| 1 | CENTRAL COAST REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD |
|----|--|
| 2 | PANEL HEARING |
| 3 | SAN LUIS OBISPO, CALIFORNIA |
| 4 | MARCH 15, 2012 |
| 5 | |
| 6 | |
| 7 | |
| 8 | CONTINUATION OF THE |
| 9 | HEARING ON THE WAIVER OF WASTE DISCHARGE |
| 10 | REQUIREMENTS DISCHARGED FROM |
| 11 | IRRIGATED LANDS |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | ATKINSON-BAKER, INC. |
| 20 | COURT REPORTERS |
| 21 | www.depo.com |
| 22 | 800-288-3376 |
| 23 | |
| 24 | REPORTED BY: DEBORAH L. HOLDEN, CSR NO. 8885 |
| 25 | FILE NO.: A6028BE |
| | |

| 1 | A P P E A R A N C E S | 1 | address some issues that I think would be of interest to |
|--|---|--|---|
| 2 | | 2 | the Board. We heard pretty frequently yesterday the need |
| 3 4 | FOR THE CENTRAL COAST REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL | 3 | to trust and verify. And I think in wanting to clarify |
| - | BOARD: | 4 | some components with respect to what could be added into |
| 5 | | 5 | the Ag Proposal to maybe provide the Board members with |
| | JEFFREY S. YOUNG, CHAIRMAN, SANTA BARBARA, WATER SUPPLY | 6 | that sense of verification and trust would be appropriate |
| 6 | Michael Johnston, Michael ille, County Courses | | |
| 7 | Michael Johnston, Watsonville, County Government Bruce Delgado, Marina, Municipal Government | 7 | that an independent audit that has been done would be part |
| / | Monica S. Hunter, Los Osos, Public | 8 | of the farm plan or be a required element of the farm plan |
| 8 | Russell M. Jeffries, Vice Chair, Salinas, Water Quality | 9 | that is to be remained on site. If Staff comes to inspect |
| | Frances McChesney, Senior Staff Counsel | 10 | the farm plan, as they are allowed under the Draft Order, |
| 9 | Michael Jordan, Santa Barbara, Recreation, Fish or Wildlife | 11 | that they would then be able to review the audit that was |
| 10 | Roger W. Briggs, Executive Officer | 12 | done by the independent auditor through the third party |
| 11 | LEAD STAFF PERSONS: | 13 | group. |
| 12 | Michael Thomas, Assistant Executive Officer/Ombudsman | 14 | In an effort to try to provide some additional, |
| | Lisa Horowitz McCann, Section Manager/Aquatic Habitat | 15 | you know, trust and verification to the process, that |
| 13 | Angela Schroeter, Agricultural Regulatory Program/ | 16 | would be an element that we think would be appropriate and |
| 14 | Basin Planning | | |
| 15 | | 17 | would not be one that we would be opposed to. So we put |
| 16 | | 18 | that forward in the form of clarification here today as |
| 17 | | 19 | something else for the Board to consider should they |
| 18 | | 20 | decide to consider the Ag Proposal, you know, looking for |
| 19 20 | SPEAKERS: PAGE: Tess Dunham 3 | 21 | that trust and verification process. |
| 21 | | 22 | The only other thing I really wanted to touch |
| 22 | | 23 | upon here today is really talking about what we mean by |
| 23 | | 24 | individual reporting or group reporting or watershed |
| 24 25 | | 25 | reporting. There's obviously been significant discussion |
| 20 | Page 2 | | Page 4 |
| | 6 | | 6 |
| | | | |
| 1 | SAN LUIS OBISPO, CALIFORNIA | 1 | with respect to what is the legal standard and the legal |
| 1 2 | SAN LUIS OBISPO, CALIFORNIA THURSDAY, MARCH 15, 2012, 2:15 P.M. | 1 | |
| 2 | SAN LUIS OBISPO, CALIFORNIA THURSDAY, MARCH 15, 2012, 2:15 P.M. | 2 | requirement. |
| 2 3 | THURSDAY, MARCH 15, 2012, 2:15 P.M. | 2 3 | requirement. Well, Water Code Section 13269 with respect to |
| 2 3 4 | THURSDAY, MARCH 15, 2012, 2:15 P.M. MR. YOUNG: Folks, it's 2:15. We're continuing | 2 3 4 | requirement. Well, Water Code Section 13269 with respect to monitoring says a couple of basic things. One, it says |
| 2 3 4 5 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 | 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, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | 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. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | 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. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | 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. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | 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. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 | 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. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 | 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. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | 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. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | 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? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | 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. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | 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. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | 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 for response to everything that they heard yesterday. And I understand that's going to be Tess Dunham. MS. DUNHAM: Thank you. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | 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, | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | 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, | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | 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. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | 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 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. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | 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 |

| | | <u> </u> | |
|----|--|----------|--|
| 1 | how it is done in regions five, regions four, and regions | 1 | haven't read the report. |
| 2 | six. This is a form, a standard, a process that the State | 2 | MS. DUNHAM: Neither have I, Chairman Young, so I |
| 3 | Water Board approved in its 2004 Order when it reviewed | 3 | can appreciate that. |
| 4 | the Conditional Waiver for the Central Valley. And it is | 4 | MR. YOUNG: There's nothing that we we haven't |
| 5 | a format and a process that is allowed under the Water | 5 | considered it because it's not part of the evidence on |
| 6 | Code. | 6 | this matter. |
| 7 | So we hope that as you work on all this today, | 7 | MS. DUNHAM: Understood. |
| 8 | you take all of that into consideration with respect to | 8 | MR. YOUNG: Yeah. Okay. Thank you. |
| 9 | the reporting, its group format, and that it does meet the | 9 | MS. DUNHAM: Thank you. |
| 10 | legal standards within the Water Code. | 10 | MR. YOUNG: All right. Mr. Briggs. |
| 11 | Now, policy decision. If the Board decides that | 11 | MR. BRIGGS: So the Order of events, if I've got |
| 12 | it wants something more different, to me that is a | 12 | it right, is that the Staff will have an opportunity to |
| 13 | different question with respect to whether does it meet | 13 | provide their response to comments yesterday, as well as |
| 14 | the legal standard. | 14 | the summary and then back to me for final recommendation. |
| 15 | That's the main points we wanted to leave with | 15 | MR. YOUNG: Okay. Can everybody speak up loudly |
| 16 | you as you start your deliberations today. And if there | 16 | and clearly. |
| 17 | are any questions, of course. | 17 | MS. McCANN: Good afternoon. Again, I'm Lisa |
| 18 | MR. YOUNG: Any Board questions? | 18 | McCann, M-c-C-a-n-n, environmental program manager. I |
| 19 | MS. HUNTER: No. | 19 | brought my suitcase today in case you make me sleep over |
| 20 | MR. YOUNG: Thank you. One thing I'd like to | 20 | again. Just kidding. |
| 21 | just alert you to, I know you lodged some objections | 21 | Last night, we successfully, and you patiently |
| 22 | yesterday | 22 | got through all the public comment. And you also gave us |
| 23 | MS. DUNHAM: Yes. | 23 | a homework assignment. And we took that seriously. |
| 24 | MR. YOUNG: at the beginning of our session. | 24 | And, Mr. Johnston, you specifically asked, What |
| 25 | I just wanted to remind you to take the opportunity right | 25 | is the most effective Order that you, the Board, can pass |
| | Page 6 | | Page 8 |
| 1 | now during your rebuttal period if there's anything that | 1 | to improve water quality which meets legal standards. And |
| 2 | you heard that you had objected to that this would be an | 2 | you also asked what legal and policy issues need to be |
| 3 | opportunity for you to rebut what you heard. | 3 | resolved to make the proposed edits and alternative from |
| 4 | MS. DUNHAM: The only thing I would add is, | 4 | Farmers For Water Quality work. |
| 5 | there's been a lot of obvious reference and a lot of press | 5 | We reviewed the proposed edits from Farmers For |
| 6 | media to the recent U.C. Davis report that's come out. | 6 | Water Quality and the additional issues that were raised |
| 7 | And I think it's important for everybody to understand | 7 | yesterday during comments and during your various |
| 8 | that that report was released on Tuesday. It is over 1300 | 8 | questions, and we've prepared responses that we will |
| 9 | pages. And it's going to take time for everybody to | 9 | present to you in next slide in this Order. This is |
| 10 | review and comprehend the extent of what that report says | 10 | generally what we're going to address. So it would be the |
| 11 | and what it means. | 11 | responses to the edits as proposed from Farmers For Water |
| 12 | As with any report, we're all going to pick and | 12 | Quality, some other suggested edits in response to |
| 13 | choose elements out of it that we like and those that we | 13 | comments, and then just, if we have time, interest and |
| 14 | don't like as it is with any scientific or technical | 14 | response to some of the other issues that were discussed, |
| 15 | report. | 15 | and then as Roger mentioned, make a recommendation. |
| 16 | I think it may have been mentioned earlier today | 16 | I do want to assure you that our responses |
| 17 | that the State Water Board is holding a workshop with | 17 | represent the best way to advance water quality |
| 18 | respect to that report on May 23rd. And from there, we'll | 18 | improvements so that aquatic habitat becomes healthier and |
| 19 | be looking to give guidance to the regional Boards, as | 19 | drinking water becomes safe for the communities on the |
| 20 | well. So I think we all need to sit back, take some time, | 20 | central coast. |
| 21 | review it ourselves, understand it ourselves, and make our | 21 | MS. SCHROETER: I think the easiest way to go |
| 22 | own determinations and conclusions with respect to the | 22 | through is to actually go through the presentation |
| 23 | information and then participate in the State Board's | 23 | provided by Ms. Dunham yesterday and talk a little bit |
| 24 | Hearing. | 24 | about what our response is to the information. |
| 25 | MR. YOUNG: I'm sure you can appreciate that we | 25 | In some cases, it's a legal response is going |
| | Page 7 | | Page 9 |

| 1 | to be required, so I'll defer to Frances for those. | 1 | apply this tier criteria. |
|--|---|--|---|
| 2 | We didn't have the opportunity to prepare a | 2 | I'm just going to jump down to Tier 3. I think |
| 3 | handout to go with these slides. So what I'm going to do | 3 | that's where there is a lot of concern about whether or |
| 4 | I'm going to put it in the format where there's notes on | 4 | not this really is an indicator of risk. So Tier 3 is |
| 5 | the bottom of this presentation. And you can just read | 5 | those farms that use chlorpyrifos or diazinon and |
| 6 | off the notes as we entered them last night and this | 6 | discharge to an impaired surface water, impaired |
| 7 | morning. | 7 | specifically for toxicity and pesticides. |
| 8 | Can you read where it says no, no, no, no. | 8 | So in our Staffs' opinion and judgment, there is |
| 9 | Let's just do it the other way, slide view. | 9 | no other better indicator for threat to water quality. |
| 10 | (Discussion held off the record.) | 10 | The use of chemicals known to cause toxicity, specifically |
| 11 | MS. McCANN: I just want to clarify what we're | 11 | diazinon and chlorpyrifos, and the actual discharge to a |
| 12 | trying to show you here. We put the notes in some of the | 12 | water body that's already impaired for pesticides and |
| 13 | responses to the edits that were proposed in the notes | 13 | toxicity. Simply that. |
| 14 | area in the PowerPoint, so we don't want to use the slide | 14 | The second one is nitrogen loading crop type and |
| 15 | view because then we won't be able to show you the notes. | 15 | an acreage grid of 500 acres. It's important to look at |
| 16 | MR. BRIGGS: It's going to be down here. | 16 | how the tiers relate to each other. Remember, again, this |
| 17 | MS. McCANN: So it's going to be a little bit | 17 | is relative threat. In this case, the acreage for Tier 3 |
| 18 | less than the full view of the slides. But hopefully | 18 | is 500 acres and the acreage for Tier 1 is 50 acres. |
| 19 | you'll be able to follow along and see exactly what we're | 19 | All things held the same, for example, a lettuce |
| 20 | trying to help you see. | 20 | crop, the potential risk or threat to water quality for a |
| 21 | MS. SCHROETER: What I suggest you do is to use | 21 | 500-acre farm is much, much different than a 50-acre farm. |
| 22 | your handout yesterday that Ms. Dunham provided to you to | 22 | We'll show you also in a moment when we get to |
| 23 | go ahead and do your markups. | 23 | other issues how we build the conditions from Tier 1, |
| 24 | In general, our review focused on all of these | 24 | Tier 2, and Tier 3 based upon that risk. So it's not that |
| 25 | items in the presentation but especially in areas where | 25 | the Tier 1 farms don't have any conditions, for example, |
| | Page 10 | | Page 12 |
| | | | |
| 1 | there were suggested changes. And we'll go through | 1 | related to nutrients, they just have lesser than those in |
| 1 | there were suggested changes. And we'll go through | 1 | related to nutrients, they just have lesser than those in |
| 2 | specifically how we responded to the specific changes or | 2 | Tier 3. |
| 2 3 | specifically how we responded to the specific changes or not, and provide you with our justification. | 2 3 | Tier 3. MS. HUNTER: Angela, so what if I can just |
| 2 3 4 | 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 | 2 3 4 | Tier 3. MS. HUNTER: Angela, so what if I can just restate what you just said. You're saying it's the size |
| 2 3 4 5 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | 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? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | 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. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | 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? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | 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. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | 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. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | 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. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | 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. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | 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. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | 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. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | 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. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | 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. 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | 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. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | 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. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | 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. 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 |

