be submitted as soon as there's one -- automatically if
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there's one exceedance of water quality centered -- more than one within three years or upon the request of the Executive Officer.

This is the normal process for the Board to implement its laws is to require technical reports be submitted upon request. So this would say the Staff would have to go to the farm, look at it, and then they couldn't take it back to evaluate it.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Johnston.
MR. JOHNSTON: Just to be clear about what the concern is that's being expressed, I don't think it's a concern that it would somehow slip out the back door of the Water Board. The concern is: That except for proprietary information in that report, that report, once its received here, does become publically accessible information.

MR. YOUNG: Right.
MS. McCHESNEY: Right. But that's not correct. They can identify the proprietary information, and the Board is obligated by law to keep it protected. And they already do that. There's quite a few reports in all the different programs that are submitted regularly that have -- basically two reports are submitted, the redacted report with the confidential information deleted. That's the public report and then a private report that this
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Staff keeps separately. And that happens in many programs. All the regional Boards deal with this on a regular basis.

MR. YOUNG: Okay.
MS. MCCHESNEY: Just so you know, the Order does very clearly state how the processor, how the person would identify what is proprietary. And they can do that.

MR. JOHNSTON: Just out of curiosity, is there a template for these reports? Remind me. I forget.

MS. McCHESNEY: I don't know.
MR. JOHNSTON: At this point for the farm plan -at this point that -- what -- there's no clarity as to whether what an individual farmer would consider proprietary and what we would consider proprietary in terms of general categories, whether those would coincide; correct?

MS. McCHESNEY: Correct. That's why it's up to the farmer to identify what they think is proprietary. And there's quite a bit of case law. This has been a big issue in the case law about how to do that, including in the area of agricultural information. But it's really up to them to identify what they think is confidential.

And it only becomes an issue if then someone makes a public record act request for the document and then which -- the process then is to go back to the farmer
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and say, "Justify why you think this is proprietary because we've been asked for it." So it's not released until they agree to it.

MR. JOHNSTON: I know we're well past the eleventh hour. Were we not, it would certainly be nice to simply have a definition of what the case law says is proprietary. That might answer the question.

MS. McCHESNEY: Yeah. It's really up to them to say what they think is proprietary. I've actually been doing -- been an attorney for the Board now for 25 years and only once has anybody ever asked for a report. It's even been an issue in my experience. It's been pretty straightforward. They identify it; we keep it confidential.

MR. YOUNG: Okay. Continue.
MR. THOMAS: Next slide, Paragraph 46, Page 21.
The recommendation is to delete this text. And the rather than read it all, I will read instead our reason for not agreeing with the deletion.

This finding is a high property inclusion for environmental justice. Individuals concerned about drinking water and other stakeholders, they've expressed concern about this very issue and wanted it to be in the Order. And the State Water Board does have goals with respect environmental justice as I mentioned yesterday.
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MR. DELGADO: And I wanted to jump in here because the rationale I heard from Tess for deleting this was that it was redundant under the law so that it's inappropriate to include it as a condition of the Waiver.

MS. McCHESNEY: Right.
And, actually, it shouldn't be in this portion.
I agree with Tess, too, that it should be -- this is the
Order part. It should be -- it can be a finding in the
Order. It's not an Order. It's not a part of the Order part.

MR. THOMAS: I agree. That's our mistake. We agreed last night that this was going to be moved and made an Order --

MS. McCHESNEY: Made a finding.
MR. THOMAS: -- made a finding --
MS. McCHESNEY: Right.
MR. THOMAS: -- and not a condition.
MS. McCHESNEY: Right. It's just like more
notice to people that these are the kinds of things that can happen.

MR. JEFFRIES: This language will be kept, but it will be kept in a finding?

MR. YOUNG: Correct.
MS. McCHESNEY: Correct. Just an informational --

MR. JEFFRIES: All right.
MR. YOUNG: Okay. Continue.
MR. THOMAS: Next slide I'm going to skip because we're going to deal with Part $E$ in a few minutes.

Next slide is Paragraph 52, Page 22. We're not going to add this language here as suggested because we have included this language in the monitoring and reporting program, and it's not necessary to make this change and include it in the Order, as well.

MR. DELGADO: Does it hurt or reduce the quality of the document to include it in an additional location as they're suggesting?

MS. SCHROETER: No, it doesn't.
MS. McCHESNEY: Well, I had a concern with it because it's kind of ambiguous the way it's written; whereas, in the MRP, it's much more clearly stated under what circumstances you either do individual or group monitoring. So to put this kind of general thing here creates ambiguity later when -- because the MRP -- because the sentence is to comply with the MRPs. The MRP includes the language that's very specific about how you do group monitoring.

MS. SCHROETER: The MRP is much more specific about the areas in which it applies.

MR. DELGADO: So this might be an example of a Page 36
subsequent plain English summary of the Ag Waiver could say something about this being allowed either individually or through a cooperative Monitoring Program. If you choose to do it one way or the other, you need to refer to the MRP for further direction. It's just something to keep in mind as an example of a subsequent plain English summary.

MS. SCHROETER: So this is just a list of items in the electronic -- or I'm sorry in the Notice of Intent. They suggested an option related to Part E. We're going to discuss that in a moment so I won't talk about that one.

The second one is a suggestion to add a place on the NOI to identify cooperative groundwater monitoring similar to the cooperative surface water monitoring selection. And that's fine. We agree with that.

There was an additional suggestion at the end to delete information on the Notice of Intent which is asking farmers if there is the presence and location of any perennial or intermittent or ephemeral streams or riparian or wetland habitats on their farm.

We disagree with this deletion. What it does is, having that checkbox, it really is just a checkbox in terms of, do you have a stream adjacent to or running through your property. It allows us to identify those
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farms quickly and to prioritize those if necessary. So we disagree with that deletion.

MR. DELGADO: Chair, can I jump in? MR. YOUNG: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: What I have down that Tess stated on this was that there was no need for a standalone requirement. Those are my words. I may be incorrect.

But if I'm correct, is this a standalone
requirement, or is it just a checklist item?
MS. SCHROETER: This is just a checkbox on the Notice of Intent.

What I understood from Ms. Dunham yesterday was she said it was not necessary because they already included the farm map and that the locations of streams were located on the farm map. That's what was written in my notes.

This is simply a checkbox. Do you have a creek or not. Without the checkbox, Staff has to go into every single farm map and look at them and see who has a creek running through their property or not. This is just a checkbox to say presence, absence, and allows us to prioritize them quickly.

MR. JOHNSTON: What I recall from the discussion wasn't just that you could get this information from the farm map, but that the question of figuring out -- some of
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these things -- it's easy to know if you have a stream. If you have a wetland area habitat, her statement was that could require a fairly comprehensive study to answer the question, that some of these -- some of the categories that are in -- I can't really tell from this if it's N or -- the last one there.

MR. YOUNG: N.
MR. JOHNSTON: -- are fairly obvious, and some are not, and that you would not necessarily get an accurate answer.

MS. SCHROETER: This is just a screening level.
So we're not using it as a definitive interpretation of whether or not it's an actual wetland per the definition. What we're looking at, is there streams, creeks, or other wetland area, riparian types of habitat running through the property or adjacent to the property.

MR. YOUNG: In other words, you're not expecting them to hire an expert to help them answer those questions?

MS. SCHROETER: No.
MR. YOUNG: It's if they know?
MS. SCHROETER: That's correct.
MR. JOHNSTON: And it won't change their tier depending on how they answer?

MS. SCHROETER: It does not change their tier.
Page 39

It's merely a screening tool for us.
MR. DELGADO: To me a wetland habitat means, in my mind, a pond or a lake. That's your interpretation, as well?

MS. SCHROETER: I think that's a fair characterization.

MR. DELGADO: All right.
MR. YOUNG: The definition may be more complicated than that as to what's a wetland.

MR. DELGADO: The official definition is more complicated than that?

MR. YOUNG: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: But in the farmers' minds and in my mind, a wetland looks different than a creek. It looks like a round object that has surface water.

MS. SCHROETER: There is actually a definition in the Order.

MR. YOUNG: Yeah. It could be a marsh.
MS. McCHESNEY: I don't know if you heard Angela.
There is a definition in the Order. They can look at that and say "yes" or "no."

MR. YOUNG: Okay.
MR. DELGADO: In real-life, I think when they fill this out, they're going to check the box according to their mindset. They're not going to go look for the
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definition buried in the Order.
MR. JOHNSTON: Right.
MR. DELGADO: If they see a seepy area with water on top of it, they may not think of that as a wetland area and they may not check that box or put that on a map.

MS. SCHROETER: One thing we could do, then, to address your comment, Mr. Delgado, is, similar to other areas of the Notice of Intent already, we have a link on the side for those that require more definition. And you simply click on that wetland and the definition pops up so they can see it right there.

MR. THOMAS: I'm going to skip the next slide.
(Recess taken.)
MS. SCHROETER: We're moving to Part E. Just to summarize, those are all of the edits, our response to all of the edits, that would result in an edit to the Order based upon the input from Farmers For Water Quality. We do have additional edits which are shown on the yellow sheet which we'll discuss later which are a result of Board member discussion.

MR. YOUNG: Are you moving to E right now? Because there's some other pages in here that don't involve E, I believe. Like they've got a Paragraph 61, Page 25. I'm assuming you're not in agreement with adding that language. Oh, cause it does --
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```
MS. McCHESNEY: That is Part E. MR. YOUNG: That is Part E. Okay. Gotcha. All right.
MR. JOHNSTON: There was also some groundwater monitoring stuff. Maybe that's going to be covered in your Part E, also. Attachments 2A, B, and C.
MS. SCHROETER: That specific edit also relates to some changes related to Board member discussion. So we'll capture those in a moment.
MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you.
MR. THOMAS: With respect to Attachment E, it was --
MS. HUNTER: Is it Attachment or Part?
MR. THOMAS: Part E.
MS. HUNTER: Part E. Thank you.
MR. THOMAS: Part E, language was proposed to add
New Part E. The Board directed us to evaluate that
language and to consider the pros and cons and answer the question about what would be the most effective Order.
MS. HUNTER: Question.
MR. THOMAS: So the pros --
MS. HUNTER: Question.
MR. THOMAS: Yes.
MS. HUNTER: I have a question.
Can you tell me the title of Part E and where I
```
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can find it in the Order so that I'm sure that I
understand what we're talking about. In this case, I do want to know where I am in the document.

MS. McCANN: You're asking where in the Order?
MS. HUNTER: (Nods head.)
MS. McCANN: Page 26. This is where they are recommending to insert --

MS. McCHESNEY: It's not in the Order.
MS. McCANN: -- a New Part E.
MS. McCHESNEY: It's their PowerPoint --
MS. HUNTER: Right.
MS. McCHESNEY: -- with the new part.
MS. HUNTER: What I'm saying is, we already have
a Part E. On Page 26, there is a Part E.
MS. McCHESNEY: It would replace their proposed
Attachment B with a New Part E.
MS. HUNTER: But where does the New Part E
belong? That's my question.
MS. McCHESNEY: Renumber, reletter. So E -- it
would be a new $E$, and $E$ would become $F$.
MS. HUNTER: Become F. Okay. That's what I
wasn't clear on. Okay. Got it.
MR. DELGADO: So they would replace the Part E
that's in the Waiver with their Part E?
MS. McCHESNEY: No. They're making some changes Page 43
to their Attachment B. Their third party group proposal that they submitted in March and May, they are proposing changes to that, and that's going to be E. It would be a new $E$, and then $E$ would become $F$, and $F$ would become $G$.

MR. DELGADO: Okay. The reason I'm a little bit confused is because the title of their Part E is pretty much the same as the title of our existing Part E. So you would have an E and an F that would had the same title.

MS. McCANN: There is a difference. Their title says, Additional conditions that apply to Tier 2 and Tier 3 Dischargers -- this is what's new -- through participation in third party group. And ours which does not say per third party group will become Part F. Wait a minute.

MR. THOMAS: The pros of the new language, the new language that was proposed. There is more detail here on a potential coalition concept, and that's a good thing. It looks like they did more work on it, thought about it more, and provided a little bit more detail.

We thought that was a good thing. We also think that coalitions could be very helpful in the overall implementation of the Order, the Water Board's Order, and that would include any Order. That includes the 2004 Order or this proposed 2012 Order.

They really could help tremendously with
Page 44
education, assistance, outreach coordination and grants, inspections, providing incentives, awards, collaboration and leveraging of their efforts with others. I think the coalitions also could help facilitate broad scale implementation. That includes Dr. Los Huertos' ideas.

And I specifically call them ideas because they are ideas. They're not developed. They're just concepts or ideas that he has been working on for some time. As he has said, he's not actually working for anyone right now. They're just his ideas.

We've talked to him about this individually outside these Board hearings about where he actually stands with this. And he's told us he does not have support, he does not have an infrastructure, he does not have an organization, or the support from any organization to implement what he's talking about doing. He's told us that it is purely an idea.

I'm not trying to knock the idea. I'm just
trying to put it in the context of how he is presenting it. Because there's -- we heard a lot yesterday and at the last workshop, that we really want you to implement Dr. Los Huertos' proposal. And it's not a proposal that can be implemented.

You also heard from Sarah Lopez yesterday about the Quail Creek Project that she did with Preservation,
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## Inc. <br> We think that the work that they did their to reduce loading is great. We think the coalitions could cause more of that type of work to be done. And we would be very supportive of that. <br> You also heard from Ross Clark who talked about Wetland Treatment Systems. And I don't know if I got the name of his organization correct there. I just was going by memory. <br> MS. HUNTER: Yeah. I think it's Central Coast Watershed Group. <br> MR. THOMAS: Central Coast Watershed Group. Sorry about that. <br> The kind of work that Ross Clark was talking about, we are highly supportive of. We agree with his presentation, and we think it was outstanding. We think the work that he's doing and is proposing to do is outstanding. We will do everything that we possibly can to help him implement those types of projects. And we think coalitions would be a big help in doing that. I actually think that it would be necessary to do it, the kind of collaboration that they could provide. <br> The cons. It is still a concept, though we think it is a concept that could be done. By saying it's a concept, I'm not trying to be overly critical, I'm not
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trying to kill the idea. I actually hope that it is developed, and that we do implement it -- or that the industry does implement it. And there may be more than one coalition. We don't know at this point.

We're still missing key indicators of pollution reduction and practice effectiveness. The language that is proposed is not what Dr. Los Huertos was proposing, even though what he was proposes was in concept, it's not the same thing -- or it's not the same as what Sarah Lopez did and what she described

If you were to look at the Preservation project that Sarah implemented -- it's already done, that project is already done -- there's a great amount of detail there. It's a scientifically based project. It's statistically significant. The design is based on science and achieving statistically significant results.

That kind of approach, that kind of information, is not included in this concept. Again, I don't mean to be overly critical here. I'm just trying to point out that what the context is for this language. And there also isn't a point of compliance, which we discuss in our Draft Order

There's also no risk-based prioritization criteria such as what we have in our Order. No milestones or targets within the term of the Order. The time frames
presented are too long. These Orders -- the one before the Board and the 2004 Order have a five-year term. They have to be renewed in five years for a reason.

We are required to -- in order to be consistent with the law, we need to determine the effectiveness of the Order. At the end of five years, we need to be able to say to the Board and the public and ourselves and the growers how effective that Order is. We need to know that so that when we renew it, we can make changes that are necessary to ensure that the Order is effective.

MR. YOUNG: Are you, Michael, referring to the 2015 date that was proposed as unacceptable because it's too long term?

MS. McCANN: I'm not sure what you're referring to. In here, we have a replacement for our timeline with the first milestone at eight years out. I would have to look at it to tell you what the other ones are

MR. BRIGGS: I think there was an 8-15.
MS. McCANN: Yeah. Maybe that's what --
MS. HUNTER: It's under Part G? Is that revised in Part G, the time frame?

MS. McCHESNEY: Yes, it would be G.
MS. McCANN: Yes. It would be their Part H replacing our Part G with time schedules that are outside the term of the Order five years -- excuse me -- eight Page 48
years. And I think Roger's correct, 15.
MR. DELGADO: Can you explain the difference between milestones, targets, and time frames? When I see the time frames that they suggested, I kind of thought of those as milestones. Can you explain the difference.

MS. McCANN: I think we're using milestones and targets interchangeably. So maybe we didn't need two words there. Or maybe another way to say it is a milestone is a target plus a time frame.

What are we trying to achieve, that's a target.
And what's the time frame that we want to achieve it or the date we want to achieve it by. So we have, for example, indicate pollution reduction with some indicators by a set date. It's fair to say that they also have some targets with time frames. I think you're calling those milestones now. But they're eight years and fifteen years out.

MR. DELGADO: When you say no milestones/targets, is that true, or did they have some?

MS. McCANN: Let me clarify. You have to read the other part of that phrase. Within the term of the Order. There's nothing proposed as a set goal that we would measure something by in terms of pollution reduction or effectiveness of management practices with a date that is within the term of the Order the way the language is
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## written.

MR. DELGADO: So they may have a target of certifying at least 20 percent of the participating farms to an audit. But that certification, that target, is not a water quality numeric target. It's a process target, sort of.

MS. McCANN: I agree with your assessment, but I wasn't trying to distinguish between water quality and other types of targets here. Now you're raising a slightly different issue which is, if there are -- to the extent that there are some -- we'll call them process targets to use your term -- they're not reported or they're reported at such a high level, that they won't tell us how much progress we're making in pollution reduction or advancing towards water quality improvement.

MR. BRIGGS: Lisa, back from the mic just a hair.
MS. HUNTER: By high level, you mean aggregate?
They're reported at an aggregate level that does not allow us to understand what's happening? I don't know what you mean by high.

MS. McCANN: As far as the language that is in here to be added to the Order, that remains unclear. But when I say high level, aggregate is not -- it's not just aggregate that's high level. It's what's scale and what's the indicator that we're aggregating the information. I
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am talking about things like numbers of growers or types of practices.

MS. HUNTER: Okay.
MR. YOUNG: Go ahead.
MR. JOHNSTON: Just a quick question here.
Is this list of cons the list of policy and legal issues which would have to be resolved to utilize this concept or is that coming separately?

MR. THOMAS: These things would have to be resolved, yes.

MR. JOHNSTON: I understand
So this is that list that I was asking for last night; is that correct?

MR. THOMAS: Yes.
MR. JOHNSTON: Okay. I want to let you walk through it, and then I've got some questions about different things.

MR. DELGADO: Okay. I have to jump in if I could, Chair, because I don't see all these as legal. Having risk-based prioritization criteria, is that a legal requirement?

MR. YOUNG: They're going to get to that.
Whether it's legal or not, they're --
MR. DELGADO: They just did get to that. They said, I think, that everything up there are legal
requirements. That's what I think I heard.
MS. McCHESNEY: No. I think he said they were some policy, some legal.

MR. DELGADO: Okay. I missed that. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: Yeah.

MR. THOMAS: So the next thing is that we don't think that the language is responsive to the threat to human health. And that includes not focusing on -because it does not focus on shallow groundwater where most domestic wells are located and where the threat to human health is greatest. There are no targets or indicators of nitrate-loading reduction, no advanced requirements for higher risk operations, operations where the threat is greater, which is how our Order is designed.

The last item there, the language and the approach does not meet the legal standard. We talked to our attorney about this last night and this morning. And the Board -- members of the Board said yesterday that Board counsel's advice is a high bar. Just so you know, from the Staffs' perspective, it's the bar.

When we have the conflicting attorneys, attorneys giving conflicting interpretations, we take the advice of the Board's legal counsel. We don't take the advice of other counsel.

I don't know if you want to jump in here,
Page 52

Frances.
MS. McCHESNEY: I don't know.
Do you want to hear my -- these are a couple issues that I had identified as concerns I have with their proposal.

So the first one is that Ms. Dunham has expressed the concern that the proposed Order would somehow be interpreted to require immediate compliance with Water Quality Standards because it says, "Dischargers shall comply with Water Quality Standards and protect beneficial uses and prevent nuisance."

And my comment on that has been that it's the language in the existing Order, it's the language in all the other Orders adopted by other regional Boards regarding compliance of Water Quality Standards, it's the requirement of the law that they comply with Water Quality Standards

Where the issue has come up is that there seems to be this view that the language means that -- assuming the Board adopts something today, that tomorrow everybody is going to be out of compliance. But there are numerous -- with the Water Quality Standards, there are numerous provisions in the Order, both in the findings and in the Order part that make it clear that for purpose -and in the State Water Board's policy on the Non Point
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Source Policy, for nonpoint sources, compliance with Water
Quality Standards means to implement management practices.
If they aren't effective in reducing discharges to meet Water Quality Standards, that they revise or do new management practices.

And it's been made clear in the Order. It's the same language in the Central Valley Order that the Staff has proposed and is currently in the Order. It has not resulted -- it's the same language that's in the Coalition Group Waiver for -- in the Central Valley. It has not resulted in any enforcement actions for not complying with Water Quality Standards.

So my recommendation that it not be changed because it's -- it implements a law, and it's been carefully defined within the Order.

Tess proposed a different way to address that issue in her proposal, which is the Paragraphs 21 and 22. You know, if you -- there are ways to write it in the way she's proposed, but it would take some rewriting because of some issues that she's raised by her proposed rewrites.

And I would -- you know, if you want to consider her proposal, I'd be happy to talk about what I would change about her proposal. But I really think it's working the way it's working. It's a requirement of the law to require compliance with Water Quality Standards.

Page 54

That's the basic standard of every discharger in the State is to comply with Water Quality Standards.

In the case of nonpoint source pollution, it's an integrative process to do management practices and then make them better. There's nothing in the Order that would require them to be in compliance tomorrow. It's made very clear.

MR. DELGADO: To the Chair, if I may. If she had suggestions that you just said were workable that also satisfy your needs and our needs, then why wouldn't we take a look at those?

MS. McCHESNEY: That's what I said. I did look at them. They would require significant rewrites because she's introduced new issues. She's changed other things in the Order in response to those changes. So it's not just like one thing. It's like going to a whole bunch of different places. Okay. Fix that, now go fix that, now go fix that. If you want me to do that, I can do that.

I want to just tell you that I don't think it's necessary to address the concern, and the language works the way it is. So that's one of the legal issues.

MR. DELGADO: Okay.
MR. YOUNG: Mr. Johnston.
MR. JOHNSTON: Yes. Just a suggestion on process, Mr. Chair. Because I know none of us want to be
here at midnight tonight.
You know, Staff has done an impressive job on, I suspect, very little sleep of responding to a tremendous volume of stuff. I suggest that we let them finish their presentation. And to the extent that we don't understand stuff that they're presenting, that we ask questions so we understand it.

And I think that there are some other proposed edits that they have. We let them run through their whole presentation, and we ask questions as we need to to understand it. And then we circle back around, and we talk about whether we as a Board want to consider trying to implement some version of what we heard yesterday from Tess. And if we decide we do, then I think we need to run through point by point: I think this is the list of legal and policy considerations that would have to be resolved and the policy considerations to our satisfaction and the legal considerations certainly, I want to satisfy Frances here. That's what we pay her for. I suggest we just run on through, ask questions as we need to to understand, and then circle back around and see how much we want to dig into this.

MR. YOUNG: That's fine. So go ahead.
Frances had some more, I think, to address this list.
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MS. McCHESNEY: I talked about the other one. That's the proposal to delete the provision of the Staff report, the Staff proposal that they provide their farm plans upon request to the Board, and they have proposed to not allow that to happen. And I have already described my legal concern with that, that it's undermining your own authority to get technical reports submitted to the Board and that I would not recommend that. And the Centra Valley's Order has that, the current Order has that. I don't see any need to delete. It would undermine your own authority, which I don't recommend that you undermine your own authority

MR. YOUNG: Okay. Michael.
MR. JOHNSTON: So that's the second point, lacks reporting requirements

What about there cannot be a shield. Could you just --

MS. McCHESNEY: I think that there is a great improvement with the newer version of the now Part E. And as far as the role of the third party groups in clarifying that individuals are ultimately responsible, there are some areas that sort of create some ambiguity about that.

Under the Water Code, a person who discharges waste is required to submit a Report of Waste Discharge, or in this case, a Notice of Intent. And either obtain
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 late.Waste Discharge Requirements or a Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements.

It's the individual Discharger's responsibility under the law to comply with the law. So you can't have a third party group that shields the individual from the compliance with the law. Some of the ways that it was written in the previous version appeared to try to do that. Which is somewhat surprising because I would think the third party group would not want to be taking on the responsibility that's really assigned to the individual discharger. So that was a little interesting.

I think the newer version does clarify some of those things that the individual discharger is ultimately responsible. But there are some areas that could be clarified better. So that was my other concern.

MR. YOUNG: Go ahead, Michael.
MR. THOMAS: Our recommendation regarding this new language, New Part E , is that -- and this is not our final recommendation of the day. This is just the recommendation regarding this particular language -- that we cannot recommend adding -- I should have said Part E there -- this language in the Order. We can't recommend it for the reasons I said on the previous slide.

However, we want to make it clear, if we haven't made it clear before, that we encourage third party groups Page 58
to develop alternative implementation approaches with the key elements on the previous slide. And we also think the technical advisory committee is a good idea. That was mentioned in the proposed language.

The question that was asked yesterday --
MR. YOUNG: Before you go, Mr. Jordan has a question for clarification.

MR. THOMAS: Yes.
MR. JORDAN: Before you left that last page, I'm
curious, other than the legal items that Frances has
identified and the strict policy items that you've
identified, is everything else on that page or everything
on the prior cons page able to be folded into the existing
Order the way it's already written?
MR. THOMAS: Yes.
MR. JORDAN: Thank you.
MR. THOMAS: That's where I was going.
MR. JORDAN: Sorry.
MR. THOMAS: That's a good question.
The question that was asked yesterday, what is the most effective Order to improve water quality and meet legal standards. There's a typo. We were working on this

What's the answer? An Order that includes the things that we've been talking about and emphasizing to
the Board for years now. Key indicators of pollution reduction and practice effectiveness, risk-based prioritization criteria, milestones or targets within the term of the Order so that we can demonstrate progress of reducing pollution loading.

We need to be responsive to the human health threat. It's our highest priority. We cannot put language into this Order that diminishes or undermines the Board's authority -- diminishes that or undermines the Board's authority. We need to focus on shallow groundwater and targets or indicators of nitrate loading reduction. We have to have advanced requirements for higher risk. This is how the Board conducts its business on every program that it implements. And the language or the approach must be consistent with the law and policies, or it's not defensible.

We also need to include in our Order in order for it to be effective an option to implement alternatives that are equivalent or better than what we are proposing. Because there are other options that are equivalent and better than what we are proposing. And the industry can develop those. So we have tried to make the Order as flexible as we can. We tried to include language to encourage and promote these alternatives. And we welcome the industry's effort to do it.
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We currently have timelines in the Order. And one of the edits that we are proposing that we'll get to in a few minutes is to extend those deadlines that are in the Order to further promote the development of these third party alternatives that will be submitted to the Executive Officer for approval.

We want them. We want them to meet these requirements. So we've designed the Order to do that. And it's not unusual. Many of the Orders that this Board adopts and has adopted over the past years -- over many years includes this approach, where the Board establishes requirements and says, or an alternative that is equivalent or better, and allows the industry or the responsible party to develop that. That is the most effective Order that we can have, to set standards and allow alternatives.

If you want to see alternatives from third party groups that meet the law and that have the conditions that we've talked about, then adopting the Order with that option is the way to go. Continuing to delay is going to result in a continuation of what we have had over the past three and a half years. We continue to argue about these things. We continue to have opposing legal arguments and we're stuck.

Okay. Other edits.
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Right?
MR. THOMAS: Sure. It's okay to have opposing legal arguments. I don't think it's okay for us to continue to delay and not implement actions that protect people that are threatened by this pollution. I don't think that's okay.

MR. YOUNG: I understand that. Right.
MS. SCHROETER: Now I'm going to -- what Michael
put up here on the screen is a list of other edits that Staff is recommending, and they also are reflected on your yellow sheets. So I'm going to talk about them in detail.

MR. YOUNG: Angela, hold on one second.
Dr. Hunter, you want to quickly ask that question?

MS. HUNTER: Okay. Thank you.
Again, I'm trying to track how the proposed new
Part E , which refers to and puts a lot of detail -- more
detail, as Michael said, from Attachment B. So that's an improvement.

Where in the monitoring report section, which is
1,2 , and 3 , do we see any kind of spelling out of how the
Page 62
third party process will work? Or do we have that? I'm not seeing it. I just want to know: Do we have something that's equivalent?

MS. McCANN: I don't think they proposed any edits to the monitoring and reporting program.

MS. HUNTER: I know.
MS. McCANN: Okay.
MS. HUNTER: So let me ask that question a little differently.

MS. McCANN: Okay.
MS. HUNTER: The only place that I see third party referenced is in Additional Findings, Number 10. It says it deals -- that's where you deal with third party groups. And it refers to the Monitoring Program Orders. That's why I was wondering: Is it in the Monitoring Program Order, or is that the only place where you refer to third party groups?

MS. McCANN: You're referring to our Draft Order?
MS. HUNTER: Yes. Correct.
MS. McCANN: Okay.
MR. JOHNSTON: Besides Condition 10, I think
Finding 11 refers to cooperative -- that's not monitoring. Sorry.

MR. BRIGGS: Mr. Chairman, in Attachment 2B, which is, for example, monitoring and reporting program

Page 63
for Tier 2 on Page 9, it talks about cooperative groundwater monitoring efforts to minimize costs. This is

A6, Page 9 of the Tier 2 Monitoring Program
MR. JOHNSTON: Page 9 of what?
MR. BRIGGS: The monitoring and reporting program for Tier 2.

MS. HUNTER: On Page 9, what number is it?
MR. BRIGGS: Number 6.
MS. HUNTER: Okay. I have found it. Thank you. (Discussion held off the record.)
MS. HUNTER: Each tier Monitoring Program has that same Number 6 apparently.

MR. DELGADO: On Page 9, Paragraph 6 in each tier.

MR. JORDAN: Okay.
MS. HUNTER: Thank you. I just need to get my bearings.

MS. SCHROETER: Now what you have in front of you on the yellow sheet are four pages of additional edits that Staff is suggesting based upon the information submitted by Farmers For Water Quality as well as the Board member discussion yesterday.

We already went through a page and a half of them. I'm going to start on Page 2 where it says
Paragraph 58, Page 24 and 25 . You'll notice on the one
Page 64
above Paragraph 56, we already discussed that one, about the NOI form and the edits to the NOI form.

Paragraph 58 is the middle of Page 2, left-hand column.

MR. YOUNG: Do you want the word "an" in front of appropriate?

MS. SCHROETER: Yes. Sorry.
MS. McCHESNEY: "In the."
MS. SCHROETER: "In the appropriate tier."
MR. YOUNG: Right.
MS. SCHROETER: This one is for Dischargers who do not provide adequate information for the Water Board to confirm. The Executive Officer will place the farm ranch in the appropriate tier based upon information submitted in the Notice of Intent. And I'm bringing this one up because this was left over from Tess' that we didn't address. Her concern was that farmers would be automatically placed on the higher tier. And we agree. So we are suggesting additional edit that they would be placed in the appropriate tier based upon the information submitted in the Notice of Intent.

The second change, and this was in response to --
MR. DELGADO: Excuse me, Angela.
MS. SCHROETER: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: To the Chair, back to that point, I
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think sometimes the Notice of Intent will be incomplete and not allow the Executive Officer based on that standalone document to make a determination. I mean, that's a possibility that I could foresee.
If this would say, "Place the farm ranch in the appropriate tier based upon either information submitted in the Notice of Intent or further communication between the Executive Officer or Staff and the applicant, that that -- I think that would be more thorough.
MS. SCHROETER: We could add that information, "or further communication with the grower regarding their enrollment."
The next one is regarding the sampling of groundwater, individual groundwater sampling. And this actually is in response to a comment that was brought up by Board Member Wolff as a stakeholder. His concern was about the need to have registered professionals conducting the groundwater sampling. We do suggest a change. We understand that comment, and the change is that we would delete the sections that say, "State registered professional engineer, professional geologist, or other similarly qualified professional," and replace that with a qualified third party, for example, technician, consultant, or individual conducting cooperative monitoring.
```
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So, for example, Preservation, Inc., currently conducts surface water cooperative monitoring. Someone like that would be fine to conduct the groundwater sampling, or a certified lab employee, for example.