| 1 | MS. SCHROETER: Mr. Sanchez and whether or not | 1 | MR. YOUNG: Okay. Go ahead. |
|----|--|----|--|
| 2 | we how we were going to deal with those smaller farms. | 2 | MS. SCHROETER: The second one relates to |
| 3 | And one of the suggestions that we are suggesting in the | 3 | Table 1A and Attachment 1B. And that, if you recall, is a |
| 4 | Order I don't know if it's an appropriate time to pass | 4 | table of Water Quality Standards. They're specifically |
| 5 | out these is to look at those specific farms that have | 5 | culling out the narrative objective for biostimulation. |
| 6 | a specific disadvantage. So USDA actually has a | 6 | The objection is is that we included language here at |
| 7 | definition for limited resource farmers and to prioritize | 7 | the bottom which is the water Board Staff estimates that |
| 8 | compliance assistance for those types of farms. | 8 | one milligram per liter nitrate is necessary to protect |
| 9 | In the interest of time, do you think I should | 9 | aguatic life. |
| 10 | iust | 10 | We agree that that's not an adopted standard. We |
| 11 | I'm wondering if I should just jump to those that | 11 | have a suggestion or we agree with the edit to delete |
| 12 | speak to specific edits. | 12 | that. |
| 13 | MR. THOMAS: Yes. | 13 | MR. DELGADO: You're agreeing to delete Table 1A? |
| 14 | (Discussion held off the record.) | 14 | MS. SCHROETER: No, no, no. Just this piece |
| 15 | MS. HUNTER: Are you done, then, with that | 15 | of just the sentence in 1A. |
| 16 | particular issue of the E.O. having the ability to elevate | 16 | What Michael is handing out is a supplemental |
| 17 | to a higher tier an individual operation? | 17 | sheet which actually summarizes all of the proposed edits. |
| 18 | MR. YOUNG: Monica, how about if I suggest this | 18 | MS. McCHESNEY: Angela, do have copies for people |
| 19 | that maybe we all hold our questions, write them down, so | 19 | in the audience, too? |
| 20 | we can have Staff tell us what they want to tell us, and | 20 | MS. SCHROETER: I'm not sure how much admin made, |
| 21 | then we'll launch in with our questions. That might just | 21 | but I think there's a lot of extras there. |
| 22 | help get through this point. | 22 | MR. YOUNG: We need to make sure everybody who |
| 23 | MS. HUNTER: Yes. You asked me that yesterday, | 23 | wants a copy gets a copy. |
| 24 | and I forgot. | 24 | MS. SCHROETER: You can make as many copies as |
| 25 | MR. YOUNG: That's okay. | 25 | you want. |
| 20 | Page 14 | | Page 16 |
| | | | |
| 1 | MS. HUNTER: Thank you. | 1 | (Discussion held off the record.) |
| 2 | MS. SCHROETER: What I'm doing now is going to | 2 | MS. SCHROETER: We can go to the page. Let's do |
| 3 | their first slide of suggested edits. | 3 | that. |
| 4 | (Discussion held off the record.) | 4 | MS. HUNTER: I just want to clarify which |
| 5 | MS. SCHROETER: Starting on Page 18, the Farmers | 5 | sentence is being deleted in Table 1A. |
| 6 | For Water Quality start suggesting specific edits. For | 6 | MS. McCHESNEY: It's on your yellow sheet right |
| 7 | example, here their suggestion is related to | 7 | there, number one. |
| 8 | Attachment 1B. Attachment 1B includes 140 findings. And | 8 | MS. SCHROETER: So in front of you, you have a |
| 9 | the solution was not to adopt Attachment 1B. | 9 | supplemental sheet. What it includes is all of the edits |
| 10 | Attachment 1B basically is the attachment to the | 10 | suggested by Staff in response to both the information |
| 11 | Order which includes all of the findings about the | 11 | presented by Farmers For Water Quality as well as some |
| 12 | rationale for conditions in the Order. Staff included | 12 | issues that were brought up by the Board members |
| 13 | these to be transparent about the justification and | 13 | themselves yesterday. |
| 14 | rationale for those conditions. So we do not agree with | 14 | If I can just make a suggestion or give you some |
| 15 | the suggestion to not adopt or not include Attachment 1B. | 15 | options for how to go through this. So we have the slides |
| 16 | There's no page numbers. Sorry. It has the | 16 | in front of us from Farmers For Water Quality, we have the |
| 17 | heading here Attachment 1B. | 17 | edits here in the yellow sheet, and we also have the Order |
| 18 | Got it? Okay. So next page. | 18 | itself. So I can connect back to the Order. We can go to |
| 19 | MR. JEFFRIES: You're not going page by page? | 19 | the page and we can look at that specific change. |
| 20 | MS. SCHROETER: In the interest of time, since | 20 | MR. JORDAN: On the yellow sheet, Angela, when |
| 21 | this presentation was 66 slides, I'm going straight to the | 21 | you don't say Attachment A, does that mean we're back in |
| 22 | ones where there was suggested modification to the Order | 22 | the Order? Like the second item. |
| 23 | MRP. And then we can go back if you want to discuss any | 23 | MS. SCHROETER: Yes. |
| 24 | of the other items. | 24 | MR. JORDAN: Okay. |
| 1 | | | |
| 25 | (Discussion held off the record.) Page 15 | 25 | MR. YOUNG: Are you ready for the second change Page 17 |

5 (Pages 14 to 17)

| 1 | you're going to tell us about or | 1 | MS. McCHESNEY: I apologize if I sound like the |
|----|--|----|---|
| 2 | MR. THOMAS: Yes. | 2 | public doesn't need to understand. It's important that |
| 3 | MR. YOUNG: or proposed change that you | 3 | you understand and not to get distracted by lots of |
| 4 | addressed and have a response to? | 4 | different things. But just make sure the Board |
| 5 | MS. SCHROETER: Yes. | 5 | understands the Staffs' responses. |
| 6 | MR. YOUNG: Go ahead. | 6 | MR. THOMAS: I think that these are |
| 7 | (Discussion held off the record.) | 7 | self-explanatory when we look at them. The Order |
| 8 | MS. SCHROETER: Just to clarify, our comments | 8 | requires currently requires as this states I'm going |
| 9 | relate to specific changes as well as to the general | 9 | right to the part where it has red text. Organic |
| 10 | concept described as Part E. And Part E is very large. I | 10 | materials, such as organic pesticides, and we're going |
| 11 | think it's going to be an involved discussion. So I'm | 11 | to we agree that we should cross that out. And |
| 12 | going to defer the Part E discussions until the very last. | 12 | registered pesticides that may. We agree to add that |
| 13 | Is that okay? | 13 | language with the exception of taking out the word |
| 14 | (Discussion held off the record.) | 14 | registered so that it's just pesticides. We're agreeing |
| 15 | MR. YOUNG: Okay. Let's continue. | 15 | with most of that edit in that part of the Order. |
| 16 | MR. THOMAS: I have a suggestion, Mr. Chairman, | 16 | MR. DELGADO: I just want to note that on the |
| 17 | that we have 66 pages that were submitted in the form | 17 | yellow sheet, the word registered is not there. That's |
| 18 | of slides with recommended changes. Some of those are | 18 | your point. |
| 19 | edits, some are policy things, some are rebuttal. What | 19 | MR. THOMAS: Yes. |
| 20 | I'm proposing is that instead of the Board trying to | 20 | MR. DELGADO: That the yellow sheet is what you |
| 21 | follow along in the Order or in the attachments or even in | 21 | want to suggest to us? |
| 22 | this sheet that we just handed out, that we just stick to | 22 | MR. THOMAS: Yes. |
| 23 | the issue that's on the Board, the slide that's up here, | 23 | MR. DELGADO: Okay. |
| 24 | where we are recommending an edit. We'll stop at each one | 24 | MR. THOMAS: Next slide? |
| 25 | where we are recommending an edit in response to the | 25 | MR. YOUNG: Yes, next slide. |
| | Page 18 | | Page 20 |
| | | | |
| 1 | suggestion. We'll just focus on that to try and simplify | 1 | MR. THOMAS: Next slide, it's slide 28. I'm |
| 2 | this. | 2 | sorry the slides are not numbered. |
| 3 | MR. YOUNG: I thought that's what we were trying | 3 | We agree with this edit as it is presented here. |
| 4 | to do. | 4 | We're agreeing to make this change to the Order. |
| 5 | MR. THOMAS: I think what happened is, when we | 5 | I'm going to keep going unless you stop me. |
| 6 | passed out the yellow sheet and I can see the Board | 6 | MR. YOUNG: That's fine. Just make sure we find |
| 7 | members trying to follow along with the yellow sheet and | 7 | the page before you advance. |
| 8 | with the Order itself trying to match things up. I think | 8 | MR. DELGADO: I'm sorry. I hate to bugger up the |
| 9 | it's too complex. | 9 | process. It would be nice if you would justify the change |
| 10 | MR. YOUNG: Okay. So we'll stick to what's on | 10 | or the disagreement. On the previous slide, you did not |
| 11 | the screen. Right? | 11 | agree to the word registered. And I know that that makes |
| 12 | MR. THOMAS: Yes. | 12 | a big difference, whether you talk about registered |
| 13 | (Discussion held off the record.) | 13 | pesticides or all pesticides. And you're recommending all |
| 14 | MR. DELGADO: Since the audience only has the | 14 | pesticides. |
| 15 | yellow sheet, perhaps, then maybe you could tell them each | 15 | MR. THOMAS: Yes. |
| 16 | slide where it is on the yellow sheet that we're talking | 16 | MR. DELGADO: So that's a big enough difference |
| 17 | about. | 17 | that I'd like you to explain the justification. |
| 18 | MS. McCHESNEY: Just to clarify, all the public | 18 | MR. THOMAS: The reason that we took out |
| 19 | comment has occurred. Now you're hearing from the Staffs' | 19 | registered is we thought it's possible that pesticides |
| 20 | rebuttal. The Staff needs to communicate with you what | 20 | might be used that are not registered. That's all. We |
| 21 | they want to communicate. The public isn't going to have | 21 | don't want to |
| 22 | an opportunity to say more. The Staff can clarify to the | 22 | MR. DELGADO: That's because not all pesticides |
| 23 | extent they can, but | 23 | need to be registered. There's a lot of things that you |
| 24 | MR. DELGADO: I understand. But it helps | 24 | use to address pests that are not toxic enough to require |
| 25 | everyone if the public can follow along. | 25 | registration; right? Like safe soaps. There's lots of |
| 1 | Page 19 | | Page 21 |

6 (Pages 18 to 21)

| 1 | things that you can use to kill pests. | 1 | that language be removed and added registered pesticides. |
|----|--|----|---|
| 2 | MR. YOUNG: Hold on one second. | 2 | We agree with that statement and just are simply saying |
| 3 | Folks, it is hard for us up here to hear clearly | 3 | that we want to remove the word registered. That might |
| 4 | when there's mumbling in the background. I would | 4 | preclude some pesticides that are not |
| 5 | encourage you, please don't do it. | 5 | MR. DELGADO: Registered. |
| 6 | MR. DELGADO: My question is: Are there | 6 | MS. SCHROETER: registered. |
| 7 | pesticides that are legal to use that are not required to | 7 | MR. JEFFRIES: I'm a little confused. I was |
| 8 | be registered? | 8 | under the impression that all pesticides are registered. |
| 9 | MS. SCHROETER: We were just intending it to be | 9 | MS. SCHROETER: That's not my understanding, but |
| 10 | inclusive of any type of pesticide used, registered, | 10 | I am not an expert on pesticides. |
| 11 | unregistered. Any type of thing, chemical, that you would | 11 | MR. JEFFRIES: Because homemade ones may not be. |
| 12 | use to control pests. | 12 | But, also, my understanding is before a farmer can apply |
| 13 | MR. DELGADO: Right. So my question is: Are | 13 | pesticides, he has to file. He does not? I see people |
| 14 | there pesticides that are legal to use in this context | 14 | shaking their heads. They don't have to file that they're |
| 15 | that are not required to be registered with the EPA? | 15 | using that application on their particular farm? |
| 16 | MS. SCHROETER: I'm not certain of that answer. | 16 | MS. SCHROETER: They I believe that they have |
| 17 | What I'm thinking of, for example, are examples | 17 | to file if they're using a registered pesticide. |
| 18 | like the bait traps that currently I'm not sure that's | 18 | MR. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman. |
| 19 | a registered pesticide. That would be an example of what | 19 | MR. YOUNG: Let me just say something. We're |
| 20 | we were thinking of. | 20 | getting bogged down on the trees and losing you know, |
| 21 | MS. McCHESNEY: And just to clarify the point of | 21 | we're losing sight of the forest here. This is just |
| 22 | this particular provision is that it's saying what is | 22 | describing waste kind of generally. Whether it's |
| 23 | covered. So the Waiver is covering the discharge of those | 23 | registered or not, I don't think is really an issue. |
| 24 | things. Whether it's a, quote, "registered pesticide" or | 24 | Pesticides. It's a type of waste that's involved in this. |
| 25 | not, it's just saying that's the scope of this provision. | 25 | So there may be some that aren't; there may be some that |
| | Page 22 | | Page 24 |
| 1 | It's not saying that they're discharging unregistered | 1 | are. For this purpose, I don't think it's going to make |
| 2 | pesticides just. It's just, this Waiver applies to things | 2 | any difference at all. It is definitional. |
| 3 | that constitute waste, and waste includes pesticides | 3 | MR. JEFFRIES: It is definitional. And if it |
| 4 | whether they're registered or not. It doesn't really | 4 | becomes an issue, it can be brought back to the Board and |
| 5 | matter if they're registered or not. For this purpose, | 5 | reconsidered. |
| 6 | it's just the scope of the Waiver so that they can be | 6 | MR. YOUNG: Okay. Yeah. Like anything can be. |
| 7 | allowed to discharge that. Otherwise, if it doesn't cover | 7 | MR. THOMAS: Next slide is Slide 28. |
| 8 | it, they would have to go get some other permit to | 8 | MS. McCANN: They don't have the numbers. |
| 9 | discharge. | 9 | MS. HUNTER: We don't have the numbers. |
| 10 | MR. DELGADO: So Staff is considering this to be | 10 | MR. THOMAS: I know. I thought that you might |
| 11 | in the favor of the growers by expanding the kinds of | 11 | count them. |
| 12 | things that they can apply if it ever is needed to include | 12 | MR. YOUNG: We don't have the numbers. |
| 13 | things that are not registered pesticides? | 13 | MR. THOMAS: We agree with this change. So we're |
| 14 | MS. SCHROETER: No. The context of this | 14 | going to make this change. |
| 15 | requirement is to talk about what can be discharged to | 15 | MR. JEFFRIES: As is? |
| 16 | water, what's covered by this Order. | 16 | MR. THOMAS: As is. |
| 17 | MR. DELGADO: You're thinking that deleting the | 17 | MR. JEFFRIES: This is a little easier to follow, |
| 18 | word registered or leaving that word out is favorable | 18 | this way. |
| 19 | to the growers because it allows them to discharge more? | 19 | MR. THOMAS: We're not agreeing with this change |
| 20 | MS. McCHESNEY: No. It's not favorable or | 20 | on this next slide. |
| 21 | unfavorable. This is just a general statement that these | 21 | MR. YOUNG: And why? |
| 22 | kinds of things are the kinds of things that could be | 22 | MR. THOMAS: We don't think it's necessary to add |
| 23 | discharged under the Waiver. So, you know, it's | 23 | the language, quote, "to the extent feasible," unquote. |
| 24 | MS. SCHROETER: The language used to say, "such | 24 | MR. DELGADO: For purpose of the audience, I'm |
| 25 | as organic pesticides. Tess, yesterday suggested that | 25 | not seeing this in the yellow sheet. |
| 1 | Page 23 | | Page 25 |