MR. DELGADO: Who would determine the qualifications necessary?

MS. SCHROETER: Well, it's per the proper sampling methods and analytical. So someone who's qualified to do the sampling methods and --

MR. DELGADO: Who determines that? I might get a lesson from you. And you and I might agree that I'm now qualified

Am I qualified?
MS. SCHROETER: What we intended to do was to hold a workshop or provide some assistance for growers of how -- it states very specifically how to conduct the sampling in the MRP. We would have some assistance about that. And then as long as it was a third party familiar and who could implement those methods, it would be a qualified third party. It's deliberately flexible.

MR. DELGADO: Okay.
MR. YOUNG: Let me just offer some example here.
When I used to grow oysters and I was taking water samples, the Department of Health Services showed me how to do it, and then I was responsible myself to go out,
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get a clean sterilized jar from the lab, take it in a bag,
go get my sample, fill out a label, and submit it, and that was okay

As long as you're going to be able to explain
this to people, train them how to be able to do it
themselves, with some training, they could become qualified.

MR. JEFFRIES: It's also a cost savings.
MR. YOUNG: It's a cost savings. And it makes it easier to do. So just consider that.

MR. DELGADO: Okay.
MS. SCHROETER: That's a good example.
The second one relates specifically to the
Farmers For Water Quality's suggestion about -clarification about the individual groundwater monitoring.

Essentially we agreed with their suggested edits, which are in the underline here. The parts that we added are in that last sentence of the second paragraph, a strikeout, where it says, Qualifying cooperative groundwater monitoring and reporting programs may include but are not limited to regional or subregional groundwater programs developed for other purposes as long as the proposed cooperative groundwater Monitoring Program meets the Water Board's general purpose of characterizing groundwater quality. That's where Farmers For Water Page 68

Quality ended.
What we'd like to do is to add because this wasn't in our original intent, "and ensuring the protection of drinking water sources."

So that really is our general purpose of the individual groundwater monitoring is both to characterize groundwater quality and ensure the protection of drinking water sources. That's the add on.

The other change that we made to the suggested edits -- oh, here. So on the third page, at the top of the page, where it says, Adequately characterize the groundwater aquifers in the local area of the participating Dischargers. We agree with that change to strike out represent and add the word characterize.

Ms. Dunham had also suggested that we strike out, "characterize the groundwater quality of the uppermost aquifer." Staff disagrees with that strikeout. We feel it's very important for any cooperative groundwater Monitoring Program to also access the uppermost aquifer. It's the most vulnerable to pollution. It's the aquifer that most domestic wells are tapped into and any cooperative groundwater Monitoring Program must include that evaluation.

Other than that, we agree with all of the other suggested edits, including the ones which gives them time
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here to submit the cooperative groundwater monitoring proposal. So you will see that they have -- someone who wanted to do it cooperatively has a year to submit the proposal. That's acceptable to Staff.

So the next suggested edit is the one that Michael specifically referenced. And that relates to the dates regarding individual discharge monitoring. So we understand that any cooperative effort, third party effort, is going to require time. So we want to be able to provide that time before some of the more burdensome requirements kick in.

For example, for individual sampling analysis plan, we would like to revise that date to submit to be one year, March 15th, 2014, instead of the previous date which was six months after adoption.

In addition, we also are suggesting the edit to revise the date to initiate the individual discharge monitoring, surface discharge monitoring to be October 1st, 2013. So this extends individual to surface discharge monitoring 1.5 years. The previous date was October 1, 2012.

MR. BRIGGS: Angela, back up one. Is that the right date there? Because it looks like you mean to say 2013.

MR. JEFFRIES: That's what I thought. You have Page 70

March 15, 2014.
MS. SCHROETER: Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, you're correct. Thank you for catching that important clarification.

MR. BRIGGS: So that's the first date change that Angela was talking about.

MS. SCHROETER: Submit the individual sampling analysis plan.

MR. BRIGGS: Right. Revise date to submit
individual sampling analysis plan to March 15th, 2013 as consistent with the one year from today.

MR. DELGADO: That is a six-month extension compared to the status quo?

MS. SCHROETER: That's correct. That is to submit the plan. And an additional extension for actually initiating the sampling, which is the next one.

So in addition, we're also revising dates to submit or to report the individual surface water discharge monitoring to March 15th, 2014. The previous date was October 1, 2013. So this basically provides two years to submit the data. So it allows growers two years to consider and implement -- start implementing alternative before they have to report any individual discharge monitoring data.

In summary for those three, they all relate to
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individual discharge monitoring for surface water, the date to submit the plan would be March 15th, 2013. The date to start sampling would be October 1st, 2013. And the date to submit any reporting would be March 15, 2014, two years after today.

In addition Staff is also recommending to delete the date of implementation for the irrigation nutrient management plan to allow for the flexibility of considering alternatives before the development of that plan. The previous date was October 1, 2013. We would just suggest --

MR. DELGADO: So you'd leave it open-ended, no date?

MS. SCHROETER: Leave that one open-ended with no date.

They development and implement that plan at their discretion; however, the next one is regarding the reporting of the elements of the irrigation issue management plan. So here we're suggesting to move the date for reporting the elements of the irrigation issue management plan by one year.

Currently it's October 1, 2014, and it would move to October 1, 2015. That previous date notation there is wrong in the note.

So those are the suggested edits that relate to
Page 72
dates. All those dates were extended out to allow for the opportunity for the development of alternatives, third party groups, or certifications, cooperative efforts.

We also are suggesting some additional edits in response to the hearing discussion yesterday. The next one relates to the nutrient balance ratios as a target versus a milestone. In response to the discussion yesterday, Staff is suggesting that we go ahead and make the nitrogen balance ratio a milestone and not a compliance condition.

So the edit, then, is by October 1, 2015, Dischargers with high nitrate loading risk must report the progress towards the following nitrogen balance ratio milestones, instead of must achieve the milestones. They have to still report the ratio at a certain date. But it's moving to a milestone instead of a compliance condition.

MR. DELGADO: When you say report progress towards, that means any amount of positive numeric progress?

MS. SCHROETER: That's correct. Then the next edit would be moving the conditions to achieve nitrogen balance ratio to the specific table. So they go from the compliance conditions table to Table 4.

What Table 4 states in the Order is that these
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milestones will be used to evaluate progress towards water quality improvement. That milestone is still how we're going to measure progress. But it's not a compliance condition to achieve it.

MR. DELGADO: Is it accurate to say that targets are requirements and milestones are suggestions? Because it seems like now we're saying here's the difference between targets and milestones; whereas, earlier they were interchangeable words.

MR. BRIGGS: Mr. Chair.
MR. YOUNG: Yes.
MR. BRIGGS: I think the key thing is not so much the word target but be consistent with Table 4 which we call milestones as opposed to meet targets. And that applies -- in the heading of the table I think was compliance. So you put all that together.

MR. DELGADO: Okay. But for the purpose of understanding this on the part of the growers especially, it would be nice if they knew the difference. Because we knew the difference between targets and milestones. So if there is a policy difference, it would be nice to know that consistent policy difference.