| 1 2 | MR. THOMAS: Because we're not agreeing to this change. | 1 | changes. I wanted to just go to the ones that we do. But we are |
|--------|--|----|---|
| 3 | MR. DELGADO: I want to back up on this because | 3 | MR. YOUNG: I think we want I'd like to know |
| 4 | Tess was recommending the words, "to the extent feasible" | 4 | which ones you're not agreeing to so we can just take a |
| 5 | be added to "Dischargers must to the extent feasible do X, | 5 | quick look at it. |
| 6 | Y, and Z regarding vegetative cover on the creeks, et | 6 | MR. THOMAS: Okay. |
| 7 | cetera. | 7 | MR. YOUNG: Read it quickly and then we can move |
| 8 | To me, they're saying, to the extent feasible, | 8 | on if we have no questions on it. |
| 9 | give some wiggle room so that things considered infeasible | 9 | MR. THOMAS: The next slide indicates where |
| 10 | would not be required of them to do. I think Staff is | 10 | disturbance of aquatic habitat is necessary for the |
| 11 | probably saying that that wiggle room is not room that | 11 | purposes of water quality improvement or restoration |
| 12 | they want to allow to be put into this language. | 12 | activities, Dischargers must implement appropriate and |
| 13 | I just wanted to make sure that that's the | 13 | practical measures. |
| 14 | justification for not agreeing to this. | 14 | We disagree with the deletion. We think that is |
| 15 | MS. SCHROETER: There's two main reasons. One, | 15 | necessary and reasonable language. |
| 16 | it's difficult to define what is "to the extent feasible." | 16 | |
| 17 | It's an ambiguous term. The other reason is, that's a | 17 | MS. SCHROETER: But we also added language to clarify that it relates to the other permitted activities. |
| 18 | consideration with all of the requirements. So if a | 18 | So things like the 40, the stream alteration agreements |
| 19 | grower has difficulty implementing something because of | 19 | actually the 401 certifications. So the change would be |
| 20 | feasibility, that would be a consideration. So we don't | 20 | in a case where disturbance of aquatic habitat is |
| 21 | generally apply that to every single condition that we | 21 | necessary for the purposes of water quality improvement or |
| 22 | MR. DELGADO: And I agree with this because I | 22 | restoration activities or other permitted activities. So |
| 23 | think that every time you have a shall or a must | 23 | just to clarify that it wasn't only for those water |
| 24 | throughout this Ag Order, you could add those words, "to | 24 | quality improvement. |
| 25 | the extent practical, feasible," et cetera. And it | 25 | MR. THOMAS: If that makes sense, we're saying |
| | Page 26 | | Page 28 |
| | | | |
| 1 | doesn't really change much. But if we're going to change | 1 | that there can be disturbance of aquatic habitat. And it |
| 2 | it in one place, we'd want to wholesaley change it | 2 | could be done as part of a stream alteration agreement or |
| 3 | everywhere throughout the document. Right? Everywhere | 3 | a 401 certification program or 401 certification. And |
| 4 | you had a must or a shall, we could be at this place of | 4 | there are requirements associated with those. For |
| 5 | considering this addition. | 5 | whatever reason the farmer would need to create that |
| 6 | MR. THOMAS: The existing language also says, "in | 6 | disturbance, they can get a permit to do it. |
| 7 | aquatic habitat areas as necessary to minimize." So we | 7 | MS. McCHESNEY: Angela, it looks like you skipped |
| 8 | already have language in there that provides wiggle room. | 8 | over Paragraph 35, Page 19, the one |
| 9 | MR. DELGADO: That's wiggle room in a different | 9 | MS. SCHROETER: It's going to come up. |
| 10 | way; right? | 10 | MS. McCHESNEY: Okay. Sorry. |
| 11 | MR. THOMAS: Uh-huh. | 11 | MR. DELGADO: We have a question to the Chair. |
| 12 | MR. DELGADO: "As necessary" is different than | 12 | Do we care about grammar or English details at this point |
| 13 | feasible. | 13 | or does that get cleaned up later by Staff? |
| 14 | MR. THOMAS: Uh-huh. | 14 | MR. YOUNG: It doesn't get cleaned up later. |
| 15 | MS. McCHESNEY: No. I think the wiggle room is | 15 | MR. DELGADO: Okay. |
| 16 | "minimize." You're not stopping it, just minimizing. So, | 16 | MR. YOUNG: When we vote on something |
| 17 | you know, that's the feasibility fits into that. | 17 | MR. DELGADO: Okay. So normally when you say |
| 18 | MR. DELGADO: You've got two wiggles. You don't | 18 | "or," you only say it once. So I would say purposes of |
| 19 | need three. | 19 | water quality improvement, comma, delete the first or, |
| 20 | MS. McCHESNEY: Exactly. | 20 | restoration activities or other permitted activities. |
| 21 | MR. YOUNG: Okay. Next one. | 21 | Just like an and. You wouldn't use an and over and over. |
| 22 | MR. THOMAS: Next one, we don't agree with the | 22 | MS. McCHESNEY: What I would suggest for that is |
| 23 | change. My intent in going through these was actually to | 23 | you note it. And then if the Board ends up choosing to |
| 24 | stop on the ones where we agree with changes and not spend | 24 | make those revisions, then we can correct all that then. |
| 25 | a lot of time on the ones where we don't agree with the | 25 | We can identify the ones. |
| | Page 27 | | Page 29 |

8 (Pages 26 to 29)

| 1 | MR. DELGADO: Is somebody logging all these | 1 | there's one exceedance of water quality centered more |
|----|--|----|--|
| 2 | little details? | 2 | than one within three years or upon the request of the |
| 3 | MS. McCHESNEY: Yeah. | 3 | Executive Officer. |
| 4 | MR. DELGADO: I hate to get to this level. I | 4 | This is the normal process for the Board to |
| 5 | just wanted to ask the Chair what he thought about | 5 | implement its laws is to require technical reports be |
| 6 | grammar, small details. | 6 | submitted upon request. So this would say the Staff would |
| 7 | MR. YOUNG: I haven't been concerned with grammar | 7 | have to go to the farm, look at it, and then they couldn't |
| 8 | up until now. I hate to admit that. If I can read it and | 8 | take it back to evaluate it. |
| 9 | understand it, you know, I'm usually good with that. | 9 | MR. YOUNG: Mr. Johnston. |
| 10 | MS. McCHESNEY: If it's a non-substantive | 10 | MR. JOHNSTON: Just to be clear about what the |
| 11 | grammar, that can be corrected without needing a Board's | 11 | concern is that's being expressed, I don't think it's a |
| 12 | vote. | 12 | concern that it would somehow slip out the back door of |
| 13 | MR. YOUNG: If there's confusion to the way it's | 13 | the Water Board. The concern is: That except for |
| 14 | written, yes, we've got to get it corrected. | 14 | proprietary information in that report, that report, once |
| 15 | MR. DELGADO: Thank you. | 15 | its received here, does become publically accessible |
| 16 | MR. YOUNG: Tell me what page we're on. | 16 | information. |
| 17 | MR. THOMAS: 31, Slide 31. | 17 | MR. YOUNG: Right. |
| 18 | MR. YOUNG: What paragraph number is that in | 18 | MS. McCHESNEY: Right. But that's not correct. |
| 19 | okay. Page 43. | 19 | They can identify the proprietary information, and the |
| 20 | Okay. | 20 | Board is obligated by law to keep it protected. And they |
| 21 | MR. THOMAS: This suggestion is to add language. | 21 | already do that. There's quite a few reports in all the |
| 22 | Farm plans must be kept current, kept on the farm, and a | 22 | different programs that are submitted regularly that |
| 23 | current copy must be made available to Central Coast Water | 23 | have basically two reports are submitted, the redacted |
| 24 | Board Staff upon request. The edit is to recommended | 24 | report with the confidential information deleted. That's |
| 25 | edit is to add the language "should Central Coast Water | 25 | the public report and then a private report that this |
| | Page 30 | | Page 32 |
| 1 | Board Staff conduct an inspection of the farm or ranch. | 1 | Staff keeps separately. And that happens in many |
| 2 | MR. YOUNG: Right. | 2 | programs. All the regional Boards deal with this on a |
| 3 | MR. THOMAS: We don't agree with that edit. That | 3 | regular basis. |
| 4 | information should be made available upon represent, not | 4 | MR. YOUNG: Okay. |
| 5 | based on a visit. | 5 | MS. McCHESNEY: Just so you know, the Order does |
| 6 | MR. YOUNG: Right. | 6 | very clearly state how the processor, how the person would |
| 7 | MR. DELGADO: Okay. So comment here. It's | 7 | identify what is proprietary. And they can do that. |
| 8 | obviously a big trust issue. They don't want a document | 8 | MR. JOHNSTON: Just out of curiosity, is there a |
| 9 | leaving the site because it could be copied, distributed, | 9 | template for these reports? Remind me. I forget. |
| 10 | to who knows as far as their perspective, to who knows | 10 | MS. McCHESNEY: I don't know. |
| 11 | who. So this is a pretty big issue. Right? | 11 | MR. JOHNSTON: At this point for the farm plan |
| 12 | We shouldn't be making it up one way or the | 12 | at this point that what there's no clarity as to |
| 13 | other. What's the industry standard? How do other | 13 | whether what an individual farmer would consider |
| 14 | regions handle farm plan | 14 | proprietary and what we would consider proprietary in |
| 15 | MS. McCHESNEY: I can answer that. | 15 | terms of general categories, whether those would coincide; |
| 16 | First of all, under the Water Code, the Board has | 16 | correct? |
| 17 | the authority to require the submittal of technical | 17 | MS. McCHESNEY: Correct. That's why it's up to |
| 18 | reports. My recommendation on this is that I can't advise | 18 | the farmer to identify what they think is proprietary. |
| 19 | you to accept this edit because the Board has the right | 19 | And there's quite a bit of case law. This has been a big |
| 20 | and responsibility to have technical reports submitted to | 20 | issue in the case law about how to do that, including in |
| 21 | them so that they can evaluate water quality. | 21 | the area of agricultural information. But it's really up |
| 22 | This would, then, preclude the Board from getting | 22 | to them to identify what they think is confidential. |
| 23 | information. It's already in the current Order. The | 23 | And it only becomes an issue if then someone |
| 24 | Central Valley Order requires these kinds of reports to be | 24 | makes a public record act request for the document and |
| 25 | submitted as soon as there's one automatically if | 25 | then which the process then is to go back to the farmer |
| | Page 31 | | Page 33 |

9 (Pages 30 to 33)

Г

| 1 | and say, "Justify why you think this is proprietary | 1 | MR. JEFFRIES: All right. |
|----|--|----|--|
| 2 | because we've been asked for it." So it's not released | 2 | MR. YOUNG: Okay. Continue. |
| 3 | until they agree to it. | 3 | MR. THOMAS: Next slide I'm going to skip because |
| 4 | MR. JOHNSTON: I know we're well past the | 4 | we're going to deal with Part E in a few minutes. |
| 5 | eleventh hour. Were we not, it would certainly be nice to | 5 | Next slide is Paragraph 52, Page 22. We're not |
| 6 | simply have a definition of what the case law says is | 6 | going to add this language here as suggested because we |
| 7 | proprietary. That might answer the question. | 7 | have included this language in the monitoring and |
| 8 | MS. McCHESNEY: Yeah. It's really up to them to | 8 | reporting program, and it's not necessary to make this |
| 9 | say what they think is proprietary. I've actually been | 9 | change and include it in the Order, as well. |
| 10 | doing been an attorney for the Board now for 25 years | 10 | MR. DELGADO: Does it hurt or reduce the quality |
| 11 | and only once has anybody ever asked for a report. It's | 11 | of the document to include it in an additional location as |
| 12 | even been an issue in my experience. It's been pretty | 12 | they're suggesting? |
| 13 | straightforward. They identify it; we keep it | 13 | MS. SCHROETER: No, it doesn't. |
| 14 | confidential. | 14 | MS. McCHESNEY: Well, I had a concern with it |
| 15 | MR. YOUNG: Okay. Continue. | 15 | because it's kind of ambiguous the way it's written; |
| 16 | MR. THOMAS: Next slide, Paragraph 46, Page 21. | 16 | whereas, in the MRP, it's much more clearly stated under |
| 17 | The recommendation is to delete this text. And the rather | 17 | what circumstances you either do individual or group |
| 18 | than read it all, I will read instead our reason for not | 18 | monitoring. So to put this kind of general thing here |
| 19 | agreeing with the deletion. | 19 | creates ambiguity later when because the MRP because |
| 20 | This finding is a high property inclusion for | 20 | the sentence is to comply with the MRPs. The MRP includes |
| 21 | environmental justice. Individuals concerned about | 21 | the language that's very specific about how you do group |
| 22 | drinking water and other stakeholders, they've expressed | 22 | monitoring. |
| 23 | concern about this very issue and wanted it to be in the | 23 | MS. SCHROETER: The MRP is much more specific |
| 24 | Order. And the State Water Board does have goals with | 24 | about the areas in which it applies. |
| 25 | respect environmental justice as I mentioned yesterday. | 25 | MR. DELGADO: So this might be an example of a |
| | Page 34 | | Page 36 |
| 1 | MR. DELGADO: And I wanted to jump in here | 1 | subsequent plain English summary of the Ag Waiver could |
| 2 | because the rationale I heard from Tess for deleting this | 2 | say something about this being allowed either individually |
| 3 | was that it was redundant under the law so that it's | 3 | or through a cooperative Monitoring Program. If you |
| 4 | inappropriate to include it as a condition of the Waiver. | 4 | choose to do it one way or the other, you need to refer to |
| 5 | MS. McCHESNEY: Right. | 5 | the MRP for further direction. It's just something to |
| б | And, actually, it shouldn't be in this portion. | 6 | keep in mind as an example of a subsequent plain English |
| 7 | I agree with Tess, too, that it should be this is the | 7 | summary. |
| 8 | Order part. It should be it can be a finding in the | 8 | MS. SCHROETER: So this is just a list of items |
| 9 | Order. It's not an Order. It's not a part of the Order | 9 | in the electronic or I'm sorry in the Notice of Intent. |
| 10 | part. | 10 | They suggested an option related to Part E. We're going |
| 11 | MR. THOMAS: I agree. That's our mistake. We | 11 | to discuss that in a moment so I won't talk about that |
| 12 | agreed last night that this was going to be moved and made | 12 | one. |
| 13 | an Order | 13 | The second one is a suggestion to add a place on |
| 14 | MS. McCHESNEY: Made a finding. | 14 | the NOI to identify cooperative groundwater monitoring |
| 15 | MR. THOMAS: made a finding | 15 | similar to the cooperative surface water monitoring |
| 16 | MS. McCHESNEY: Right. | 16 | selection. And that's fine. We agree with that. |
| 17 | MR. THOMAS: and not a condition. | 17 | There was an additional suggestion at the end to |
| 18 | MS. McCHESNEY: Right. It's just like more | 18 | delete information on the Notice of Intent which is asking |
| 19 | notice to people that these are the kinds of things that | 19 | farmers if there is the presence and location of any |
| 20 | can happen. | 20 | perennial or intermittent or ephemeral streams or riparian |
| 21 | MR. JEFFRIES: This language will be kept, but it | 21 | or wetland habitats on their farm. |
| 22 | will be kept in a finding? | 22 | We disagree with this deletion. What it does is, |
| 23 | MR. YOUNG: Correct. | 23 | having that checkbox, it really is just a checkbox in |
| 24 | MS. McCHESNEY: Correct. Just an | 24 | terms of, do you have a stream adjacent to or running |
| 25 | informational Page 35 | 25 | through your property. It allows us to identify those |
| 1 | Page 35 | | Page 37 |