MR. JEFFRIES: What you're inferring is that the language of milestones be consistent throughout the Order? It means the same thing?
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MR. DELGADO: Sort of. If there is a difference, let's say that targets were things that had to be met to be complaint, but milestones were time frames that were more wishy washy. Or if there was any other consistent difference, it's just important to me that the growers are able to understand.

MR. JEFFRIES: I understand and I appreciate
that. And this statement earlier in the presentation
that -- at least I understood -- that targets and milestones were interchangeable by the Staff and interpretation. Is that correct?

MS. McCANN: Maybe we need to clarify something.
This is the only indicator -- or place where we use the term target. It's a descriptor for this thing called the nutrient balance ratio. And we want it to be a milestone. First it's a condition.

MS. McCHESNEY: I think I can explain it. The difference is is that in Table 3, this is a time schedule, for example, submit your photo monitoring. So that's a specific date. So if they submit it on that date, by that date, they're in compliance. They wouldn't be subject to enforcement. Those compliance dates, the way I understand it, is that they're clearly enforceable dates. Where the milestone is, This is information provided to the Board so they can see if progress is being made, but it's not going
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to be an enforceable requirement. If they don't show progress, they're not going to be hit with enforcements. It's just, Okay. Now you need to look at more what you can do to show improvements.

Right?
MR. DELGADO: So then are targets enforceable?
MS. McCHESNEY: Target was only the word used for that thing, and there's no other use of the word target. So it goes away.

MR. DELGADO: In the Ag Order and the associated MRP, target comes up in one instance. And in that instance, it's enforceable. But otherwise target's not used, instead milestones are used.

MS. McCHESNEY: That was -- because you said yesterday that was the only -- the nitrogen target was the only enforceable thing, if that's a word.

MR. JOHNSTON: I think it was enforceable part -the implication I got was -- it was in a table labeled Conditions.

MS. McCHESNEY: Right.
MR. JOHNSTON: And we have moved it from a table labeled Conditions to a table labeled Milestones and said it will be -- we've stated specifically that you're required to -- excuse me. We said specifically that you must report progress in the direction of that.
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```
MS. McCHESNEY: Right.
MR. JOHNSTON: So we've moved it from being a condition you have to meet to something you have to progress towards.
MS. McCHESNEY: Right. And so you -- before -- I mean, the way it was originally proposed, if you didn't meet that 1 or 1.2 or other alternative that was approved by that date, you would be out of compliance.
Right?
MS. SCHROETER: That's correct.
And actually Roger said it simply before that.
The only reason to change the wording from target to milestone is that it was going to the milestone table, otherwise there wasn't really a distinction. It's compliance condition versus a milestone.
MR. DELGADO: So just to beat a dead horse, then, there's no longer the word target in any of the papers
before us as far as something you have to meet?
MS. SCHROETER: Right.
MR. DELGADO: Okay.
MS. SCHROETER: That's what we intend.
MR. BRIGGS: As long as you go to the next change, which is to make the monitoring reporting program for Tier 3 consistent.
MS. SCHROETER: Right. There's the use of the
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word target. It's the same change. It just isn't in the MRP.

So that brings me to our last edit. And that is, again -- we already started discussing this one -- that's in response to Mr. Sanchez's comment about his concerns related to small disadvantaged growers, especially those that may be non-English speaking.

We agree. We would like to prioritize those types of growers for assistance, and we would like to actually add a finding to the Order that states, The Central Coast Water Board recognizes that certain disadvantaged farmers may have difficulties to achieve compliance with this Order.

The Central Coast Water Board will prioritize assistance for these farmers, including but not limited to technical assistance, grant opportunities, and necessary flexibility to achieve compliance with this Order, (e.g.), adjusted monitoring reporting or time schedules.

So if that issue comes up, that's how we would handle it. And actually the USDA has a definition for growers called the limited resource farmer definition. And those are the types of farmers that they prioritize for assistance for equip funds and other types of grant opportunities.

MR. JEFFRIES: Angela, how is a disadvantaged Page 78
farmer going to be able to interpret this if they're non-English speaking?

MS. SCHROETER: We have increased our efforts to conduct outreach with the non-English speaking community of growers. Our latest example of doing that is working with the Chinese chrysanthemum speakers. So we're really trying to coordinate with commodity groups to identify where that need is. That's actually an example of success. We've increased enrollment in that segment of the agriculture industry where it was not there before.

MR. YOUNG: How about for Spanish speakers?
I understand that.
I just want to know what mechanism do you have right now in place should a Spanish-speaking farmer call the Board to get some help or direction? Is there someone that --

MS. SCHROETER: Right now we have two full-time
Staff who are Spanish speaking who are actually in the Ag program. It is standard now for all of our letters to have the language on top of the letter that states, "If you need Spanish translation or Spanish assistance to call the numbers of those Staff. We've also held I think three or four Spanish-speaking workshops throughout the region north and south.

MR. YOUNG: Have they been attended.

MS. SCHROETER: They have been. Monica can correct me if I'm wrong, but I think those have been the most well attended is with those grower groups.

MR. YOUNG: Has anyone called to speak to our Spanish-speaking Staff?

MS. SCHROETER: Yes, all the time.
MR. JEFFRIES: I'm sure there's going to be some of those folks who are going to fall through the cracks. And I think that's some of the folks that Mr. Sanchez was referring to that are afraid to step forward for one reason or another and to ask or even inquire what they're supposed to do.

So that's -- and I don't want to speak for him, but that's what I took from some of his comments, that there's folks out there that are farming, whatever type of farming they're doing, haven't attended any of these workshops. And now they're afraid that there's going to be some Order which means some kind of liability to them, and that they don't understand.

Is the form also in Spanish and Chinese.
MS. SCHROETER: All of our electronic Notice of Intent forms are all in Spanish. They've all been distributed to the commodity groups, where there are Spanish-speaking growers that we know of. For example, the Alba Group. That's just one example as well as the Page 80
local farm bureaus. For example, the Cachuma RCD, we've worked with them to distribute our documents in Spanish. We hear the concern, and our intent is to provide a higher level of assistance and prioritize assistance for those farmers.

MR. JEFFRIES: I realize that we can't cover all bases. But eventually I'm sure we'll discover those folks as they --

MR. YOUNG: As they pop up.
MR. JEFFRIES: -- as they pop up.
MS. SCHROETER: Many of them are already
enrolled. So I don't want to leave you with the
impression that those types of groups are
under-represented. They actually are very well
represented. I'm sure that we don't have all of them. But they check a box on the Notice of Intent which states what language is their speaking preference, and there are many non-English speaking growers.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Delgado.
MR. DELGADO: Yes.
I thought I heard you say that the USDA
definition is for something slightly differently worded than disadvantaged farmers. If that's true, why don't we call it what they call it. Dollars.

MS. SCHROETER: That was a lay edit. We were
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trying to find the actual language. That was my recalling
of what a definition was. But yes, you're --
    MR. DELGADO: So what were those two words
instead of disadvantaged farmers?
    MS. SCHROETER: It's called limit resource
farmer.
    MR. DELGADO: Limited resource farmer, CUSDA
definition. Is that your preferred language at this
point.
    MS. SCHROETER: That was just a reminder to me to
look at that definition so we can strike out the CUSDA.
    MR. DELGADO: I like the CUSDA definition because
then everybody knows that it exists
    MS. SCHROETER: Okay. Perfect.
    MR. DELGADO: And then my other question on this
was, if I was a Caucasian grower, I might feel slighted
that grants and technical assistance opportunities would
be prioritized for somebody else. I just want to make
sure that that's both legal and fair in your mind.
    MS. SCHROETER: Actually it was very difficult
for us to articulate what disadvantaged means, which is
why we are relying upon an existing definition. The
existing definition actually doesn't specify language,
ethnicity, anything like that. It's based upon the
standard practice of looking at median household income
```

Page 82
and other indicators.

MR. BRIGGS: Needs based
MS. SCHROETER: Needs based
MS. McCHESNEY: Right. And it specifically says that they can't discriminate based on race, color, nation of origin, all that stuff.

MR. DELGADO: But they can discriminate in a way based upon socioeconomic status. That's -- what you're telling us is legal?

MS. McCHESNEY: The IACT authorizes the secretary to set aside five percent of available equipped funds and CSB acres for socially disadvantaged farmers or ranchers.

MR. YOUNG: Speak up.
MR. DELGADO: Socialize disadvantaged. So those are different words than --

MS. McCHESNEY: The beginning of it refers to limited resource farmers or ranchers. I mean, it's a federal law that deals with limited resource farmers or ranchers and then provides a certain percentage of funds for a certain limited resource and beginning farmers or ranchers, et cetera.

MR. DELGADO: Okay. That sounds more fair. If I was a higher income ranch grower that was having trouble implementing this, that there might be 95 percent of the money still available for people like me and five percent
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is set aside for people that are in a lower socioeconomic status than I?

MS. McCHESNEY: Correct. That's what it appears, yeah.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Jordan.
MR. JORDAN: Actually I want to back up a couple squares if everybody's done with that subject.

MR. YOUNG: Okay.
MR. JORDAN: Angela, could you tell me quickly, going back up to the top on the nitrate dates changes. Just a couple sentences. What the difference is between developing irrigation and nutrients management program and submitting the elements? What does that mean?

MS. SCHROETER: We require them to develop a plan.

MR. JORDAN: Right.
MS. SCHROETER: The irrigation management plan, and we also require them to report specific elements.

MR. JORDAN: You're proposing, then, to eliminate the first part of that and just give them a window to submit; right?

MS. SCHROETER: What we are proposing to do is to eliminate the date specified for developing the plan. They still have to develop the plan.

MR. JORDAN: Correct.
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MS. SCHROETER: Right.
MR. JORDAN: There's just no intermediary milestone timeline target.

MS. SCHROETER: That's correct. It provides full flexibility as to when to develop that plan.

MR. JORDAN: That only applies to a subset of Tier 3; right?

MS. SCHROETER: That's correct. It only would apply to a subset of the Tier 3 farms, approximately, if I can recall from yesterday, 61.

MR. JORDAN: That subset was developed specifically to recognize a higher risk even within Tier 3; correct?

MS. SCHROETER: That is correct.
MR. JORDAN: It seems like a significant giveback. I'm wondering what discussions took place on that issue.

MS. SCHROETER: It is a very significant compromise, correct.

MR. JORDAN: Would you like to share any discussions that were -- well, here's my point, then you can decide. If Staff is willing to give that back, okay. But the particular line where it talks about the strikeout of must meet and is replaced with must report progress towards, that, to me, is a historical line that should be
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remembered in three years when you start to work on the next Order. Because that's indicative right there that if conditions continue to worsen that that was clearly a point of giveback for consideration at this point. And that it could have been worse at this time.
Does that make sense? Or it could have been more stringent at this time? Worse is probably not the right word.
MR. THOMAS: It does, yes. I agree. The conversation that we had about it, we go round and round about whether we should or shouldn't reduce these requirements further or extend these due dates further. And in the interest of promoting this coalition effort, we said what can we change in the Order that would promote it and would allow for opportunity and time for people to do that.
We didn't want to -- correct me if I'm wrong here, Angela. We didn't want to set up a situation where people were trying to do both, working on the requirements in the Order and trying to set up a coalition or trying to meet requirements of a coalition at the same time. So we wanted to give space to develop that coalition process.
MR. JORDAN: It seems to me to be a huge carrot you're dangling out there. Obviously we went by it really quick, and I'm surprised that nobody had any opinions on
```
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it. But it would also seem to put the ball in the other party's court, and they better do something with that ball that leads to results or else the next time you look at this, the language reverts back to a more stringent language. Just my two cents.

MR. YOUNG: What more does Staff have for us?
MS. SCHROETER: Those are all of the suggested changes and some other discussion.

MR. YOUNG: Okay. Any other rebuttal for Staff?
Any other comments to us on anything else you've heard?
MR. THOMAS: There were other issues that came up yesterday. So what we would -- instead of -- let me back up here. So instead of going into the issues that came up and rebutting, we're willing to just let it go and go to our final recommendation.

I would request, though, that we be allowed to -if we could take a 5- or 10-minute break so we can talk to the Executive Officer and formulate our final recommendation.

MR. YOUNG: Okay. Mr. Johnston.
MR. JOHNSTON: Before we do that and presumably after the final recommendation, we're going to circle back around and talk about as a policy, as well as a legal matter, if and how we want to approach the stuff that was given to us yesterday.

I have a couple of minor things I'd like to run by Staff that came out of comments. And I don't have something printed on this, but it's pretty simple. This first one, in the Order on Page 7, Paragraph 27. I had it a minute ago. The way that paragraph reads right now, Landowners and operators of irrigated lands who obtain a pesticide use permit from a local County agricultural commissioner may have a discharge of waste that could affect surface water and groundwater and therefore must submit to the Central Coast Water Board a completed electronic Notice of Intent to comply with the conditions of this Order to comply with the Water Code.

What that basically says is, if you obtain a pesticide use permit, whether there's any surface water or even whether you're irrigating or not, you must file a Notice of Intent. It seems like -- here's my proposed changes to that. I just want you guys to consider -- if you need to talk about them when you're talking with the Executive Officer, that's fine.

MR. YOUNG: Hold on. I think before you get to there, this is conditioned upon it being irrigated lands, which would mean that someone has to be irrigating Ag.

MR. JOHNSTON: Correct.
MR. YOUNG: That's a precondition.
MR. JOHNSTON: Let me just tell you what my Page 88
proposed change and Staff can talk about it and they can see what they think. I want to remove the word "may" in the second line after agricultural commissioner and add the words "and that." I want to -- after surface water and before groundwater -- replace the word "and" with the word "or" and strike the words "and therefore."

Then it would read, Landowners and operators of irrigated lands who obtain a pesticide use permit from a County agricultural commissioner and that have a discharge of waste that could affect surface water or groundwater must submit to the Central Coast Water Board a completed Notice of Intent, yada, yada, yada. Talk about that.

The second thing that was raised in comments yesterday and that I didn't hear a response to and I would just like to get Staffs' take on it. It was raised in comments that some piece of the -- I believe it's the irrigation plan has to be prepared by a certified crop advisor with a certificate in hydrology. There was a certified crop advisor who spoke and said, "You know, that's a really high bar and almost nobody has that."

MR. THOMAS: It's gone.
MR. JOHNSTON: Oh, it's gone?
MR. YOUNG: Yeah.
MR. JOHNSTON: Okay. Thank you.
MR. JEFFRIES: It was stricken.
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MR. THOMAS: We said earlier that we were removing it.
MR. JOHNSTON: I missed that.
MS. SCHROETER: Actually, you're correct. We heard that also and intended to strike that. We intended to strike it with the one about collecting groundwater samples. We did that one, but we had intended to strike out the language also that said CCA with a hydrology certificate.
MR. JOHNSTON: Okay. Thank you.
MR. BRIGGS: One more thing, Mr. Chair
MR. YOUNG: Yes.
MR. BRIGGS: You should also mention that in the original Staff report, we recommended changes which had to do with -- mostly administrative. Had to do with the fact that the hearing has been delayed, so it changed a lot of dates. Some of those may be superceded by changes you just went over. And then didn't we have another supplemental sheet?
MS. McCHESNEY: Yes.
MR. BRIGGS: I mean the one besides --
MR. DELGADO: Chair, I have a small request for an edit.
MR. YOUNG: A what?
MR. DELGADO: A small request for an edit.
```
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MR. BRIGGS: Before we do that, though, let's
just -- I want to make sure that --
MS. McCHESNEY: Here it is.
MR. BRIGGS: Yes, this one.
MR. YOUNG: Prepared March 6th.
MR. BRIGGS: Have you got that handy?
MS. SCHROETER: I don't have it with me. It should be in the Board member folders.

MR. YOUNG: It is.
MS. McCHESNEY: It's in our blue folders.
MR. DELGADO: Was the subject the minutes?
MR. JOHNSTON: Is it yellow?
MR. YOUNG: Yes.
MS. HUNTER: Was it Item Number 8?
MR. YOUNG: No, Item Number Four. It's a single page.

MR. DELGADO: So proposed revisions. Is that the one?

MR. YOUNG: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: Page 6 and 12?
It was in our little blue Peechee folder.
MR. BRIGGS: It may have gotten lost in the shuffle.

MR. THOMAS: Does anyone need a copy?
MR. JOHNSTON: I need a copy.

```
MR. BRIGGS: I think we can share here.
MR. JEFFRIES: I don't have one
MS. McCHESNEY: Here, you can take mine. If you
need a copy, make a copy.
    MR. BRIGGS: I just want to make sure we've got
all the pieces.
    Okay, Mr. Chair.
    MR. YOUNG: What's the question that's pending?
    MS. McCHESNEY: Bruce had a question.
    MR. DELGADO: Mine was in the additional findings
that is Attachment 1B on Page 6, finding Number 20,
regarding NPS policy. It's actually 1B, Page 6, the 20th
additional finding.
    MR. YOUNG: What's the edit change?
    MR. DELGADO: It has the words, "never may." So
the sentence reads, Management practice implementation
never may be a substitute for meeting water quality
requirements.
MS. McCHESNEY: Instead of may never.
MR. DELGADO: Instead of may never, or I would prefer it to say is not necessarily a substitute for meeting quality water requirements.
MS. McCHESNEY: And the language is from the Non Point Source Policy, but I don't think it's an exact quote. So I would recommend that we say what's in the Non
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Point Source Policy so I can check what it actually says to make sure it's an accurate -- I don't think it says
"never may," so I'll --
    MR. DELGADO: It could say may never, or it could
say something else.
MS. McCHESNEY: Right. So I'll check it.
MR. DELGADO: Thank you.
MR. YOUNG: We're going to take a break, right,
for about }10\mathrm{ minutes?
(Recess taken.)
MR. YOUNG: Okay, folks. We're going to resume
our meeting.
    We are at the point where we heard from Staff.
And the Board is now at the point where it can begin to
deliberate.
    MS. McCHESNEY: No. Recommendations, Roger's.
    MR. JORDAN: Roger's got something.
    MR. JOHNSTON: All roads lead to Roger.
    MR. YOUNG: Yes. But -- and actually before
that --
    MR. JORDAN: You mean comments from the Board
members?
    MR. YOUNG: Comments from Board members, is what
I meant. We're at the point where it's in the Board's
hands. We're still going to hear from Roger on any kind
```
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of final recommendation before we actually consider what
to do.
But, Mr. Johnston, did you have anything at this point? I thought maybe, or not, or wait --
MR. JOHNSTON: I gather you're aware,
Mr. Chairman, because it was shared with you, although none of the other Board members, is I have worked with the Executive Officer and counsel over the last week or two on a couple of different pieces of language. And the principal stuff in there is -- well, three different things, really.
One of them deals with a coalition monitoring of groundwater. And the other two deal with setting up a little more defined process for third party groups to come to make proposals to the Executive Officer and a technical advisory committee to review and make recommendations on the acceptability of those proposals.
And my thought on that language, frankly, is that we, as a Board, should decide which of two roads we want to go down. And one road is to work -- to look at the stuff that Ag presented yesterday. And to take point by point by point each of the policy issues on Staffs' con slide. And each of the legal issues on that slide. And resolve them, modify the Ag Order -- excuse me -- the Ag Alternative that was proposed yesterday. And see if we
```
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can come up with something that we wish to adopt. And I think if we're not interested in doing that and instead we want to simply kick down the road to the Executive Officer and a technical advisory committee the question of the details of how third party alternatives would work, then I would propose that language.

But I think, at least in the way I'm looking at it, kind of the first step would be for us as a Board to -- I guess polling ourselves or something to decide how much interest there is in trying to work through what Ag proposed and use it as a base. I want to come out with an Order today no matter what. I don't --

MR. YOUNG: Right. The question you're posing is for each of us to respond to are the changes Staff has just given us in response to Tess Dunham's presentation acceptable as a path to go down, or would you prefer that we go back and revisit the cons and try to take each of those and tweak the Ag Alternative to meet -- no.

MR. JOHNSTON: I wouldn't put the question quite that way.

MR. YOUNG: Okay.
MR. JOHNSTON: I think the changes that Staff has proposed sort of stand on their own. And most, if not all, of them actually made sense to me. I think that the followup question to that, though, is: Do we as a

Board -- I think --
MR. YOUNG: Let's put those up, if we can, since we're talking about, those cons.

MR. JOHNSTON: Put the cons up?
MR. YOUNG: Put the cons up so we've got something to look at.
(Discussion held off the record.)
MR. JOHNSTON: I suspect -- I don't want to speak for anyone else on this Board --

MR. YOUNG: Right
MR. JOHNSTON: -- but I suspect that there would be general consensus on the pros that are up on the slide that we're looking at right now. That there certainly are some advantages to the ideas however un-fleshed out they are. And whatever failings they may have, either in policy terms or in legal terms, that there are some advantages to the pros on here and those ideas.

And I think that the question that we as a Board face is -- I suspect there's general consensus on that on this Board. That's just my sense from our -- from our public discussion.

I think the question we as a Board face is: What's the best way to capture those pros in an Order that we can pass. And one alternative is to -- I'm not saying this would involve rejecting the edits that Staff has Page 96
proposed. But Staff has made a very clear recommendation that we don't really go past those edits and use what Ag presented as any sort of a framework for how third party coalitions could be formed and participate and provide some alternatives

I think one alternative for us as a Board is to say: Let's take that framework, let's --

Can you give me the next slide.
I take very seriously everything on that list. I don't think that Staff is raising any of this to be obstructive. They're all of the policy issues, which is really everything except the last three points. I think we need to seriously talk about it, I think we need to decide as a Board issue by issue do we agree with Staff on it? Does that require us, if we're going to use the Ag Proposal as a framework to make changes in that proposal?

When we get to the last three, I think we need to look at the legal questions, as well, and say what do we need to do to change in that proposal if we're going to use it as a framework to comply with the law in our Order. That's one alternative. And it's certainly the more labor intensive one. I want to go home tonight.

MR. BRIGGS: Mr. Chair.
MR. YOUNG: Yes.
MR. BRIGGS: To that point, may I say

## A6028BE

## HEARING MARCH 15, 2012

something --
MR. YOUNG: Yes.
MR. BRIGGS: -- that I was going to say in the concluding remarks. I think it might be helpful in not having to go such a labor-intensive route. And that is that I don't think you need to resolve all the cons that are listed there. But I think you can realize the pros, the advantages that were listed on the previous slide. And that's because Part E can be developed as an alternative.

Right now it's kind of a cloud. It's a moving cloud. It can be developed as a proposal. And within the framework that we have provided here, plus all the changes that we've added to encourage this flexibility, it can come back as a proposal for E.O. consideration. And if the E.O., whether it's me or somebody else, disagrees, they can come to the Board -- and come back to the Board.
That's what we've been trying to get to in terms of a lot
of the changes that we've been making to our proposal to
not only allow that but to encourage that kind of approach.

We've made significant changes to the Order to
support that kind of alternative development. Without the
Order in place, however, we won't have the incentives to
do that. We will have incentives to continue to debate
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and to argue without making progress.
In trying to assist with that question, I think
you framed the question really well, but I think that's a
really reasonable route for the Board to take is to adopt the Order with the flexibility that we built into it to encourage something like Part E to come back to the Board.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Jordan.
MR. JORDAN: To that end, I guess, I'll ask my question again to Mr. Briggs

In the result of all the edits we saw today in the existing Order, wouldn't it be your opinion that the cons are already envisioned within the wording of the existing Order and the process you just described of coming back with the proposal is already existing in the existing Order as we discussed today?

MR. BRIGGS: I'm not sure I understood your question. I'm sorry.

MR. JORDAN: Let me try again.
We added a bunch of edits today that were the result today of public comment and proposals.

MR. BRIGGS: Right.
MR. JORDAN: There were some other edits that
Staff added that both strengthened language and were
givebacks as a result of comments yesterday. The
inclusion of the full proposal of Section E as brought by
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the Ag group, at this time is not being -- at this time is not part of Staffs' recommendation into the Order.

MR. BRIGGS: Correct.
MR. JORDAN: But both the list of cons that are up there and the possible inclusion of other segments of the proposed Section E are contemplated within that end product of the Order as we have it right now.

MR. BRIGGS: Where I'm not following you is that we're not including the list of cons.

MR. JORDAN: I'm saying they're already in the existing Order.

MR. YOUNG: In terms of they're addressed.
MR. JORDAN: Correct.
MR. YOUNG: They're addressed.
MR. BRIGGS: Okay. That's why I wasn't following you.

MR. JORDAN: I'm saying those issues that are cons have been recognized and addressed in the existing wording of the Order.

Is that a fair statement?
MR. BRIGGS: Yes.
MR. YOUNG: Yes.
MR. JORDAN: I also -- my experience is, when this can move up the food chain is to look to policy and look to law and look to goals and not get too involved in
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the last three lines on the cons list that have to do with my legal interpretation of the issue.

Somebody else is going to get to chew on that another day. And I'd be happy to offer my two cents as a reminder to my peers of what the goal of this particular body are. I think you guys all know them, so I don't need to read them out. That's what I think the focus should be on. Are we moving toward those goals consistent within the policy and law. And can we say that the Order meets that criteria at the end of the day, whether it can be legally challenged or not is somebody else's fight another day. It's not my fight today.

So, thanks.
MR. YOUNG: To that end, I am not in favor of going through the con list and trying to work that in terms of the Ag Alternative. I am in favor of taking the language that I saw that you worked on, I think that that has merit. And I'd like to see that offered up and brought into the recommendation.

MR. JOHNSTON: How about this? I think ultimately what we need to do is kind of just decide between one of those two approaches.

MR. YOUNG: Right.
MR. JOHNSTON: I'm perfectly happy to put that language out now, and we can have a sense of alternatives,
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Attachment 1. It's the Order itself. It's Attachment 1.
MS. SCHROETER: We're making copies for you.
MR. JOHNSTON: Should we just wait for the
copies? Would that be easier?
MR. YOUNG: Yeah.
MR. JOHNSTON: That's awfully tiny to read.
MR. YOUNG: I think we need to make more than just for the Board would be helpful.

MR. JOHNSTON: I would point out that because
this is done in red and black rather than underline strikeout, hopefully the copies will be readable if they're done on a monochrome printer.