| 1 | farms quickly and to prioritize those if necessary. So we | 1 | It's merely a screening tool for us. |
|----------|--|----------|---|
| 2 | disagree with that deletion. | 2 | MR. DELGADO: To me a wetland habitat means, in |
| 3 | MR. DELGADO: Chair, can I jump in? | 3 | my mind, a pond or a lake. That's your interpretation, as |
| 4 | MR. YOUNG: Yes. | 4 | well? |
| 5 | MR. DELGADO: What I have down that Tess stated | 5 | MS. SCHROETER: I think that's a fair |
| 6 | on this was that there was no need for a standalone | 6 | characterization. |
| 7 | requirement. Those are my words. I may be incorrect. | 7 | MR. DELGADO: All right. |
| 8 | But if I'm correct, is this a standalone | 8 | MR. YOUNG: The definition may be more |
| 9 | requirement, or is it just a checklist item? | 9 | complicated than that as to what's a wetland. |
| 10 | MS. SCHROETER: This is just a checkbox on the | 10 | MR. DELGADO: The official definition is more |
| 11 | Notice of Intent. | 11 | complicated than that? |
| 12 | What I understood from Ms. Dunham yesterday was | 12 | MR. YOUNG: Yes. |
| 13 | she said it was not necessary because they already | 13 | MR. DELGADO: But in the farmers' minds and in my |
| 14 | included the farm map and that the locations of streams | 14 | mind, a wetland looks different than a creek. It looks |
| 15 | were located on the farm map. That's what was written in | 15 | like a round object that has surface water. |
| 16 | my notes. | 16 | MS. SCHROETER: There is actually a definition in |
| 17 | This is simply a checkbox. Do you have a creek | 17 | the Order. |
| 18 | or not. Without the checkbox, Staff has to go into every | 18 | MR. YOUNG: Yeah. It could be a marsh. |
| 19 | single farm map and look at them and see who has a creek | 19 | MS. McCHESNEY: I don't know if you heard Angela. |
| 20 | running through their property or not. This is just a | 20 | There is a definition in the Order. They can look at that |
| 21 | checkbox to say presence, absence, and allows us to | 21 | and say "yes" or "no." |
| 22 | prioritize them quickly. | 22 | MR. YOUNG: Okay. |
| 23 | MR. JOHNSTON: What I recall from the discussion | 23 | MR. DELGADO: In real-life, I think when they |
| 24 | wasn't just that you could get this information from the | 24 | fill this out, they're going to check the box according to |
| 25 | farm map, but that the question of figuring out some of | 25 | their mindset. They're not going to go look for the |
| | Page 38 | | Page 40 |
| 1 | these things it's easy to know if you have a stream. | 1 | definition buried in the Order. |
| 2 | If you have a wetland area habitat, her statement was that | 2 | MR. JOHNSTON: Right. |
| 3 | could require a fairly comprehensive study to answer the | 3 | MR. DELGADO: If they see a seepy area with water |
| 4 | question, that some of these some of the categories | 4 | on top of it, they may not think of that as a wetland area |
| 5 | that are in I can't really tell from this if it's N | 5 | and they may not check that box or put that on a map. |
| 6 | or the last one there. | 6 | MS. SCHROETER: One thing we could do, then, to |
| 7 | MR. YOUNG: N. | 7 | address your comment, Mr. Delgado, is, similar to other |
| 8 | MR. JOHNSTON: are fairly obvious, and some | 8 | areas of the Notice of Intent already, we have a link on |
| 9 | are not, and that you would not necessarily get an | 9 | the side for those that require more definition. And you |
| 10 | accurate answer. | 10 | simply click on that wetland and the definition pops up so |
| 11 | MS. SCHROETER: This is just a screening level. | 11 | they can see it right there. |
| 12 | So we're not using it as a definitive interpretation of | 12 | MR. THOMAS: I'm going to skip the next slide. |
| 13 | whether or not it's an actual wetland per the definition. | 13 | (Recess taken.) |
| 14 | What we're looking at, is there streams, creeks, or other | 14 | MS. SCHROETER: We're moving to Part E. Just to |
| 15 | wetland area, riparian types of habitat running through | 15 | summarize, those are all of the edits, our response to all |
| 16 | the property or adjacent to the property. | 16 | of the edits, that would result in an edit to the Order |
| 17 | MR. YOUNG: In other words, you're not expecting | 17 | based upon the input from Farmers For Water Quality. We |
| 18 | them to hire an expert to help them answer those | 18 | do have additional edits which are shown on the yellow |
| 19 | questions? | 19 | sheet which we'll discuss later which are a result of |
| 20 | MS. SCHROETER: No. | 20 | Board member discussion. |
| | | | MD VOUNCE Are you maying to E right now? |
| 21 | MR. YOUNG: It's if they know? | 21 | MR. YOUNG: Are you moving to E right now? |
| 21 22 | MR. YOUNG: It's if they know? MS. SCHROETER: That's correct. | 21 22 | Because there's some other pages in here that don't |
| | - | | |
| 22 | MS. SCHROETER: That's correct. | 22 | Because there's some other pages in here that don't |
| 22 23 | MS. SCHROETER: That's correct. MR. JOHNSTON: And it won't change their tier | 22 23 | Because there's some other pages in here that don't involve E, I believe. Like they've got a Paragraph 61, |

| | | 1 | |
|----------|---|----|--|
| 1 | MS. McCHESNEY: That is Part E. | 1 | to their Attachment B. Their third party group proposal |
| 2 | MR. YOUNG: That is Part E. Okay. Gotcha. | 2 | that they submitted in March and May, they are proposing |
| 3 | All right. | 3 | changes to that, and that's going to be E. It would be a |
| 4 | MR. JOHNSTON: There was also some groundwater | 4 | new E, and then E would become F, and F would become G. |
| 5 | monitoring stuff. Maybe that's going to be covered in | 5 | MR. DELGADO: Okay. The reason I'm a little bit |
| 6 | your Part E, also. Attachments 2A, B, and C. | 6 | confused is because the title of their Part E is pretty |
| 7 | MS. SCHROETER: That specific edit also relates | 7 | much the same as the title of our existing Part E. So you |
| 8 | to some changes related to Board member discussion. So | 8 | would have an E and an F that would had the same title. |
| 9 | we'll capture those in a moment. | 9 | MS. McCANN: There is a difference. Their title |
| 10 | MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you. | 10 | says, Additional conditions that apply to Tier 2 and |
| 11 | MR. THOMAS: With respect to Attachment E, it | 11 | Tier 3 Dischargers this is what's new through |
| 12 | was | 12 | participation in third party group. And ours which does |
| 13 | MS. HUNTER: Is it Attachment or Part? | 13 | not say per third party group will become Part F. Wait a |
| 14 | MR. THOMAS: Part E. | 14 | minute. |
| 15 | MS. HUNTER: Part E. Thank you. | 15 | MR. THOMAS: The pros of the new language, the |
| 16 | MR. THOMAS: Part E, language was proposed to add | 16 | new language that was proposed. There is more detail here |
| 17 | New Part E. The Board directed us to evaluate that | 17 | on a potential coalition concept, and that's a good thing. |
| 18 | language and to consider the pros and cons and answer the | 18 | It looks like they did more work on it, thought about it |
| 19 | question about what would be the most effective Order. | 19 | more, and provided a little bit more detail. |
| 20 | MS. HUNTER: Question. | 20 | We thought that was a good thing. We also think |
| 21 | MR. THOMAS: So the pros | 21 | that coalitions could be very helpful in the overall |
| 22 | MS. HUNTER: Question. | 22 | implementation of the Order, the Water Board's Order, and |
| 23 | MR. THOMAS: Yes. | 23 | that would include any Order. That includes the 2004 |
| 24 | MS. HUNTER: I have a question. | 24 | Order or this proposed 2012 Order. |
| 25 | Can you tell me the title of Part E and where I | 25 | They really could help tremendously with |
| 20 | Page 42 | | Page 44 |
| 1 | | 1 | |
| 1 | can find it in the Order so that I'm sure that I | | education, assistance, outreach coordination and grants, |
| 2 | understand what we're talking about. In this case, I do want to know where I am in the document. | 2 | inspections, providing incentives, awards, collaboration and leveraging of their efforts with others. I think the |
| 3 4 | MS. McCANN: You're asking where in the Order? | 3 | coalitions also could help facilitate broad scale |
| 5 | - | 5 | |
| 6 | MS. HUNTER: (Nods head.) MS. McCANN: Page 26. This is where they are | 6 | implementation. That includes Dr. Los Huertos' ideas. |
| 7 | - | 7 | And I specifically call them ideas because they |
| | recommending to insert | | are ideas. They're not developed. They're just concepts |
| 8 | MS. McCHESNEY: It's not in the Order. | 8 | or ideas that he has been working on for some time. As he |
| 9 10 | MS. McCANN: a New Part E. | 9 | has said, he's not actually working for anyone right now. |
| | MS. McCHESNEY: It's their PowerPoint | 10 | They're just his ideas. |
| 11 | MS. HUNTER: Right. | | We've talked to him about this individually |
| 12 13 | MS. McCHESNEY: with the new part. | 12 | outside these Board hearings about where he actually |
| | MS. HUNTER: What I'm saying is, we already have | 13 | stands with this. And he's told us he does not have |
| 14 | a Part E. On Page 26, there is a Part E. | 14 | support, he does not have an infrastructure, he does not |
| 15 | MS. McCHESNEY: It would replace their proposed | 15 | have an organization, or the support from any organization |
| 16 | Attachment B with a New Part E. | 16 | to implement what he's talking about doing. He's told us |
| 17 | MS. HUNTER: But where does the New Part E | 17 | that it is purely an idea. |
| 18 | belong? That's my question. | 18 | I'm not trying to knock the idea. I'm just |
| 19 | MS. McCHESNEY: Renumber, reletter. So E it | 19 | trying to put it in the context of how he is presenting |
| 20 | would be a new E, and E would become F. | 20 | it. Because there's we heard a lot yesterday and at |
| 21 | MS. HUNTER: Become F. Okay. That's what I | 21 | the last workshop, that we really want you to implement |
| 22 | wasn't clear on. Okay. Got it. | 22 | Dr. Los Huertos' proposal. And it's not a proposal that |
| 23 | MR. DELGADO: So they would replace the Part E | 23 | can be implemented. |
| 24 | that's in the Waiver with their Part E? | 24 | You also heard from Sarah Lopez yesterday about |
| 25 | MS. McCHESNEY: No. They're making some changes | 25 | the Quail Creek Project that she did with Preservation, |
| | Page 43 | | Page 45 |

12 (Pages 42 to 45)

| | | 1 | , |
|----|---|----|--|
| 1 | Inc. | 1 | presented are too long. These Orders the one before |
| 2 | We think that the work that they did their to | 2 | the Board and the 2004 Order have a five-year term. They |
| 3 | reduce loading is great. We think the coalitions could | 3 | have to be renewed in five years for a reason. |
| 4 | cause more of that type of work to be done. And we would | 4 | We are required to in order to be consistent |
| 5 | be very supportive of that. | 5 | with the law, we need to determine the effectiveness of |
| 6 | You also heard from Ross Clark who talked about | 6 | the Order. At the end of five years, we need to be able |
| 7 | Wetland Treatment Systems. And I don't know if I got the | 7 | to say to the Board and the public and ourselves and the |
| 8 | name of his organization correct there. I just was going | 8 | growers how effective that Order is. We need to know that |
| 9 | by memory. | 9 | so that when we renew it, we can make changes that are |
| 10 | MS. HUNTER: Yeah. I think it's Central Coast | 10 | necessary to ensure that the Order is effective. |
| 11 | Watershed Group. | 11 | MR. YOUNG: Are you, Michael, referring to the |
| 12 | MR. THOMAS: Central Coast Watershed Group. | 12 | 2015 date that was proposed as unacceptable because it's |
| 13 | Sorry about that. | 13 | too long term? |
| 14 | The kind of work that Ross Clark was talking | 14 | MS. McCANN: I'm not sure what you're referring |
| 15 | about, we are highly supportive of. We agree with his | 15 | to. In here, we have a replacement for our timeline with |
| 16 | presentation, and we think it was outstanding. We think | 16 | the first milestone at eight years out. I would have to |
| 17 | the work that he's doing and is proposing to do is | 17 | look at it to tell you what the other ones are. |
| 18 | outstanding. We will do everything that we possibly can | 18 | MR. BRIGGS: I think there was an 8-15. |
| 19 | to help him implement those types of projects. And we | 19 | MS. McCANN: Yeah. Maybe that's what |
| 20 | think coalitions would be a big help in doing that. I | 20 | MS. HUNTER: It's under Part G? Is that revised |
| 21 | actually think that it would be necessary to do it, the | 21 | in Part G, the time frame? |
| 22 | kind of collaboration that they could provide. | 22 | |
| 23 | | 23 | MS. McCHESNEY: Yes, it would be G. MS. McCANN: Yes. It would be their Part H |
| 24 | The cons. It is still a concept, though we think | 24 | |
| 25 | it is a concept that could be done. By saying it's a | 25 | replacing our Part G with time schedules that are outside |
| 20 | concept, I'm not trying to be overly critical, I'm not Page 46 | 25 | the term of the Order five years excuse me eight Page 48 |
| 1 | | 1 | verse And I think December or the 1 |
| 1 | trying to kill the idea. I actually hope that it is | | years. And I think Roger's correct, 15. |
| 2 | developed, and that we do implement it or that the | 2 | MR. DELGADO: Can you explain the difference |
| 3 | industry does implement it. And there may be more than | 3 | between milestones, targets, and time frames? When I see |
| 4 | one coalition. We don't know at this point. | 4 | the time frames that they suggested, I kind of thought of |
| 5 | We're still missing key indicators of pollution | 5 | those as milestones. Can you explain the difference. |
| 6 | reduction and practice effectiveness. The language that | 6 | MS. McCANN: I think we're using milestones and |
| 7 | is proposed is not what Dr. Los Huertos was proposing, | 7 | targets interchangeably. So maybe we didn't need two |
| 8 | even though what he was proposes was in concept, it's not | 8 | words there. Or maybe another way to say it is a |
| 9 | the same thing or it's not the same as what Sarah Lopez | 9 | milestone is a target plus a time frame. |
| 10 | did and what she described. | 10 | What are we trying to achieve, that's a target. |
| 11 | If you were to look at the Preservation project | 11 | And what's the time frame that we want to achieve it or |
| 12 | that Sarah implemented it's already done, that project | 12 | the date we want to achieve it by. So we have, for |
| 13 | is already done there's a great amount of detail there. | 13 | example, indicate pollution reduction with some indicators |
| 14 | It's a scientifically based project. It's statistically | 14 | by a set date. It's fair to say that they also have some |
| 15 | significant. The design is based on science and achieving | 15 | targets with time frames. I think you're calling those |
| 16 | statistically significant results. | 16 | milestones now. But they're eight years and fifteen years |
| 17 | That kind of approach, that kind of information, | 17 | out. |
| 18 | is not included in this concept. Again, I don't mean to | 18 | MR. DELGADO: When you say no milestones/targets, |
| 19 | be overly critical here. I'm just trying to point out | 19 | is that true, or did they have some? |
| 20 | that what the context is for this language. And there | 20 | MS. McCANN: Let me clarify. You have to read |
| 21 | also isn't a point of compliance, which we discuss in our | 21 | the other part of that phrase. Within the term of the |
| 22 | Draft Order. | 22 | Order. There's nothing proposed as a set goal that we |
| 23 | There's also no risk-based prioritization | 23 | would measure something by in terms of pollution reduction |
| 24 | criteria such as what we have in our Order. No milestones | 24 | or effectiveness of management practices with a date that |
| | | | |
| 25 | or targets within the term of the Order. The time frames $$\operatorname{Page}\xspace47$$ | 25 | is within the term of the Order the way the language is $\label{eq:page 49} Page 49$ |