MR. DELGADO: Just to get going, can we enlarge the --

MR. JOHNSTON: Sure. We can go there.
MR. DELGADO: Can we enlarge the font, is what I'm suggesting

MR. BRIGGS: Enlarge the font.
MR. JOHNSTON: Not zoom in, but change the font.
(Discussion held off the record.)
MR. JOHNSTON: So this is language regarding encouraging Dischargers to coordinate, and we include cooperative monitoring and reporting efforts. And my intention with the word reporting is not just reporting results. I take it back. It is reporting results.

Excuse me.
Cooperative monitoring and reporting efforts.
And then if you go down, we add, in cases where cooperative water quality improvement efforts were local or regional treatment strategies, and we add in coordinated by a third party group. Example, watershed group, water quality coalition, or other similar cooperative effort, or by a group of Dischargers, necessitate alternative water quality monitoring or a Ionger time schedule to achieve compliance. The Dischargers can request a different schedule.

And then we go on down to, Dischargers may submit an alternative water quality monitoring and reporting plan. And there's some language that we'll get to in the next section as to why reporting is in there.

Then it says groups of Dischargers, added language, and/or third party groups. Example, a watershed group or water quality coalition may submit to the Executive Officer for approval of alternative water quality monitoring and reporting programs. An alternative water quality monitoring and reporting program must include collection of data that will provide indicators of water quality improvement or pollution load reduction. And aggregate monitoring and reporting must be on a scale sufficient to track progress in small sub basins and be Page 104
sufficiently representative of conditions.
Aggregate monitoring may apply to surface and groundwater. The Executive Officer will evaluate the alternative monitoring and reporting programs on a case-by-case basis considering the potential effectiveness of the aggregate or alternative monitoring. Example, request to conduct aggregate monitoring for a certain time frame to give new practices or treatment time to maximize effectiveness and other factors such as whether the farms are currently significantly contributing to impaired surface water or groundwater, with drinking water wells, or whether farms are in compliance with other provisions such as enrollment or submittal of annual compliance information.

Dischargers who participate in an alternative monitoring and reporting programs maintain individual responsibility to comply with the Order's provisions. And there's just a couple more changes in this, if you go down to the next paragraph

MR. YOUNG: It does say the word conditions, not provisions.

MR. JEFFRIES: Yeah, conditions.
MR. YOUNG: Mike, is that --
MR. JEFFRIES: The word up on the screen was conditions. You said provisions.

Page 105

## A6028BE

## HEARING MARCH 15, 2012

MR. JOHNSTON: It says conditions. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: Yes.
MR. JOHNSTON: Dischargers may continue to implement the alternative treatment or monitoring programs approved, and Dischargers may seek review of E.O. decisions by the Water Board.

Let me explain my intent with this. The Order requires basically every farm to do at least one round of groundwater monitoring. And besides the concern that has been expressed by growers around potential liability and other issues regarding disclosing individual results, which has been somewhat dealt with by blurring both the location and identity of the farm the well's on.

The question I was raising was, it seems like we need the monitoring to get a good baseline picture of what's going on in the groundwater. And I think that's a mutual interest with agriculture. We don't necessarily, in every situation, need every well. And there's a cost involved in this.

And so the concept here is, if you can do monitoring in the sub watershed that's on a fine enough scale geographically -- and that's both north, south, east, west and up/down geographically to get the picture we need, we maybe don't need data from all the wells.

I was looking at this as a potential cost savings
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to be able to get aggregate results on a fine enough scale that it's useful to us and to the affected farmers, frankly. And we may well be able to do that with fewer -with less sampling of wells, or for that matter, there are going to be surface water situations where this is applicable, as well.

MR. YOUNG: Why don't you go through the other --
MR. JOHNSTON: Yeah. Let me go through the others.

Page 13, Condition 10, that is -- we're on into the -- this is the language that already talks about how Dischargers can comply with the Order by participating in different kinds of groups or cooperative efforts. What was added in here is the language including implementing water quality improvement projects and then it references the MRPs.

Because, we're providing below, an alternative way to do the monitoring. We're saying, or the alternative monitoring and reporting programs as provided in Condition 11 below. And Condition 11 is a new condition. And what -- you want to page down past -since we're already on this page, we can come back to 72 and 73. Actually, let's go back up.

72 and 73 are from the Tier 3 MRP. And we're just adding, or alternative monitoring and reporting
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programs as set forth in Finding 11 and Condition 11.
That's just enabling language for what's happening in the new Condition 11.

MR. JEFFRIES: Is that date still good,
October 1st of '12?
MR. JOHNSTON: That date may not be good.
MR. DELGADO: Whatever the date is --
MR. JOHNSTON: Whatever the date is it is.
MR. DELGADO: We've already agreed on it as a change.

MR. JOHNSTON: We've talked about. We haven't voted on anything.

MR. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman and Mr. Johnston.
MR. YOUNG: Yes.
MR. THOMAS: I'm sorry I interrupted you.
Backing up, it says here, Dischargers may comply with this Order by participating in third party groups.
And at the end of that sentence, it says, approved by the Central Coast Water Board. The direction you're going in would be -- that would have to be changed to, approved by the Executive Officer.

MR. JOHNSTON: I would -- yeah. I would say by the Central Coast Water Board or the Executive Officer. There is an appeal from the Executive Officer in the thing I'm about to get to.

Page 108

MR. THOMAS: The way this is set up, it would have to come back to you.

MR. JOHNSTON: I understand. So I would say approved by the Executive Officer or the Central Coast Water Board because what we've got down -- the next thing we're going to go through is the process of getting approval for third party groups. And it goes to the Executive Officer, and it's appealable to the Central -- a decision -- a denial by the Executive Officer is appealable to the Board. So I would assume we would want to put them both in there.

Thank you for catching that, Mike.
MR. DELGADO: So it would be and/or? It would be the Executive Officer and/or?

MR. JOHNSTON: And/or, yes. No, the Executive Officer or.

MR. DELGADO: Or.
MR. JOHNSTON: Because it may well not come to the Central Coast Water Quality Board at all. The Executive Officer approves it, they're not going to appeal it. It's not going to come to us.

So let's go down to the new Condition 11. This is all new language. And basically the point of this is
to set up some criteria for third party groups, to set up a process to evaluate proposals for third party groups
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involving a technical advisory committee, and to set up --
which then makes a recommendation to the Executive
Officer, and then to set up a process where an Executive
Officer denial is appealable to the Board.
    Do I need to read this whole thing?
    MS. HUNTER: Yes.
    MR. JOHNSTON: I can read it.
    Did people get copies yet?
    MR. YOUNG: Yes.
    MR. JOHNSTON: All of what's in Condition 11,
while it's not bolded, it's all new language.
    MR. YOUNG: Right.
    MR. JOHNSTON: The entire condition is new. It
would renumber the Condition 11 that follows to
Condition 12 and everything down below it.
    And it reads as follows: Dischargers may form
third party groups to develop and implement alternative
water quality management practices, i.e., group projects
or cooperative monitoring and reporting programs to comply
with this Order. At the discretion of the Executive
Officer, Dischargers that are a participant in a third
party group that implements Executive Officer approved
water quality improvements projects or Executive Officer
approved alternative monitoring and reporting programs may
be moved to a lower Tier. Example, Tier }3\mathrm{ to Tier 2, or
```
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Tier 2 to Tier 1, and/or provided alternative project specific timelines and milestones

To be subject to tier changes or alternative timelines, projects will be evaluated for, among other elements, project description. The description must include identification of participant's methods and schedule for implementation

Purpose. Proposal must state desired outcome for goals of the projects. Example, pollutants to be addressed, the amount of pollutant load to be reduced, water quality improvement expected.

Scale. Solutions must be scaled to address impairment

Chance of success. Projects must demonstrate a reasonable chance of eliminating toxicity within the permit term, five years, or reducing discharge of nutrients to surface and groundwater, long-term solutions and contingencies. Proposals must address what new actions will be taken if the project does not meet goals and how the project will be sustained through time.

Accountability. Proposals must set milestones
that indicate progress towards goals stated as above in purpose.

Monitoring and reporting. Description of monitoring and measuring methods and information to be

Page 11
provided to the Water Board. Monitoring points must be representative but may not always be at the edge of farms so long as monitoring result demonstrate water quality improvement and the efficacy of a project.

In addition, monitoring must, one, characterize and be representative of discharge to receiving water Two, demonstrate project effectiveness. Three, and verify progress towards water quality improvement and waste water production.

Project proposals will evaluated by a technical advisory committee comprised of two researchers or academics skilled in agricultural practices and/or water quality, one farm advisor NRCS or RCD, one grower representative, one environmental representative, one environmental justice or environmental health representative, and one regional Board Staff.

The TAC must have a minimum of five members to evaluate project proposals and make recommendations to the Executive Officer. The Executive Officer has discretion to approve any project after receiving project evaluation results and recommendations from the committee

If the Executive Officer denies approval, the third party group may seek review by the regional Board. As stated in the NPS policy, management practice implementation is not a substitute for compliance with
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water quality requirements. If the project is not effective in achieving Water Quality Standards, additional management practices by individual Dischargers or third party groups will be necessary

The point of this is to -- is to -- if we choose not to use the Ag Proposal as a framework and give -- make a set of decisions today on a detailed program to give a framework within which such proposals can be brought to the Board -- or excuse me -- can be brought to the Executive Officer after evaluation by a technical advisory committee -- and we know that the technical advisory committee, back before this process became so polarized, was a functional group that got some stuff done. And my hope in proposing this is that it would provide some balanced way to evaluate stuff, provide input to the Executive Officer and to the Board as well stuff that's appealed to the Board.

MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I think what you've done is taken what Staff has always said was achievable as part of what they have been proposing, and essentially put down in writing what it might look like, and make that part of what we're going to incorporate in the Order and the Monitoring Program.

So how much of this did you write?
MR. JOHNSTON: About half.
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MR. YOUNG: Good. It's great.
MR. BRIGGS: Mr. Chair.
MR. YOUNG: Yes.
MR. BRIGGS: Mr. Johnston asked --
MR. JOHNSTON: In answer to your question about what I wrote, this was a back and forth between --
MR. YOUNG: I understand.
MR. JOHNSTON: -- myself, Roger, Frances. And I would imagine that Roger was consulting other Staff on it.
MR. YOUNG: Right.
Is this acceptable to Staff?
MR. BRIGGS: That was the reason Mr. Johnston wanted to vet it instead of dropping it here was to see if it would be acceptable. Mr. Johnston asked me to help flesh out some ideas for a technical advisory committee But I wanted just one -- I think it's a typo type of admission. In the last paragraph that you just referred to, the second line, that parenthetical -- I think my intent was for that to be an, e.g., for example NRCS, or RCD. And we should spell that out, too, instead of using acronyms.
MR. DELGADO: Can I ask a specific question?
MR. YOUNG: Yes.
MR. DELGADO: On New Condition 11, all new
language, there's about seven black dot bullets. And the
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fourth bullet is Chance of Success. It says, must demonstrate reasonable chance of eliminating toxicity within the permit term of five years. And I just wondered if you meant to say eliminate toxicity or more realistically would substantially reduce or reduce or something?

MR. JOHNSTON: It says, within the permit term or unless this got -- let me compare.

MR. YOUNG: The first part deals with toxicity; the second part deals with nutrients

MR. JOHNSTON: Right.
MR. DELGADO: Toxicity theoretically could remain high, low, or medium. But then if you reduced nitrates to surface and to the groundwater, the toxicity would be let lie.

MR. JOHNSTON: What it says is, if these are the -- it says that it has to demonstrate a reasonable chance of eliminating toxicity within the five years, which is a goal of this, or reducing the nutrients.
Everybody knows we're not going to eliminate those nutrients in five years. That's no secret.

Go ahead, Roger. You look like you're about to jump --

MR. BRIGGS: I was going to point out that there could very well be projects -- most likely will be
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projects that are geared towards one or the other. You're
likely to not have the perfect silver bullet for both toxicity and nutrients.

So, for example, the wood chip, pretty simple technology that can be pretty effective with nitrates, but it's not really targeting toxicity.

MR. JOHNSTON: So what could fit within this framework is a variety of things, from something like what Ag was proposing, which was a large scale coalition across -- I would suspect they were looking at across multiple growing areas, multiple crops that could fit within this. But what could also fit within this is a much more limited scale project that's addressing -- maybe not even addressing every issue in the Order, but addressing certain issues in the Order.

It may be that such -- now, the Ag Proposal calls for -- participation in that proposal brings you to Tier 1. This says it can drop you down Tier 3 to Tier 2, Tier 2 to Tier 1 . So it could be that this is a very limited scope project that tries to accomplish one thing, and it moves you from Tier 3 to Tier 2. There's the ability to propose a lot of different kinds of projects in here.

MR. YOUNG: Okay
MR. JEFFRIES: Good job.
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MR. YOUNG: Good job. All right
So what would we like to do? Do you want to have a motion put on the table? Is there more discussion needed?

Dr. Hunter.
MS. HUNTER: Well, I do appreciate this last conceptual and also very well-defined and spelled-out opportunity to open the door to the intent New Part E. So I really appreciate that language, and I believe -- and I'm glad to know that there was time for Staff and Mr. Briggs and Frances McChesney to also consider the language. Knowing that, I would like to propose that we accept those suggest revisions wholesale.

With that in mind, I would like to move the motion to approve. So unless others have anything they want to add to that.

Mr. Johnston.
MR. YOUNG: As part of your motion, are you incorporating the Staffs' recommendation?

MS. HUNTER: Why don't I go ahead and make the motion.

MR. JORDAN: Okay.
MS. HUNTER: I want to move to approve the renewal of the Conditional Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements for discharge from irrigated lands, which is
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Order Number R3-2012-0011. And that's the revisions listed by Staff and reviewed by the Board today, as well as the changes in language noted by Ms. McChesney to insert specific language that is consistent with language in the Non Point Source Policy. And that the revisions to the Order -- pardon me -- and that revisions to the Order with noted corrections submitted by Mr. Johnston be incorporated into the final language of the Order.
So I'm proposing that the motion to approve include all of the Staff edits that we reviewed and discussed today, that Ms. McChesney's noted consistency with Non Point Source Policy, and then your printed and written out, submitted revisions that we just reviewed, that all of those changes be incorporated into the permit and that we ask Mr. Briggs to oversee the final revisions to ensure accuracy and that they be taken from the record.
MS. McCHESNEY: Can I just add one more thing?
MR. YOUNG: Yes.
MS. HUNTER: Yes.
MS. McCHESNEY: I did check the Non Point Source Policy and the quote is actually accurate from the policy.
MR. JEFFRIES: That's good.
MS. McCHESNEY: The second thing is that the
Staff had agreed that the Order part of the Order number
46 that referred to the authority to issue Orders and
```

Page 118
require groundwater stuff would be moved into a finding instead of in the Order part, which would be Number 46. That wasn't specifically included in the Staffs' proposal.