| 1 | written. | 1 | requirements. That's what I think I heard. |
|----------|--|----------|---|
| 2 | MR. DELGADO: So they may have a target of | 2 | MS. McCHESNEY: No. I think he said they were |
| 3 | certifying at least 20 percent of the participating farms | 3 | some policy, some legal. |
| 4 | to an audit. But that certification, that target, is not | 4 | MR. DELGADO: Okay. I missed that. Thank you. |
| 5 | a water quality numeric target. It's a process target, | 5 | MR. YOUNG: Yeah. |
| 6 | sort of. | 6 | MR. THOMAS: So the next thing is that we don't |
| 7 | MS. McCANN: I agree with your assessment, but I | 7 | think that the language is responsive to the threat to |
| 8 | wasn't trying to distinguish between water quality and | 8 | human health. And that includes not focusing on |
| 9 | other types of targets here. Now you're raising a | 9 | because it does not focus on shallow groundwater where |
| 10 | slightly different issue which is, if there are to the | 10 | most domestic wells are located and where the threat to |
| 11 | extent that there are some we'll call them process | 11 | human health is greatest. There are no targets or |
| 12 | targets to use your term they're not reported or | 12 | indicators of nitrate-loading reduction, no advanced |
| 13 | they're reported at such a high level, that they won't | 13 | requirements for higher risk operations, operations where |
| 14 | tell us how much progress we're making in pollution | 14 | the threat is greater, which is how our Order is designed. |
| 15 | reduction or advancing towards water quality improvement. | 15 | The last item there, the language and the |
| 16 | MR. BRIGGS: Lisa, back from the mic just a hair. | 16 | approach does not meet the legal standard. We talked to |
| 17 | MS. HUNTER: By high level, you mean aggregate? | 17 | our attorney about this last night and this morning. And |
| 18 | They're reported at an aggregate level that does not allow | 18 | the Board members of the Board said yesterday that |
| 19 | us to understand what's happening? I don't know what you | 19 | Board counsel's advice is a high bar. Just so you know, |
| 20 | mean by high. | 20 | from the Staffs' perspective, it's the bar. |
| 21 | MS. McCANN: As far as the language that is in | 21 | When we have the conflicting attorneys, attorneys |
| 22 | here to be added to the Order, that remains unclear. But | 22 | giving conflicting interpretations, we take the advice of |
| 23 | when I say high level, aggregate is not it's not just | 23 | the Board's legal counsel. We don't take the advice of |
| 24 | aggregate that's high level. It's what's scale and what's | 24 | other counsel. |
| 25 | the indicator that we're aggregating the information. I Page 50 $$ | 25 | I don't know if you want to jump in here, Page 52 |
| | Tage 30 | | 1 age 52 |
| 1 | am talking about things like numbers of growers or types | 1 | Frances. |
| 2 | of practices. | 2 | MS. McCHESNEY: I don't know. |
| 3 | MS. HUNTER: Okay. | 3 | Do you want to hear my these are a couple |
| 4 | MR. YOUNG: Go ahead. | 4 | issues that I had identified as concerns I have with their |
| 5 | MR. JOHNSTON: Just a quick question here. | 5 | proposal. |
| 6 | Is this list of cons the list of policy and legal | 6 | So the first one is that Ms. Dunham has expressed |
| 7 | issues which would have to be resolved to utilize this | 7 | the concern that the proposed Order would somehow be |
| 8 | concept or is that coming separately? | 8 | interpreted to require immediate compliance with Water |
| 9 | MR. THOMAS: These things would have to be | 9 | Quality Standards because it says, "Dischargers shall |
| 10 | resolved, yes. | 10 | comply with Water Quality Standards and protect beneficial |
| 11 | MR. JOHNSTON: I understand. | 11 | uses and prevent nuisance." |
| 12 | So this is that list that I was asking for last | 12 | And my comment on that has been that it's the |
| 13 | night; is that correct? | 13 | language in the existing Order, it's the language in all |
| 14 | MR. THOMAS: Yes. | 14 | the other Orders adopted by other regional Boards |
| 15 | MR. JOHNSTON: Okay. I want to let you walk | 15 | regarding compliance of Water Quality Standards, it's the |
| 16 | through it, and then I've got some questions about | 16 | requirement of the law that they comply with Water Quality |
| 17 | different things. | 17 | Standards. |
| 18 | MR. DELGADO: Okay. I have to jump in if I | 18 | Where the issue has come up is that there seems |
| 19 | could, Chair, because I don't see all these as legal. | 19 | to be this view that the language means that assuming |
| 20 | Having risk-based prioritization criteria, is that a legal | 20 | the Board adopts something today, that tomorrow everybody |
| 21 | requirement? | 21 | is going to be out of compliance. But there are |
| 22 | MR. YOUNG: They're going to get to that. | 22 | numerous with the Water Quality Standards, there are |
| 23 | Whether it's legal or not, they're | 23 | numerous provisions in the Order, both in the findings and |
| | | | in the Order part that make it clear that for purpose |
| 24 | MR. DELGADO: They just did get to that. They | 24 | in the Order part that make it clear that for purpose |
| 24 25 | MR. DELGADO: They just did get to that. They said, I think, that everything up there are legal Page 51 | 24 25 | and in the State Water Board's policy on the Non Point Page 53 |

14 (Pages 50 to 53)

| 1 | Source Policy, for nonpoint sources, compliance with Water | 1 | here at midnight tonight. |
|--|---|---|---|
| 2 | Quality Standards means to implement management practices. | 2 | You know, Staff has done an impressive job on, I |
| 3 | If they aren't effective in reducing discharges to meet | 3 | suspect, very little sleep of responding to a tremendous |
| 4 | Water Quality Standards, that they revise or do new | 4 | volume of stuff. I suggest that we let them finish their |
| 5 | management practices. | 5 | presentation. And to the extent that we don't understand |
| 6 | And it's been made clear in the Order. It's the | 6 | stuff that they're presenting, that we ask questions so we |
| 7 | same language in the Central Valley Order that the Staff | 7 | understand it. |
| 8 | has proposed and is currently in the Order. It has not | 8 | And I think that there are some other proposed |
| 9 | resulted it's the same language that's in the Coalition | 9 | edits that they have. We let them run through their whole |
| 10 | Group Waiver for in the Central Valley. It has not | 10 | presentation, and we ask questions as we need to to |
| 11 | resulted in any enforcement actions for not complying with | 11 | understand it. And then we circle back around, and we |
| 12 | Water Quality Standards. | 12 | talk about whether we as a Board want to consider trying |
| 13 | So my recommendation that it not be changed | 13 | to implement some version of what we heard yesterday from |
| 14 | because it's it implements a law, and it's been | 14 | Tess. And if we decide we do, then I think we need to run |
| 15 | carefully defined within the Order. | 15 | through point by point: I think this is the list of legal |
| 16 | Tess proposed a different way to address that | 16 | and policy considerations that would have to be resolved, |
| 17 | issue in her proposal, which is the Paragraphs 21 and 22. | 17 | and the policy considerations to our satisfaction and the |
| 18 | You know, if you there are ways to write it in the way | 18 | legal considerations certainly, I want to satisfy Frances |
| 19 | she's proposed, but it would take some rewriting because | 19 | here. That's what we pay her for. I suggest we just run |
| 20 | of some issues that she's raised by her proposed rewrites. | 20 | on through, ask questions as we need to to understand, and |
| 21 | And I would you know, if you want to consider | 21 | then circle back around and see how much we want to dig |
| 22 | her proposal, I'd be happy to talk about what I would | 22 | into this. |
| 23 | change about her proposal. But I really think it's | 23 | MR. YOUNG: That's fine. So go ahead. |
| 24 | working the way it's working. It's a requirement of the | 24 | Frances had some more, I think, to address this |
| 25 | law to require compliance with Water Quality Standards. | 25 | list. |
| | Page 54 | | Page 56 |
| | | | |
| 1 | That's the basic standard of every discharger in the State | 1 | MS. McCHESNEY: I talked about the other one. |
| 2 | is to comply with Water Quality Standards. | 2 | That's the proposal to delete the provision of the Staff |
| 3 | In the case of nonpoint source pollution, it's an | 3 | report, the Staff proposal that they provide their farm |
| 4 | integrative process to do management practices and then | 4 | plans upon request to the Board, and they have proposed to |
| 5 | make them better. There's nothing in the Order that would | 5 | not allow that to happen. And I have already described my |
| 6 | require them to be in compliance tomorrow. It's made very | 6 | legal concern with that, that it's undermining your own |
| 7 | clear. | 7 | |
| 8 | | | authority to get technical reports submitted to the Board, |
| | MR. DELGADO: To the Chair, if I may. If she had | 8 | and that I would not recommend that. And the Central |
| 9 | suggestions that you just said were workable that also | 8 9 | and that I would not recommend that. And the Central Valley's Order has that, the current Order has that. I |
| 10 | suggestions that you just said were workable that also satisfy your needs and our needs, then why wouldn't we | 9 10 | and that I would not recommend that. And the Central Valley's Order has that, the current Order has that. I don't see any need to delete. It would undermine your own |
| 10 11 | 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? | 9 10 11 | and that I would not recommend that. And the Central 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 |
| 10 11 12 | 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 | 9 10 11 12 | and that I would not recommend that. And the Central 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. |
| 10 11 12 13 | 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 | 9 10 11 12 13 | and that I would not recommend that. And the Central 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. |
| 10 11 12 13 14 | 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 | 9 10 11 12 13 14 | and that I would not recommend that. And the Central 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 |
| 10 11 12 13 14 15 | 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 | 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | and that I would not recommend that. And the Central 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. |
| 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | 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 | 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | and that I would not recommend that. And the Central 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 |
| 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | 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 | 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | and that I would not recommend that. And the Central 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 |
| 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | 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. | 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | and that I would not recommend that. And the Central 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 |
| 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | 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 | 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | and that I would not recommend that. And the Central 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 |
| 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | 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. | 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | and that I would not recommend that. And the Central 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 |
| 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | 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 | 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | and that I would not recommend that. And the Central 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 |
| 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | 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 | 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | and that I would not recommend that. And the Central 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 |
| 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | 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. | 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | and that I would not recommend that. And the Central 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 |
| 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | 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. | 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | and that I would not recommend that. And the Central 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. |
| 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | 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. | 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | and that I would not recommend that. And the Central 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 |