MS. HUNTER: We would want to include that correction, as well -- or that revision?

MS. McCHESNEY: It's Page 21 of the Order, and it's Number 46 would be moved to a finding. I don't know what finding number, but that's okay.

MR. YOUNG: Okay.
MS. McCHESNEY: And then Roger did have something he does need to add. Right?

MR. BRIGGS: I think you actually covered a
couple of logistics things because you said all edits that
we discussed today, which includes the two -- the changes in the Staff report as well as the supplemental sheet that was in your folders, we want to point out that this item -- consideration of this item includes the entire record for this matter.

MS. McCHESNEY: Right. From -- the 2004 adoption until today including all the written comments, Staff reports, audios, and everything else.

MR. BRIGGS: I also want to point out that I think with the motion it would be a good idea to direct me to have Staff monitor the implementation of this Order. And after a quarter, perhaps four months, something like
that, "agendize" a status report for the Board so that you can see how things are going. Others would have a chance to address you in terms of how things are going and at probably some regular intervals after that.

I do think that from my perspective of having worked on a lot of contentious issues in a few decades here that in 6 months --3 months, 6 months, whenever, that you will probably look back and say, gee, what was all the fuss about? Because we've prompted management practices that are more effective. We've acquired some accountability for those. And we're on the road to improvements.

When you consider that perspective, if you can find yourself to accept that, and you weigh that against the urgency of acting in the face of severe toxicity problems we have throughout the region, as we discussed over and over again, and severe public health threats that are unprecedented in their scope in this region, unprecedented in this region's history, it's clear to me now is the time to act on this motion.

MS. McCHESNEY: I want to make sure your motion includes a certification of the subsequent EIR -- right -include certification of the subsequent EIR that's part of the Staffs' --

MR. THOMAS: It's on the screen.
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MS. McCANN: Okay. Good.
MR. THOMAS: Also the MRP.
MS. McCHESNEY: Also I wanted to clarify that yesterday there were quite a few slide presentations that included slides about the report that came out on Tuesday. And I want to make clear that the record does not include those slides that were -- the record generally includes the slide -- it includes the slide presentations, but we'll specifically delete those slides that had anything to do with that.

MR. YOUNG: Which report? Can you be more clear.
MS. McCHESNEY: The -- I -- what's the --
MS. HUNTER: Davis --
MR. THOMAS: The U.C. Davis Harter SBX2 Report.
MR. YOUNG: I just want to make sure the record is clear.

MS. McCHESNEY: And I made a list of those slide numbers and presentations to be sure that Staff --

MR. YOUNG: Okay.
MS. McCANN: -- excludes those from the record.
And then the other thing to clarify is that the
record -- it starts with the 2004 Order and goes through today. There are some things that may be necessary preceding 2004 in order to make the record complete. For example, with respect to CEQA. But generally the record
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preceding the 2004 adoption is not part of this record.
    MR. YOUNG: Are those changes acceptable?
    MS. HUNTER: Yes.
    MR. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman.
    MR. YOUNG: Yes.
    MR. THOMAS: No one has said out loud yet, but we
are also recommending adoption of the monitoring and
reporting program that goes with this Order
MS. HUNTER: I would add to my motion that we adopt the monitoring and reporting program Number R3-2012-0011.
MR. THOMAS: And the CEQA resolution.
MS. HUNTER: I'm sorry. I thought we already agreed to that. Yes, the CEQA resolution.
MR. YOUNG: Mr. Jordan.
MR. JORDAN: Not to stop the momentum, but I'll
be happy to support the direction we're going and to thank
Mr. Johnston for his efforts, but I'll continue to want to note the significant giveback that Staff made on the nitrate loading. I continue to feel that that was significant concession on the part of Staff.
One of the provisions of Board work alone is not just to improve but to protect from degradation. I take that phrase as an aggressive statement, not a reactionary statement, but one that puts the burden on this Board to
```
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act to protect rather than just seek actions to improve situations. In fact, along with outside the box, I think improving water quality is probably one of the misused phrases because it infers that water quality is already at some level of acceptability, and you're just ratcheting it up a little better.

The fact of the matter is, it's really at a degraded point right now. We're really trying to catch up. I think the ball clearly should be in the Discharger's court now. You've been given some significant concessions and significant tools to work with. And in five years from now, we hope to see better results. I hope that we don't have to go through this process again and talk about some of these more stringent give-ups that we did today.

Thank you.
MR. YOUNG: Is that a second to the motion?
MR. JORDAN: I'd be happy to second it with those comments.

MR. YOUNG: We're not going to vote yet on it.
MR. JORDAN: Okay.
Go ahead.
MS. McCHESNEY: I just want to make one clarification. Your MRP number, that includes all three MRPs, that number? Because in the draft, they had three
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different numbers
MS. SCHROETER: It has a dash 01,02 and 03 --
MS. McCHESNEY: Okay.
MS. SCHROETER: -- in all of them.
MS. McCANN: The numbers are consistent.
MR. YOUNG: Mr. Johnston and then Mr. Jeffries.
Go ahead.
MR. JOHNSTON: I hate to tie myself on the tracks
in front of the train here. I know we all want to go
home. But, quite frankly, my purpose in running through
that language was to lay out a choice for the Board for
two alternatives that we take to move forward on passing
an Order tonight.
    And given the -- everybody on all sides has put a
huge amount of work into this. But given the work that
went into what was put before us yesterday, I still think
it appropriate to see if there is interest on the Board
in -- and I'm prepared to stay tonight as late as I need
to -- in working through the Ag Proposal and seeing if we
can accommodate and resolve the policy issues raised by
Staff and the legal issues raised by Staff.
    I am interested in extracting the maximum amount
of collaboration possible without diminishing our results
in terms of water quality -- can add to our results in
terms of water quality. So I mean, I'm mentally counting
                                    Page 124
noses and suspecting that there's not support on the Board
for that, but it's a question I'd like to ask.
And I'd hoped to ask it before a motion was made.
Perhaps I can be advised as to if there's an appropriate
parliamentary way. I suppose I could propose to amend the
motion. That's kind of clumsy to something that's
completely different.
Frances.
MS. McCHESNEY: I just looked at the rule. This is what's called a main motion, and you can debate the main motion, and then, I assume, included in the debate is whether to -- what to do about that motion and then vote on it and then do something else.
MR. JORDAN: What you're saying is that --
MS. McCHESNEY: Let me look some more about what to do about that.
MR. JOHNSTON: -- is that the only way to address on the Board before we vote on Dr. Hunter's motion, whether there's interest in the Board in going through and attempting to revise the Ag Proposal, is to first vote down Dr. Hunter's motion?
MS. McCHESNEY: No. That's not what I said. You can discuss your idea, and I'll keep looking.
MR. YOUNG: Let's have everybody speak to the motion, and we can address, I think, the questions.
```
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She'll provide the answers
MR. JORDAN: We can count noses that way. MR. YOUNG: Yeah, yeah

Let me just state how I feel about this. I know
Russ and I have been through this from the beginning. We enjoy the experience of having seen the development of this whole process from its very beginning to where it is today.

There's been a huge amount of effort put into this by everybody, both the Ag community, the environmental community, and now we have the environmental
justice interests involved in this, which we've never had before. That wasn't part of our first permit. This is a new element.

We've had the revelation of the extent of the groundwater contamination with nitrate that was not there before. We had a little bit of indication that it was there, but it had become really apparent with a lot of data that it is quite widespread, and people are drinking water that needs to be addressed in terms of, you know, remediation, source control.

The list of the cons, I'm not interested in going through and trying to piece by piece address them. I appreciate the offer up of the choice that we could do that and spend the time to do it. I think there are some
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fundamental differences when you really boil everything down to what Ag has proposed that I don't think we're going to be able to reconcile.

I think what we've had for many years is an approach that takes the data and keeps it, to some degree, from public scrutiny, kind of camouflages it somewhat. I know Tess Dunham is of the opinion that that can be done. It can be done through coalitions. It can be aggregate collection and then reporting summaries.

I'm just not comfortable with that approach.
Fundamentally I'm not comfortable with that. I read the
Water Code statute, and my take from that is that this agency has a responsibility to be transparent to the public process in terms of requiring efforts that will change over time these sources of contamination, that there will be accountability to those that are making changes on the ground.

And it's a public -- these are public resources that we are addressing and are statutorily mandated to protect both the groundwater, surface waters. We're the only agency in this State for this region that has that responsibility. It's not going to be the Department of Pesticide Regulations.

We have had them come before us -- actually, before the three of you came on board, but they did tell
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us their focus was in labeling and application of pesticides. It's not in looking at protecting beneficial uses.

We have had Fish and Game come before us and tell us they -- and the Department of Health all really in concurrence with what we're trying to do. So I appreciate ag's added effort. I mean, they have moved this process, I think, immensely in a direction to where they'd like to go. I know they'd like to get it further, but I think, practically speaking, we're at a point now where we can go ahead and vote and adopt what's being proposed.

I feel comfortable with it. I think my only remaining issue would be -- and this is something Dr. Wolff had mentioned.

I wish you would have approached Roger, which you could have done before the Board meeting, that this may be a huge implementation task for the agency in terms of getting everybody on board, making sure we have all the growers, making sure they know what they're supposed to be doing, and making sure that the agency has shifted some Staff, at least, to get the ball rolling in this, and that there should be some kind of an additional technical advisory committee, if you want to call it that. I think Dr. Wolff called it a management advisory committee.

MS. McCHESNEY: Can I just interrupt to --
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MR. YOUNG: Yes.
MS. McCHESNEY: Dr. Wolff had -- his conflict of interest precluded him from discussing this with Staff. You mentioned him talking to Roger, and he couldn't do that.

MR. YOUNG: He couldn't? I thought he could.
MS. McCHESNEY: No. He can only comment as an individual representing himself. He could not discuss --

MR. YOUNG: He could never have discussed it?
THE WITNESS: No.
MR. YOUNG: Okay.
MS. McCHESNEY: I just wanted to clarify that.
MR. WOLFF: So I'm off the hook.
MR. YOUNG: But after today, there will be no pending matter, and he could participate in --

MS. McCHESNEY: Yeah. I'll check on that, but I don't think we need to go there right now.

MR. YOUNG: That would be my -- I think he made a good suggestion with that, to make sure that things get on board and implemented properly.

To answer your question, Mike, I'm in favor of the motion as it stands. But let's hear --

Russ has a keen interest in this issue. I do
because of how far back we go with this firm's origin.
How do you feel?
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1 Staff has conceded considerably.
I think what Ag has proposed, from what they originally proposed, they have conceded some and made some moves in the right direction.

So my interpretation of this is that it is kind of a win-win type situation. Again, I think it's time -I think I said this a couple meetings back -- I'd like to have this Order completed before I leave the Board -- that we can move forward.

I think that if we give that direction -- and I
like the cooperative monitoring. I really like that. I
think it's got some real merit in there. Not only that,
but it really puts responsibility back on to the people
that are using it. And I think that's kind of good. And
It think the Kind of proposed that and sadi, look aty you
know, well toke that responsbility on, and well be the ones that monitors that.

It would relieve the Staff. And I questioned yesterday and I've questioned before, do we have enough Staff to handle all this to implement it. And, quite frankly, I still have that question. And I'm not really sure. But I guess I'm going to find out pretty soon because if it doesn't work, all these folks that are here today and the ones that were here yesterday are going to be back here pounding on the table and saying, look, it
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doesn't work. You've got to do something. We need some help. We need some direction from Staff, and we're not getting it.

I thank Mr. Johnston for doing what he's done. I think it's a great compromise. But I think you and I are probably thinking on the same lines. I'll stay here and hammer it out if you want to.

MR. YOUNG: He just offered it up as an option.
MR. JEFFRIES: I know he did. I'm trying to tell him --

MR. YOUNG: Right.
MR. JEFFRIES: -- there's still the opportunity to have that happen. And those folks can come back and say, these are the areas that we're having problems with, and this is what we're proposing to make that better.

So I'll stop.
MR. YOUNG: Mr. Delgado.
MR. DELGADO: If I was an Ag member or a grower -- and I considered the Ag Proposal -- I had some ownership. It's kind of like my preferred alternative; it's my plan. I might feel some relief that there seems to have been some changes in my direction and fairly significant ones.

We now have the spelled-out option of aggregate monitoring and aggregate reporting being a potential which
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wasn't part of the plan, you know, half an hour ago.
We have some extensions on some of the -- the most immediate near-term deadlines. Something that they were asking for. We have a new carrot process to move down from Tier 3 or down from Tier 2. That was a big message that we heard. So that would give me some relief and hope if this was my Ag plan that I wanted. I would want more. But I would be getting more than I had when I came in this morning or came in yesterday and that would make me feel good.

If I was a member of the environmental justice community or the environmental community, I would think, oh, God. Now they've moved further toward Ag and further away from what I wanted. I wanted something that was similar to 2010. And we've made so many changes in the Ag direction before today. Now there's more changes, more significant changes. I would feel frustrated in hearing this option to stay later tonight to potentially adopt the Ag Alternative.

As an environmental justice or environmental member, I'd feel the opposite of relief and hope. But I am willing personally now to stay until midnight if need be. But I think one option is to approve the motion before us with a friendly amendment that subsequent to that approval, and as soon as we're done approving it,
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that we take a shot at staying tonight to address the fundamental differences that remain between what we approved in the Ag Alternative with the option of a second vote later tonight to accept a revised Ag Proposal.

Yesterday we talked about non-negotiability and whether there were any nonnegotiable items. And Sam Farr and others seemed to indicate, well, maybe they're not if you get down to it. But we left that question unanswered.

If we can negotiate those fundamental differences to our satisfaction -- I don't mind staying later, but I really like the idea from an environmental justice and environmental perspective to get something done today that's been in motion for a long time.

MS. HUNTER: Can I speak to my own motion?
MR. DELGADO: That wasn't a friendly amendment.
MR. YOUNG: I want to know if you were facetious with that amendment.

MR. DELGADO: No, it wasn't facetious.
MR. YOUNG: Okay.
Dr. Hunter.
MS. HUNTER: I will speak to my own motion. I will be very brief.

I am with you on that last element. What I'm satisfied in is the way this Order has taken shape at this point in time. What satisfies me is that now we'll start
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to see some groundwater data coming out of the program. And that has been my priority all along.

I also have tried to be, along with the other Board members, prior to your all joining us, as responsive as we could be to the sensitive issues that emerged from the stakeholder process.

As Chair Young led in his leadership in
recognizing that the Board needed to be more involved and opened up the process to workshops and some other ways in which we supported Staff to get things back on track, that we've seen this process come an enormous distance back to a place where I think we -- at least I believe we all see the potential and the openings that have been discussed both conceptually. To some degree, there's been more specificity that's emerged in that process and then the potential involvement of very talented individuals like Dr. Marc Los Huertos.

That all gives us great energy now; whereas, we were all weary, I feel like there's some energy back in the room. I want to thank Ms. Dunham for her extraordinary work in moving the Ag Proposal to a point where we could see the connections.

I hope that's true for all of you who support -in support of the Ag Alternative.

At the same time, I want to say to the
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environmental side and the E.J. side, I think we're going to start to see and develop greater understanding of our watersheds in coastal systems that are both contributing to marine degradation as well as to the fresh water issues.

So for that reason, I do believe we are ready to implement this permit program now. And I don't think that it would serve any of us to try to now address this kind of parking lot of elements that we know are not being accommodated at this point; however, I want to thank Mr. Jordan for pointing out -- some important changes have occurred. I think Reese Nelson said the same thing, and in spirit, of course, Mr. Johnston.

Some important changes have occurred in a very short period of time. And the framework that we have now before us allows us to do all of these positive and progressive things in the right direction. So I would urge my fellow Board members to support the motion and that we look forward to -- Mr. Briggs suggested that we regularly schedule updates and presentations to the Board in a way that Staff could accommodate that mode. Because, again, we're working with great limits right now.

But that we want to shepherd the implementation of this. And the Board will have a good and close sense of how it's working. And that there will be opportunity Page 136
for stakeholders to come to us with feedback and where are the gaps and where they need some assistance.

So I fully anticipate that we're going to
continue in that spirit which started about a year and a half ago when the Board became more engaged.

So that's my final statement.
MR. YOUNG: Before I call for a vote on Dr. Hunter's motion, I just want to say to the Ag community and the public that I certainly don't expect to see possibly even immediate, you know, water quality changes. I don't care if it says five years in there.

What I'm looking for -- and this is my own personal opinion with this and perspective -- is that we're seeing a good faith effort to work towards improving the water quality degradation. That's what I'm looking for.

I know that this is going to take in some regions -- some part of our regions years and years and years to get to where we want to be. And I know that we're at the point we are because of decades of acceptable practices. And these have been culturally acceptable. The public has been okay with them. There hasn't been scrutiny on them before. And I think we have to recognize that to expect a huge, diverse complex entity, if you want to call it an entity, is Ag , to be able to change so
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quickly, I'm not expecting that in terms of the
groundwater and surface water improvements. But I am
looking for the good faith effort to make progress in that
end.
Having said that, Mr. Johnston.
MR. JOHNSTON: Couple of things.
First of all, the question I posed to Staff
before the break regarding Paragraph 27, Page 7, the coupling between filing a pesticide use permit and being required to submit a Notice of Intent.
Did you guys have a chance to take a look at that? If so, what is your recommendation?
MS. SCHROETER: I think the changes that you suggest, I think are fine. I don't have any objection to the changes.
MR. YOUNG: Is that included in your motion, Dr. Hunter?
MS. HUNTER: Yes. I would ask that Staff include that in the list of revisions.
MR. JOHNSTON: Speaking to the motion, were there four votes for proceeding to try and see if we can make sausage out of the Ag Proposal. I think that would have been the appropriate way to proceed. It does not appear there are. So I will support Dr. Hunter's motion.
MR. YOUNG: All those in favor of the motion say
```
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aye.
MR. JORDAN: Aye.
MS. HUNTER: Aye.
MS. McCHESNEY: Aye.
MR. JEFFRIES: Aye.
MR. JOHNSTON: Aye.
MR. DELGADO: Aye.
MR. BRIGGS: Aye.
MR. YOUNG: Any opposed?
The motion is carried unanimously.
Is there another motion being proposed,
Mr. Delgado?
MR. DELGADO: Sure. I'll throw it out there.
MR. YOUNG: You can throw it out there.
MR. DELGADO: It was my friendly amendment. I'll
motion that we stay tonight to address the fundamental
differences that remain between the approved motion that
we just heard and the most recent version of the Ag
Proposal that Tess brought to us yesterday with the option
of taking a second vote later tonight on a revised Ag
Proposal -- on acceptance of a revised Ag Proposal.
MR. YOUNG: Do we need a second for that?
MS. McCHESNEY: No, you're not required to have a second.

MR. YOUNG: The effect of that is what? We've
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## already passed the recommendation by Staff. <br> MR. JOHNSTON: The motion for reconsideration. <br> MR. YOUNG: Okay. Well -- <br> MR. DELGADO: I don't know if it's a motion for reconsideration. It's a motion for a subsequent step to the last motion passed. <br> MR. BRIGGS: May I speak on that? <br> MR. YOUNG: Yes. Go ahead. <br> MR. BRIGGS: I really think that what you're doing is talking about doing Staff work, not only that, at a late hour. And, actually, I think maybe the ball would be in the court of Ag to take a look at the cons, see if they're interested in talking about those cons. <br> And as I said before, what we have adopted now allows the flexibility for that proposal to come forward. I think it makes a lot more sense for that proposal to be developed by the folks on the ground who have proposed that in the first place. And if -- you know, if the Order being adopted allows for it to come to the Board, if it's stymied, in other words, if a proposal comes to me and I say, no, it's still not there, you have the option to come to the Board, but then it would be a cooked proposal. <br> A proposal that is fleshed out, that is not a moving cloud, as I said. I think that is appropriate. I don't think it makes sense for this Board to not only take

 Page 140your time -- I appreciate your offer to do that -- but basically you would be taking everybody else's time, too, after two very long hearing days, and I just don't think that is reasonable.

MR. YOUNG: Also, I think that there are some things that aren't reconcilable with the cons.

MR. BRIGGS: Yes.
MR. YOUNG: There are some that may be; there are some that are not.

MR. BRIGGS: By the way when I mentioned taking everyone's time, I'm willing to stay here myself. I'm talking about everyone else here, the folks out there, it's not fair to them.

MR. JORDAN: Mr. Chair.
MR. YOUNG: Yes.
MR. JORDAN: I'd also point out that I think there's an issue of noticing involved with that motion. The action that we just took was noticed, but we certainly did not notice that we were going to pass that motion and then the work on revising that action. That certainly wasn't publically noticed.

MR. DELGADO: And I'd like to counter it. Within the sideboards of what was listed on the agenda, we could have ditched that Ag Order and rubber-stamped the alternative, the Ag Alternative component. So to consider
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modifying the Ag Alternative for approval would be within those same sideboards.

MS. McCHESNEY: I am looking at this. So when you adopt -- when you make a motion and you vote on the motion, you can make a motion to reconsider at your same meeting if the main motion is carried or lost. There was a motion. It was carried. You could make a motion to reconsider your motion. But to make the motion like you did, you know, isn't in the list. You could rescind your motion or repeal your motion, whatever you --

MR. YOUNG: What are you reading from, Frances? Roberts?

MS. McCHESNEY: No. Sturgis rules that apply to your proceedings.

MR. DELGADO: I'd like to ask the Chair -- you
just mentioned that you thought there might be some irreconcilable differences between the Ag Alternative and what we approved just a few minutes ago. I thought -- I don't know what those are, but they sound like the nonnegotiable potential that we heard last night and we discussed last night.

Are there really irreconcilable differences? And if there are, I would think it would be a short list. I would like to know what that short list was, and then my motion was to stay tonight to work on that short list to Page 142
see if Ag was willing to change their alternative so that those irreconcilable differences were resolved.

MR. YOUNG: Dr. Hunter.
MS. HUNTER: Okay. I'm with you on that, the idea that we need to explore and really understand where those irreconcilable differences fall. In order to have that discussion, however, we need stakeholder input, and we need to have a thoughtful process. And I think the review that created that set of pros and cons was the result of Mr. Johnston's request to the Staff. And I think that satisfied his request. But I don't believe that that set of points was intended to drive the changes or the building out, if you will, the filling in of the details of the permit that is to be implemented.

So I would hesitate to take that summary which was created for a different purpose and use it now to drive a new discussion, or at least the next generation of this discussion, and expect that both the regulated community and interested stakeholders are going to be able to participate in a discussion at this point in the evening really fully prepared. So what would we accomplish?

I think we'd hear a lot of the ideas that have already been stated over the last three years. We've been hearing these things evolve forward, and I think we're
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clear on the positions that are reflected among the stakeholders that are involved, that have been involved, that have engaged in this process.

I want to see that discussion take place over time in a thoughtful and productive way. I don't see that occurring in the course of the next few hours.

I would urge you to reconsider.
MR. YOUNG: Mr. Johnston.
MR. JOHNSTON: I do not believe that it would be appropriate tonight for us engage in a discussion with agricultural stakeholders about whether they're willing to modify their Proposal. We have closed public comment. And we're at the point that it's -- we can ask questions of Staff, or whatever. We're at the point where it's us, the Board, figuring out what we're going to do. And --

MS. McCHESNEY: Right.
MR. YOUNG: Yeah.
MR. JOHNSTON: Let me just finish, Counselor.
I think that if we were to pass a motion to reconsider, really our only option would be, can we now sufficiently amend what was offered in order to make it satisfy our policy and legal concerns. I think it would be patently unfair to all of the stakeholders for us to start discussion with one group of stakeholders hoping -that's not practical.
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## MR. YOUNG: Right.

MS. McCHESNEY: What I was just going to say is that it would be hard for me to give you advise given that we got the Proposal yesterday, and I would rather be able to sit down with Ms. Dunham and others. If you want to schedule that for some other time, to have a discussion, then you can do that. It's not noticed to have that discussion with stakeholders participating so they're not all here.

MR. YOUNG: Right.
MS. McCHESNEY: So, anyway.
MR. DELGADO: I appreciate that, what you just said, Frances.

I'll withdraw my motion. What I wouldn't want is to leave tonight and not start implementing what's been approved because there might be something else coming down the pipes. Everyone just remains in limbo.

I would hope that if we stay later tonight, we would either learn more that is helpful to everybody or we would come up with a revised product that we are even happier with. I do understand that that's highly unlikely, but I just thought the time spent trying would be of benefit.

MR. YOUNG: Okay. So you're withdrawing your motion?
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