ſ

| 1 | Waste Discharge Requirements or a Waiver of Waste | 1 | the Board for years now. Key indicators of pollution |
|----|--|----|---|
| 2 | Discharge Requirements. | 2 | reduction and practice effectiveness, risk-based |
| 3 | It's the individual Discharger's responsibility | 3 | prioritization criteria, milestones or targets within the |
| 4 | under the law to comply with the law. So you can't have a | 4 | term of the Order so that we can demonstrate progress of |
| 5 | third party group that shields the individual from the | 5 | reducing pollution loading. |
| 6 | compliance with the law. Some of the ways that it was | 6 | We need to be responsive to the human health |
| 7 | written in the previous version appeared to try to do | 7 | threat. It's our highest priority. We cannot put |
| 8 | that. Which is somewhat surprising because I would think | 8 | language into this Order that diminishes or undermines the |
| 9 | the third party group would not want to be taking on the | 9 | Board's authority diminishes that or undermines the |
| 10 | responsibility that's really assigned to the individual | 10 | Board's authority. We need to focus on shallow |
| 11 | discharger. So that was a little interesting. | 11 | groundwater and targets or indicators of nitrate loading |
| 12 | I think the newer version does clarify some of | 12 | reduction. We have to have advanced requirements for |
| 13 | those things that the individual discharger is ultimately | 13 | higher risk. This is how the Board conducts its business |
| 14 | responsible. But there are some areas that could be | 14 | on every program that it implements. And the language or |
| 15 | clarified better. So that was my other concern. | 15 | the approach must be consistent with the law and policies, |
| 16 | MR. YOUNG: Go ahead, Michael. | 16 | or it's not defensible. |
| 17 | MR. THOMAS: Our recommendation regarding this | 17 | We also need to include in our Order in order for |
| 18 | new language, New Part E, is that and this is not our | 18 | it to be effective an option to implement alternatives |
| 19 | final recommendation of the day. This is just the | 19 | that are equivalent or better than what we are proposing. |
| 20 | recommendation regarding this particular language that | 20 | Because there are other options that are equivalent and |
| 21 | we cannot recommend adding I should have said Part E | 21 | better than what we are proposing. And the industry can |
| 22 | there this language in the Order. We can't recommend | 22 | develop those. So we have tried to make the Order as |
| 23 | it for the reasons I said on the previous slide. | 23 | flexible as we can. We tried to include language to |
| 24 | However, we want to make it clear, if we haven't | 24 | encourage and promote these alternatives. And we welcome |
| 25 | made it clear before, that we encourage third party groups | 25 | the industry's effort to do it. |
| | Page 58 | | Page 60 |
| 1 | to develop alternative implementation approaches with the | 1 | We currently have timelines in the Order. And |
| 2 | key elements on the previous slide. And we also think the | 2 | one of the edits that we are proposing that we'll get to |
| 3 | technical advisory committee is a good idea. That was | 3 | in a few minutes is to extend those deadlines that are in |
| 4 | mentioned in the proposed language. | 4 | the Order to further promote the development of these |
| 5 | The question that was asked yesterday | 5 | third party alternatives that will be submitted to the |
| 6 | MR. YOUNG: Before you go, Mr. Jordan has a | 6 | Executive Officer for approval. |
| 7 | question for clarification. | 7 | We want them. We want them to meet these |
| 8 | MR. THOMAS: Yes. | 8 | requirements. So we've designed the Order to do that. |
| 9 | MR. JORDAN: Before you left that last page, I'm | 9 | And it's not unusual. Many of the Orders that this Board |
| 10 | curious, other than the legal items that Frances has | 10 | adopts and has adopted over the past years over many |
| 11 | identified and the strict policy items that you've | 11 | years includes this approach, where the Board establishes |
| 12 | | 12 | |
| 13 | identified, is everything else on that page or everything | 13 | requirements and says, or an alternative that is equivalent or better, and allows the industry or the |
| 14 | on the prior cons page able to be folded into the existing | 14 | |
| 14 | Order the way it's already written? | | responsible party to develop that. That is the most |
| | MR. THOMAS: Yes. | 15 | effective Order that we can have, to set standards and |
| 16 | MR. JORDAN: Thank you. | 16 | allow alternatives. |
| 17 | MR. THOMAS: That's where I was going. | 17 | If you want to see alternatives from third party |
| 18 | MR. JORDAN: Sorry. | 18 | groups that meet the law and that have the conditions that |
| 19 | MR. THOMAS: That's a good question. | 19 | we've talked about, then adopting the Order with that |
| 20 | The question that was asked yesterday, what is | 20 | option is the way to go. Continuing to delay is going to |
| 21 | the most effective Order to improve water quality and meet | 21 | result in a continuation of what we have had over the past |
| 22 | legal standards. There's a typo. We were working on this | 22 | three and a half years. We continue to argue about these |
| 23 | late. | 23 | things. We continue to have opposing legal arguments and |
| 24 | What's the answer? An Order that includes the | 24 | we're stuck. |
| 25 | things that we've been talking about and emphasizing to | 25 | Okay. Other edits. |
| 1 | Page 59 | | Page 61 |

| r | | 1 | |
|----------|---|----|---|
| 1 | MR. YOUNG: Let me just say something. It's okay | 1 | for Tier 2 on Page 9, it talks about cooperative |
| 2 | to have opposing legal arguments. Ultimately the Board | 2 | groundwater monitoring efforts to minimize costs. This is |
| 3 | needs to weigh those and decide where it wants to go with | 3 | A6, Page 9 of the Tier 2 Monitoring Program. |
| 4 | that. | 4 | MR. JOHNSTON: Page 9 of what? |
| 5 | Right? | 5 | MR. BRIGGS: The monitoring and reporting program |
| 6 | MR. THOMAS: Sure. It's okay to have opposing | 6 | for Tier 2. |
| 7 | legal arguments. I don't think it's okay for us to | 7 | MS. HUNTER: On Page 9, what number is it? |
| 8 | continue to delay and not implement actions that protect | 8 | MR. BRIGGS: Number 6. |
| 9 | people that are threatened by this pollution. I don't | 9 | MS. HUNTER: Okay. I have found it. Thank you. |
| 10 | think that's okay. | 10 | (Discussion held off the record.) |
| 11 | MR. YOUNG: I understand that. Right. | 11 | MS. HUNTER: Each tier Monitoring Program has |
| 12 | MS. SCHROETER: Now I'm going to what Michael | 12 | that same Number 6 apparently. |
| 13 | put up here on the screen is a list of other edits that | 13 | MR. DELGADO: On Page 9, Paragraph 6 in each |
| 14 | Staff is recommending, and they also are reflected on your | 14 | |
| 15 | yellow sheets. So I'm going to talk about them in detail. | 15 | MR. JORDAN: Okay. |
| 16 | MR. YOUNG: Angela, hold on one second. | 16 | MS. HUNTER: Thank you. I just need to get my |
| 17 | Dr. Hunter, you want to quickly ask that | 17 | bearings. |
| 18 | question? | 18 | MS. SCHROETER: Now what you have in front of you |
| 19 | MS. HUNTER: Okay. Thank you. | 19 | on the yellow sheet are four pages of additional edits |
| 20 | Again, I'm trying to track how the proposed new | 20 | that Staff is suggesting based upon the information |
| 21 | Part E, which refers to and puts a lot of detail more | 21 | submitted by Farmers For Water Quality as well as the |
| 22 | detail, as Michael said, from Attachment B. So that's an | 22 | Board member discussion yesterday. |
| 23 | improvement. | 23 | We already went through a page and a half of |
| 24 | | 24 | |
| 24 25 | Where in the monitoring report section, which is | | them. I'm going to start on Page 2 where it says |
| 20 | 1, 2, and 3, do we see any kind of spelling out of how the Page 62 | 25 | Paragraph 58, Page 24 and 25. You'll notice on the one Page 64 |
| | | | |
| 1 | third party process will work? Or do we have that? I'm | 1 | above Paragraph 56, we already discussed that one, about |
| 2 | not seeing it. I just want to know: Do we have something | 2 | the NOI form and the edits to the NOI form. |
| 3 | that's equivalent? | 3 | Paragraph 58 is the middle of Page 2, left-hand |
| 4 | MS. McCANN: I don't think they proposed any | 4 | column. |
| 5 | edits to the monitoring and reporting program. | 5 | MR. YOUNG: Do you want the word "an" in front of |
| 6 | MS. HUNTER: I know. | 6 | appropriate? |
| 7 | MS. McCANN: Okay. | 7 | MS. SCHROETER: Yes. Sorry. |
| 8 | MS. HUNTER: So let me ask that question a little | 8 | MS. McCHESNEY: "In the." |
| 9 | differently. | 9 | MS. SCHROETER: "In the appropriate tier." |
| 10 | MS. McCANN: Okay. | 10 | MR. YOUNG: Right. |
| 11 | MS. HUNTER: The only place that I see third | 11 | MS. SCHROETER: This one is for Dischargers who |
| 12 | party referenced is in Additional Findings, Number 10. It | 12 | do not provide adequate information for the Water Board to |
| 13 | says it deals that's where you deal with third party | 13 | confirm. The Executive Officer will place the farm ranch |
| 14 | groups. And it refers to the Monitoring Program Orders. | 14 | in the appropriate tier based upon information submitted |
| 15 | That's why I was wondering: Is it in the Monitoring | 15 | in the Notice of Intent. And I'm bringing this one up |
| 16 | Program Order, or is that the only place where you refer | 16 | because this was left over from Tess' that we didn't |
| 17 | to third party groups? | 17 | address. Her concern was that farmers would be |
| 18 | MS. McCANN: You're referring to our Draft Order? | 18 | automatically placed on the higher tier. And we agree. |
| 19 | MS. HUNTER: Yes. Correct. | 19 | So we are suggesting additional edit that they would be |
| 20 | MS. McCANN: Okay. | 20 | placed in the appropriate tier based upon the information |
| 21 | MR. JOHNSTON: Besides Condition 10, I think | 21 | submitted in the Notice of Intent. |
| 22 | Finding 11 refers to cooperative that's not monitoring. | 22 | The second change, and this was in response to |
| 23 | Sorry. | 23 | MR. DELGADO: Excuse me, Angela. |
| 24 | MR. BRIGGS: Mr. Chairman, in Attachment 2B, | 24 | MS. SCHROETER: Yes. |
| 1 | | | |
| 25 | which is, for example, monitoring and reporting program | 25 | MR. DELGADO: To the Chair, back to that point, I |

| 1 | think sometimes the Notice of Intent will be incomplete | 1 | get a clean sterilized jar from the lab, take it in a bag, |
|--|---|--|---|
| 2 | and not allow the Executive Officer based on that | 2 | go get my sample, fill out a label, and submit it, and |
| 3 | standalone document to make a determination. I mean, | 3 | that was okay. |
| 4 | that's a possibility that I could foresee. | 4 | As long as you're going to be able to explain |
| 5 | If this would say, "Place the farm ranch in the | 5 | this to people, train them how to be able to do it |
| 6 | appropriate tier based upon either information submitted | 6 | themselves, with some training, they could become |
| 7 | in the Notice of Intent or further communication between | 7 | qualified. |
| 8 | the Executive Officer or Staff and the applicant, that | 8 | MR. JEFFRIES: It's also a cost savings. |
| 9 | that I think that would be more thorough. | 9 | MR. YOUNG: It's a cost savings. And it makes it |
| 10 | MS. SCHROETER: We could add that information, | 10 | easier to do. So just consider that. |
| 11 | "or further communication with the grower regarding their | 11 | MR. DELGADO: Okay. |
| 12 | enrollment." | 12 | MS. SCHROETER: That's a good example. |
| 13 | The next one is regarding the sampling of | 13 | The second one relates specifically to the |
| 14 | groundwater, individual groundwater sampling. And this | 14 | Farmers For Water Quality's suggestion about |
| 15 | actually is in response to a comment that was brought up | 15 | clarification about the individual groundwater monitoring. |
| 16 | by Board Member Wolff as a stakeholder. His concern was | 16 | Essentially we agreed with their suggested edits, |
| 17 | about the need to have registered professionals conducting | 17 | which are in the underline here. The parts that we added |
| 18 | the groundwater sampling. We do suggest a change. We | 18 | are in that last sentence of the second paragraph, a |
| 19 | understand that comment, and the change is that we would | 19 | strikeout, where it says, Qualifying cooperative |
| 20 | delete the sections that say, "State registered | 20 | groundwater monitoring and reporting programs may include |
| 21 | professional engineer, professional geologist, or other | 21 | but are not limited to regional or subregional groundwater |
| 22 | similarly qualified professional," and replace that with a | 22 | programs developed for other purposes as long as the |
| 23 | qualified third party, for example, technician, | 23 | proposed cooperative groundwater Monitoring Program meets |
| 24 | consultant, or individual conducting cooperative | 24 | the Water Board's general purpose of characterizing |
| 25 | monitoring. | 25 | groundwater quality. That's where Farmers For Water |
| | Page 66 | | Page 68 |
| 1 | So, for example, Preservation, Inc., currently | 1 | Quality and ad |
| 2 | conducts surface water cooperative monitoring. Someone | 1 2 | Quality ended. What we'd like to do is to add because this |
| 3 | like that would be fine to conduct the groundwater | 3 | wasn't in our original intent, "and ensuring the |
| 4 | sampling, or a certified lab employee, for example. | 4 | protection of drinking water sources." |
| 5 | MR. DELGADO: Who would determine the | 5 | So that really is our general purpose of the |
| 6 | qualifications necessary? | 6 | individual groundwater monitoring is both to characterize |
| 7 | MS. SCHROETER: Well, it's per the proper | 7 | groundwater quality and ensure the protection of drinking |
| 8 | sampling methods and analytical. So someone who's | 8 | water sources. That's the add on. |
| 9 | qualified to do the sampling methods and | 9 | The other change that we made to the suggested |
| 10 | MR. DELGADO: Who determines that? I might get a | 10 | edits oh, here. So on the third page, at the top of |
| 11 | lesson from you. And you and I might agree that I'm now | 11 | the page, where it says, Adequately characterize the |
| 12 | qualified. | 12 | groundwater aquifers in the local area of the |
| 13 | | 13 | participating Dischargers. We agree with that change to |
| т 3 | Am I gualified? | | |
| 14 | Am I qualified? MS. SCHROETER: What we intended to do was to | 14 | strike out represent and add the word characterize. |
| | MS. SCHROETER: What we intended to do was to | 14 15 | strike out represent and add the word characterize. Ms. Dunham had also suggested that we strike out, |
| 14 | MS. SCHROETER: What we intended to do was to hold a workshop or provide some assistance for growers of | | Ms. Dunham had also suggested that we strike out, |
| 14 15 16 | 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 | 15 16 | Ms. Dunham had also suggested that we strike out, "characterize the groundwater quality of the uppermost |
| 14 15 | 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 | 15 | Ms. Dunham had also suggested that we strike out, "characterize the groundwater quality of the uppermost aquifer." Staff disagrees with that strikeout. We feel |
| 14 15 16 17 | 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 | 15 16 17 | 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 |
| 14 15 16 17 18 | 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 | 15 16 17 18 | 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. |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 | 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. | 15 16 17 18 19 | 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 |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | 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. | 15 16 17 18 19 20 | 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 |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | 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. | 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | 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 |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | 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. | 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | 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. |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | 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 | 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | 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 |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | 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 | 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | 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. |

| 1 | here to submit the cooperative groundwater monitoring | 1 | individual discharge monitoring for surface water, the |
|----------|--|----|--|
| 2 | proposal. So you will see that they have someone who | 2 | date to submit the plan would be March 15th, 2013. The |
| 3 | wanted to do it cooperatively has a year to submit the | 3 | date to start sampling would be October 1st, 2013. And |
| 4 | proposal. That's acceptable to Staff. | 4 | the date to submit any reporting would be March 15, 2014, |
| 5 | So the next suggested edit is the one that | 5 | two years after today. |
| 6 | Michael specifically referenced. And that relates to the | 6 | In addition Staff is also recommending to delete |
| 7 | dates regarding individual discharge monitoring. So we | 7 | the date of implementation for the irrigation nutrient |
| 8 | understand that any cooperative effort, third party | 8 | management plan to allow for the flexibility of |
| 9 | effort, is going to require time. So we want to be able | 9 | considering alternatives before the development of that |
| 10 | to provide that time before some of the more burdensome | 10 | plan. The previous date was October 1, 2013. We would |
| 11 | requirements kick in. | 11 | just suggest |
| 12 | For example, for individual sampling analysis | 12 | MR. DELGADO: So you'd leave it open-ended, no |
| 13 | plan, we would like to revise that date to submit to be | 13 | date? |
| 14 | one year, March 15th, 2014, instead of the previous date | 14 | MS. SCHROETER: Leave that one open-ended with no |
| 15 | which was six months after adoption. | 15 | date. |
| 16 | In addition, we also are suggesting the edit to | 16 | They development and implement that plan at their |
| 17 | revise the date to initiate the individual discharge | 17 | discretion; however, the next one is regarding the |
| 18 | monitoring, surface discharge monitoring to be | 18 | reporting of the elements of the irrigation issue |
| 19 | October 1st, 2013. So this extends individual to surface | 19 | management plan. So here we're suggesting to move the |
| 20 | discharge monitoring 1.5 years. The previous date was | 20 | date for reporting the elements of the irrigation issue |
| 21 | October 1, 2012. | 21 | management plan by one year. |
| 22 | MR. BRIGGS: Angela, back up one. Is that the | 22 | Currently it's October 1, 2014, and it would move |
| 23 | right date there? Because it looks like you mean to say | 23 | to October 1, 2015. That previous date notation there is |
| 24 | 2013. | 24 | wrong in the note. |
| 25 | MR. JEFFRIES: That's what I thought. You have | 25 | So those are the suggested edits that relate to |
| 20 | Page 70 | | Page 72 |
| | 6 | | 6 |
| 1 | March 15, 2014. | 1 | dates. All those dates were extended out to allow for the |
| 2 | MS. SCHROETER: Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, you're | 2 | opportunity for the development of alternatives, third |
| 3 | correct. Thank you for catching that important | 3 | party groups, or certifications, cooperative efforts. |
| 4 | clarification. | 4 | We also are suggesting some additional edits in |
| 5 | MR. BRIGGS: So that's the first date change that | 5 | response to the hearing discussion yesterday. The next |
| б | Angela was talking about. | 6 | one relates to the nutrient balance ratios as a target |
| 7 | MS. SCHROETER: Submit the individual sampling | 7 | versus a milestone. In response to the discussion |
| 8 | analysis plan. | 8 | yesterday, Staff is suggesting that we go ahead and make |
| 9 | MR. BRIGGS: Right. Revise date to submit | 9 | the nitrogen balance ratio a milestone and not a |
| 10 | individual sampling analysis plan to March 15th, 2013 as | 10 | compliance condition. |
| 11 | consistent with the one year from today. | 11 | So the edit, then, is by October 1, 2015, |
| 12 | MR. DELGADO: That is a six-month extension | 12 | Dischargers with high nitrate loading risk must report the |
| 13 | compared to the status quo? | 13 | progress towards the following nitrogen balance ratio |
| 14 | MS. SCHROETER: That's correct. That is to | 14 | milestones, instead of must achieve the milestones. They |
| 15 | submit the plan. And an additional extension for actually | 15 | have to still report the ratio at a certain date. But |
| 16 | initiating the sampling, which is the next one. | 16 | it's moving to a milestone instead of a compliance |
| 17 | So in addition, we're also revising dates to | 17 | condition. |
| 18 | submit or to report the individual surface water discharge | 18 | MR. DELGADO: When you say report progress |
| 19 | monitoring to March 15th, 2014. The previous date was | 19 | towards, that means any amount of positive numeric |
| 20 | October 1, 2013. So this basically provides two years to | 20 | progress? |
| 21 | submit the data. So it allows growers two years to | 21 | MS. SCHROETER: That's correct. Then the next |
| 22 | consider and implement start implementing alternative | 22 | edit would be moving the conditions to achieve nitrogen |
| 1 | | 22 | balance ratio to the specific table. So they go from the |
| 23 | before they have to report any individual discharge | 23 | balance radio to the specific table. So they go from the |
| 23 24 | before they have to report any individual discharge monitoring data. | 23 | compliance conditions table to Table 4. |
| | | | |
| 24 | monitoring data. | 24 | compliance conditions table to Table 4. |

| 1 | milestones will be used to evaluate progress towards water | 1 | to be an enforceable requirement. If they don't show |
|----------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|
| 2 | quality improvement. That milestone is still how we're | 2 | progress, they're not going to be hit with enforcements. |
| 3 | going to measure progress. But it's not a compliance | 3 | It's just, Okay. Now you need to look at more what you |
| 4 | condition to achieve it. | 4 | can do to show improvements. |
| 5 | MR. DELGADO: Is it accurate to say that targets | 5 | Right? |
| 6 | are requirements and milestones are suggestions? Because | 6 | MR. DELGADO: So then are targets enforceable? |
| 7 | it seems like now we're saying here's the difference | 7 | MS. McCHESNEY: Target was only the word used for |
| 8 | between targets and milestones; whereas, earlier they were | 8 | that thing, and there's no other use of the word target. |
| 9 | interchangeable words. | 9 | So it goes away. |
| 10 | MR. BRIGGS: Mr. Chair. | 10 | MR. DELGADO: In the Ag Order and the associated |
| 11 | MR. YOUNG: Yes. | 11 | MRP, target comes up in one instance. And in that |
| 12 | MR. BRIGGS: I think the key thing is not so much | 12 | instance, it's enforceable. But otherwise target's not |
| 13 | the word target but be consistent with Table 4 which we | 13 | used, instead milestones are used. |
| 14 | call milestones as opposed to meet targets. And that | 14 | MS. McCHESNEY: That was because you said |
| 15 | applies in the heading of the table I think was | 15 | yesterday that was the only the nitrogen target was the |
| 16 | compliance. So you put all that together. | 16 | only enforceable thing, if that's a word. |
| 17 | MR. DELGADO: Okay. But for the purpose of | 17 | MR. JOHNSTON: I think it was enforceable part |
| 18 | understanding this on the part of the growers especially, | 18 | the implication I got was it was in a table labeled |
| 19 | it would be nice if they knew the difference. Because we | 19 | Conditions. |
| 20 | knew the difference between targets and milestones. So if | 20 | MS. McCHESNEY: Right. |
| 21 | there is a policy difference, it would be nice to know | 21 | MR. JOHNSTON: And we have moved it from a table |
| 22 | that consistent policy difference. | 22 | labeled Conditions to a table labeled Milestones and said |
| 23 | MR. JEFFRIES: What you're inferring is that the | 23 | it will be we've stated specifically that you're |
| 24 | language of milestones be consistent throughout the Order? | 24 | required to excuse me. We said specifically that you |
| 25 | It means the same thing? | 25 | must report progress in the direction of that. |
| | Page 74 | | Page 76 |
| 1 | MR. DELGADO: Sort of. If there is a difference, | 1 | MS. McCHESNEY: Right. |
| 2 | let's say that targets were things that had to be met to | 2 | MR. JOHNSTON: So we've moved it from being a |
| 3 | be complaint, but milestones were time frames that were | 3 | condition you have to meet to something you have to |
| 4 | more wishy washy. Or if there was any other consistent | 4 | progress towards. |
| 5 | difference, it's just important to me that the growers are | 5 | MS. McCHESNEY: Right. And so you before I |
| 6 | able to understand. | 6 | mean, the way it was originally proposed, if you didn't |
| 7 | MR. JEFFRIES: I understand and I appreciate | 7 | meet that 1 or 1.2 or other alternative that was approved |
| 8 | that. And this statement earlier in the presentation | 8 | by that date, you would be out of compliance. |
| 9 | that at least I understood that targets and | 9 | Right? |
| 10 | milestones were interchangeable by the Staff and | 10 | MS. SCHROETER: That's correct. |
| 11 | interpretation. Is that correct? | 11 | And actually Roger said it simply before that. |
| 12 | MS. McCANN: Maybe we need to clarify something. | 12 | The only reason to change the wording from target to |
| 13 | This is the only indicator or place where we | 13 | milestone is that it was going to the milestone table, |
| 14 | use the term target. It's a descriptor for this thing | 14 | otherwise there wasn't really a distinction. It's |
| 15 | called the nutrient balance ratio. And we want it to be a | 15 | compliance condition versus a milestone. |
| 16 | milestone. First it's a condition. | 16 | MR. DELGADO: So just to beat a dead horse, then, |
| 17 | | 17 | there's no longer the word target in any of the papers |
| | MS. McCHESNEY: I think I can explain it. The | | |
| 18 | MS. McCHESNEY: I think I can explain it. The difference is is that in Table 3, this is a time schedule, | 18 | before us as far as something you have to meet? |
| 18 19 | | 18 19 | before us as far as something you have to meet? MS. SCHROETER: Right. |
| | difference is is that in Table 3, this is a time schedule, | | |
| 19 | difference is is that in Table 3, this is a time schedule, for example, submit your photo monitoring. So that's a | 19 | MS. SCHROETER: Right. |
| 19 20 | 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 | 19 20 | MS. SCHROETER: Right. MR. DELGADO: Okay. |
| 19 20 21 | 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 | 19 20 21 | MS. SCHROETER: Right. MR. DELGADO: Okay. MS. SCHROETER: That's what we intend. |
| 19 20 21 22 | 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 | 19 20 21 22 | MS. SCHROETER: Right. MR. DELGADO: Okay. MS. SCHROETER: That's what we intend. MR. BRIGGS: As long as you go to the next |
| 19 20 21 22 23 | 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 | 19 20 21 22 23 | 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 |

20 (Pages 74 to 77)

| 1 | word target. It's the same change. It just isn't in the | 1 | MS. SCHROETER: They have been. Monica can |
|--|---|--|--|
| 2 | MRP. | 2 | correct me if I'm wrong, but I think those have been the |
| 3 | So that brings me to our last edit. And that is, | 3 | most well attended is with those grower groups. |
| 4 | again we already started discussing this one that's | 4 | MR. YOUNG: Has anyone called to speak to our |
| 5 | in response to Mr. Sanchez's comment about his concerns | 5 | Spanish-speaking Staff? |
| 6 | related to small disadvantaged growers, especially those | 6 | MS. SCHROETER: Yes, all the time. |
| 7 | that may be non-English speaking. | 7 | MR. JEFFRIES: I'm sure there's going to be some |
| 8 | We agree. We would like to prioritize those | 8 | of those folks who are going to fall through the cracks. |
| 9 | types of growers for assistance, and we would like to | 9 | And I think that's some of the folks that Mr. Sanchez was |
| 10 | actually add a finding to the Order that states, The | 10 | referring to that are afraid to step forward for one |
| 11 | Central Coast Water Board recognizes that certain | 11 | reason or another and to ask or even inquire what they're |
| 12 | disadvantaged farmers may have difficulties to achieve | 12 | supposed to do. |
| 13 | compliance with this Order. | 13 | So that's and I don't want to speak for him, |
| 14 | The Central Coast Water Board will prioritize | 14 | but that's what I took from some of his comments, that |
| 15 | assistance for these farmers, including but not limited to | 15 | there's folks out there that are farming, whatever type of |
| 16 | technical assistance, grant opportunities, and necessary | 16 | farming they're doing, haven't attended any of these |
| 17 | flexibility to achieve compliance with this Order, (e.g.), | 17 | workshops. And now they're afraid that there's going to |
| 18 | adjusted monitoring reporting or time schedules. | 18 | be some Order which means some kind of liability to them |
| 19 | So if that issue comes up, that's how we would | 19 | and that they don't understand. |
| 20 | handle it. And actually the USDA has a definition for | 20 | Is the form also in Spanish and Chinese. |
| 21 | growers called the limited resource farmer definition. | 21 | MS. SCHROETER: All of our electronic Notice of |
| 22 | And those are the types of farmers that they prioritize | 22 | Intent forms are all in Spanish. They've all been |
| 23 | for assistance for equip funds and other types of grant | 23 | distributed to the commodity groups, where there are |
| 24 | opportunities. | 24 | Spanish-speaking growers that we know of. For example, |
| 25 | MR. JEFFRIES: Angela, how is a disadvantaged | 25 | the Alba Group. That's just one example as well as the |
| | Page 78 | | Page 8 |
| 1 | farmer going to be able to interpret this if they're | 1 | local farm bureaus. For example, the Cachuma RCD, we've |
| 2 | non-English speaking? | 2 | worked with them to distribute our documents in Spanish. |
| 3 | MS. SCHROETER: We have increased our efforts to | 3 | We hear the concern, and our intent is to provide a higher |
| 4 | conduct outreach with the non-English speaking community | 4 | level of assistance and prioritize assistance for those |
| 5 | of growers. Our latest example of doing that is working | 5 | farmers. |
| 6 | with the Chinese chrysanthemum speakers. So we're really | 6 | MR. JEFFRIES: I realize that we can't cover all |
| 7 | trying to coordinate with commodity groups to identify | 7 | bases. But eventually I'm sure we'll discover those folks |
| 8 | where that need is. That's actually an example of | 8 | as they |
| 9 | success. We've increased enrollment in that segment of | 9 | MR. YOUNG: As they pop up. |
| 10 | the agriculture industry where it was not there before. | 10 | MR. JEFFRIES: as they pop up. |
| 11 | MR. YOUNG: How about for Spanish speakers? | 11 | MS. SCHROETER: Many of them are already |
| 12 | I understand that. | 12 | enrolled. So I don't want to leave you with the |
| 13 | I just want to know what mechanism do you have | 13 | impression that those types of groups are |
| 14 | right now in place should a Spanish-speaking farmer call | 14 | under-represented. They actually are very well |
| | right now in place should a spanish-speaking farmer can | | represented. I'm sure that we don't have all of them. |
| 15 | | 15 | |
| | the Board to get some help or direction? Is there someone | 15 | But they check a box on the Notice of Intent which states |
| 16 | the Board to get some help or direction? Is there someone that | | But they check a box on the Notice of Intent which states |
| 16 17 | the Board to get some help or direction? Is there someone that MS. SCHROETER: Right now we have two full-time | 16 | But they check a box on the Notice of Intent which states what language is their speaking preference, and there are |
| 16 17 18 | 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 | 16 17 18 | 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. |
| 16 17 18 19 | 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 | 16 17 | 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. |
| 16 17 18 19 20 | 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 | 16 17 18 19 20 | 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. |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 | 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 | 16 17 18 19 20 21 | 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 |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | 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 | 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | 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 |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | 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 | 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | 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 |
| 21 22 | 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 | 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | 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 |

| 1 | trying to find the actual language. That was my recalling | 1 | is set aside for people that are in a lower socioeconomic |
|---|---|---|--|
| 2 | of what a definition was. But yes, you're | 2 | status than I? |
| 3 | MR. DELGADO: So what were those two words | 3 | MS. McCHESNEY: Correct. That's what it appears, |
| 4 | instead of disadvantaged farmers? | 4 | yeah. |
| 5 | MS. SCHROETER: It's called limit resource | 5 | MR. YOUNG: Mr. Jordan. |
| б | farmer. | 6 | MR. JORDAN: Actually I want to back up a couple |
| 7 | MR. DELGADO: Limited resource farmer, CUSDA | 7 | squares if everybody's done with that subject. |
| 8 | definition. Is that your preferred language at this | 8 | MR. YOUNG: Okay. |
| 9 | point. | 9 | MR. JORDAN: Angela, could you tell me quickly, |
| 10 | MS. SCHROETER: That was just a reminder to me to | 10 | going back up to the top on the nitrate dates changes. |
| 11 | look at that definition so we can strike out the CUSDA. | 11 | Just a couple sentences. What the difference is between |
| 12 | MR. DELGADO: I like the CUSDA definition because | 12 | developing irrigation and nutrients management program and |
| 13 | then everybody knows that it exists. | 13 | submitting the elements? What does that mean? |
| 14 | MS. SCHROETER: Okay. Perfect. | 14 | MS. SCHROETER: We require them to develop a |
| 15 | MR. DELGADO: And then my other question on this | 15 | plan. |
| 16 | was, if I was a Caucasian grower, I might feel slighted | 16 | MR. JORDAN: Right. |
| 17 | that grants and technical assistance opportunities would | 17 | MS. SCHROETER: The irrigation management plan, |
| 18 | be prioritized for somebody else. I just want to make | 18 | and we also require them to report specific elements. |
| 19 | sure that that's both legal and fair in your mind. | 19 | MR. JORDAN: You're proposing, then, to eliminate |
| 20 | MS. SCHROETER: Actually it was very difficult | 20 | the first part of that and just give them a window to |
| 21 | for us to articulate what disadvantaged means, which is | 21 | submit; right? |
| 22 | why we are relying upon an existing definition. The | 22 | MS. SCHROETER: What we are proposing to do is to |
| 23 | existing definition actually doesn't specify language, | 23 | eliminate the date specified for developing the plan. |
| 24 | ethnicity, anything like that. It's based upon the | 24 | They still have to develop the plan. |
| 25 | standard practice of looking at median household income | 25 | MR. JORDAN: Correct. |
| | Page 82 | | Page 84 |
| 1 | and other indicators. | 1 | MS. SCHROETER: Right. |
| 2 | MR. BRIGGS: Needs based. | 2 | MR. JORDAN: There's just no intermediary |
| 3 | MS. SCHROETER: Needs based. | 3 | milestone timeline target. |
| | | | |
| 4 | | 4 | MS. SCHROFTER: That's correct. It provides full |
| 4 5 | MS. McCHESNEY: Right. And it specifically says that they can't discriminate based on race, color, nation | 4 | MS. SCHROETER: That's correct. It provides full flexibility as to when to develop that plan. |
| 4 5 6 | that they can't discriminate based on race, color, nation | 4 5 6 | flexibility as to when to develop that plan. |
| 5 6 | that they can't discriminate based on race, color, nation of origin, all that stuff. | 5 6 | flexibility as to when to develop that plan. MR. JORDAN: That only applies to a subset of |
| 5 6 7 | that they can't discriminate based on race, color, nation of origin, all that stuff. MR. DELGADO: But they can discriminate in a way | 5 6 7 | flexibility as to when to develop that plan. MR. JORDAN: That only applies to a subset of Tier 3; right? |
| 5 6 7 8 | 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 | 5 6 | 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 |
| 5 6 7 | that they can't discriminate based on race, color, nation of origin, all that stuff. MR. DELGADO: But they can discriminate in a way | 5 6 7 8 9 | 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 |
| 5 6 7 8 9 | 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 | 5 6 7 8 | 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. |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 | 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 | 5 6 7 8 9 10 | 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 |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | 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. | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | 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 |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | 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. | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | 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? |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | 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. | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | 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. |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | 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 | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | 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 |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | 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 | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | 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. |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | 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 | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | 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. |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | 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 | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | 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 |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | 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 | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | 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. |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | 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 | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | 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 |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | 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 | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | 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. |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | 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. | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | 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 |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | 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 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 | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | 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. |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | 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 | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | 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 |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | 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 | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | 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 |

Г

| 1 2 | remembered in three years when you start to work on the next Order. Because that's indicative right there that if | 1 2 | I have a couple of minor things I'd like to run |
|--|---|--|---|
| ∠ 3 | c c | | by Staff that came out of comments. And I don't have |
| | conditions continue to worsen that that was clearly a | 3 | something printed on this, but it's pretty simple. This |
| 4 5 | point of giveback for consideration at this point. And | 4 | first one, in the Order on Page 7, Paragraph 27. I had it |
| | that it could have been worse at this time. | 5 | a minute ago. The way that paragraph reads right now, |
| 6 | Does that make sense? Or it could have been more | 6 | Landowners and operators of irrigated lands who obtain a |
| 7 | stringent at this time? Worse is probably not the right | 7 | pesticide use permit from a local County agricultural |
| 8 | word. | 8 | commissioner may have a discharge of waste that could |
| 9 | MR. THOMAS: It does, yes. I agree. The | 9 | affect surface water and groundwater and therefore must |
| 10 | conversation that we had about it, we go round and round | 10 | submit to the Central Coast Water Board a completed |
| 11 | about whether we should or shouldn't reduce these | 11 | electronic Notice of Intent to comply with the conditions |
| 12 | requirements further or extend these due dates further. | 12 | of this Order to comply with the Water Code. |
| 13 | And in the interest of promoting this coalition effort, we | 13 | What that basically says is, if you obtain a |
| 14 | said what can we change in the Order that would promote it | 14 | pesticide use permit, whether there's any surface water or |
| 15 | and would allow for opportunity and time for people to do | 15 | even whether you're irrigating or not, you must file a |
| 16 | that. | 16 | Notice of Intent. It seems like here's my proposed |
| 17 | We didn't want to correct me if I'm wrong | 17 | changes to that. I just want you guys to consider if |
| 18 | here, Angela. We didn't want to set up a situation where | 18 | you need to talk about them when you're talking with the |
| 19 | people were trying to do both, working on the requirements | 19 | Executive Officer, that's fine. |
| 20 | in the Order and trying to set up a coalition or trying to | 20 | MR. YOUNG: Hold on. I think before you get to |
| 21 | meet requirements of a coalition at the same time. So we | 21 | there, this is conditioned upon it being irrigated lands, |
| 22 | wanted to give space to develop that coalition process. | 22 | which would mean that someone has to be irrigating Ag. |
| 23 | MR. JORDAN: It seems to me to be a huge carrot | 23 | MR. JOHNSTON: Correct. |
| 24 | you're dangling out there. Obviously we went by it really | 24 | MR. YOUNG: That's a precondition. |
| 25 | quick, and I'm surprised that nobody had any opinions on | 25 | MR. JOHNSTON: Let me just tell you what my |
| | Page 86 | | Page 88 |
| 1 | it. But it would also seem to put the ball in the other | 1 | proposed change and Staff can talk about it and they can |
| 2 | party's court, and they better do something with that ball | 2 | see what they think. I want to remove the word "may" in |
| 3 | that leads to results or else the next time you look at | 3 | the second line after agricultural commissioner and add |
| 4 | this, the language reverts back to a more stringent | 4 | the words "and that." I want to after surface water |
| 5 | language. Just my two cents. | 5 | and before groundwater replace the word "and" with the |
| 6 | MR. YOUNG: What more does Staff have for us? | 6 | word "or" and strike the words "and therefore." |
| 7 | MS. SCHROETER: Those are all of the suggested | 7 | Then it would read, Landowners and operators of |
| 8 | changes and some other discussion. | 8 | irrigated lands who obtain a pesticide use permit from a |
| 9 | MR. YOUNG: Okay. Any other rebuttal for Staff? | 9 | County agricultural commissioner and that have a discharge |
| 10 | Any other comments to us on anything else you've heard? | 10 | of waste that could affect surface water or groundwater |
| 1 1 | MD THOMAC. These was athen issues that same we | 11 | must submit to the Central Coast Water Board a completed |
| 11 | MR. THOMAS: There were other issues that came up | | |
| 12 | yesterday. So what we would instead of let me back | 12 | Notice of Intent, yada, yada, yada. Talk about that. |
| | • | 12 13 | Notice of Intent, yada, yada, yada. Talk about that. The second thing that was raised in comments |
| 12 | yesterday. So what we would instead of let me back | | |
| 12 13 | yesterday. So what we would instead of let me back up here. So instead of going into the issues that came up | 13 | The second thing that was raised in comments |
| 12 13 14 | 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 | 13 14 | The second thing that was raised in comments yesterday and that I didn't hear a response to and I would |
| 12 13 14 15 | 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. | 13 14 15 | 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 |
| 12 13 14 15 16 | 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 | 13 14 15 16 | 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 |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 | 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 | 13 14 15 16 17 | 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 |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | 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 | 13 14 15 16 17 18 | 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 |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | 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. | 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | 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, |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | 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. | 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | 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." |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | 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 | 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | 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. |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | 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 | 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | 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. |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | 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 | 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | 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? |

23 (Pages 86 to 89)

ſ

| 1 | MR. THOMAS: We said earlier that we were | 1 | MR. BRIGGS: I think we can share here. |
|----|--|----|--|
| 2 | removing it. | 2 | MR. JEFFRIES: I don't have one. |
| 3 | MR. JOHNSTON: I missed that. | 3 | MS. McCHESNEY: Here, you can take mine. If you |
| 4 | MS. SCHROETER: Actually, you're correct. We | 4 | need a copy, make a copy. |
| 5 | heard that also and intended to strike that. We intended | 5 | MR. BRIGGS: I just want to make sure we've got |
| 6 | to strike it with the one about collecting groundwater | 6 | all the pieces. |
| 7 | samples. We did that one, but we had intended to strike | 7 | Okay, Mr. Chair. |
| 8 | out the language also that said CCA with a hydrology | 8 | MR. YOUNG: What's the question that's pending? |
| 9 | certificate. | 9 | MS. McCHESNEY: Bruce had a question. |
| 10 | MR. JOHNSTON: Okay. Thank you. | 10 | MR. DELGADO: Mine was in the additional findings |
| 11 | MR. BRIGGS: One more thing, Mr. Chair. | 11 | that is Attachment 1B on Page 6, finding Number 20, |
| 12 | MR. YOUNG: Yes. | 12 | regarding NPS policy. It's actually 1B, Page 6, the 20th |
| 13 | MR. BRIGGS: You should also mention that in the | 13 | additional finding. |
| 14 | original Staff report, we recommended changes which had to | 14 | MR. YOUNG: What's the edit change? |
| 15 | do with mostly administrative. Had to do with the fact | 15 | MR. DELGADO: It has the words, "never may." So |
| 16 | that the hearing has been delayed, so it changed a lot of | 16 | the sentence reads, Management practice implementation |
| 17 | dates. Some of those may be superceded by changes you | 17 | never may be a substitute for meeting water quality |
| 18 | just went over. And then didn't we have another | 18 | requirements. |
| 19 | supplemental sheet? | 19 | MS. McCHESNEY: Instead of may never. |
| 20 | MS. McCHESNEY: Yes. | 20 | MR. DELGADO: Instead of may never, or I would |
| 21 | MR. BRIGGS: I mean the one besides | 21 | prefer it to say is not necessarily a substitute for |
| 22 | MR. DELGADO: Chair, I have a small request for | 22 | meeting quality water requirements. |
| 23 | an edit. | 23 | MS. McCHESNEY: And the language is from the Non |
| 24 | MR. YOUNG: A what? | 24 | Point Source Policy, but I don't think it's an exact |
| 25 | MR. DELGADO: A small request for an edit. | 25 | quote. So I would recommend that we say what's in the Non |
| 20 | Page 90 | | Page 92 |
| | | 1 | |
| 1 | MR. BRIGGS: Before we do that, though, let's | | Point Source Policy so I can check what it actually says |
| 2 | just I want to make sure that | 2 | to make sure it's an accurate I don't think it says |
| 3 | MS. McCHESNEY: Here it is. | 3 | "never may," so I'll |
| 4 | MR. BRIGGS: Yes, this one. | 4 | MR. DELGADO: It could say may never, or it could |
| 5 | MR. YOUNG: Prepared March 6th. | 5 | say something else. |
| 6 | MR. BRIGGS: Have you got that handy? | 6 | MS. McCHESNEY: Right. So I'll check it. |
| 7 | MS. SCHROETER: I don't have it with me. It | 7 | MR. DELGADO: Thank you. |
| 8 | should be in the Board member folders. | 8 | MR. YOUNG: We're going to take a break, right, |
| 9 | MR. YOUNG: It is. | 9 | for about 10 minutes? |
| 10 | MS. McCHESNEY: It's in our blue folders. | 10 | (Recess taken.) |
| 11 | MR. DELGADO: Was the subject the minutes? | 11 | MR. YOUNG: Okay, folks. We're going to resume |
| 12 | MR. JOHNSTON: Is it yellow? | 12 | our meeting. |
| 13 | MR. YOUNG: Yes. | 13 | We are at the point where we heard from Staff. |
| 14 | MS. HUNTER: Was it Item Number 8? | 14 | And the Board is now at the point where it can begin to |
| 15 | MR. YOUNG: No, Item Number Four. It's a single | 15 | deliberate. |
| 16 | page. | 16 | MS. McCHESNEY: No. Recommendations, Roger's. |
| 17 | MR. DELGADO: So proposed revisions. Is that the | 17 | MR. JORDAN: Roger's got something. |
| 18 | one? | 18 | MR. JOHNSTON: All roads lead to Roger. |
| 19 | MR. YOUNG: Yes. | 19 | MR. YOUNG: Yes. But and actually before |
| 20 | MR. DELGADO: Page 6 and 12? | 20 | that |
| 21 | It was in our little blue Peechee folder. | 21 | MR. JORDAN: You mean comments from the Board |
| 22 | MR. BRIGGS: It may have gotten lost in the | 22 | members? |
| 23 | shuffle. | 23 | MR. YOUNG: Comments from Board members, is what |
| 24 | MR. THOMAS: Does anyone need a copy? | 24 | I meant. We're at the point where it's in the Board's |
| | This monitor bocs anyone need a copy. | | |
| 25 | MR. JOHNSTON: I need a copy. Page 91 | 25 | hands. We're still going to hear from Roger on any kind Page 93 |

24 (Pages 90 to 93)

| 1 | of final recommendation before we actually consider what | 1 | Board I think |
|--|--|--|--|
| 2 | to do. | 2 | MR. YOUNG: Let's put those up, if we can, since |
| 3 | But, Mr. Johnston, did you have anything at this | 3 | we're talking about, those cons. |
| 4 | point? I thought maybe, or not, or wait | 4 | MR. JOHNSTON: Put the cons up? |
| 5 | MR. JOHNSTON: I gather you're aware, | 5 | MR. YOUNG: Put the cons up so we've got |
| 6 | Mr. Chairman, because it was shared with you, although | 6 | something to look at. |
| 7 | none of the other Board members, is I have worked with the | 7 | (Discussion held off the record.) |
| 8 | Executive Officer and counsel over the last week or two on | 8 | MR. JOHNSTON: I suspect I don't want to speak |
| 9 | a couple of different pieces of language. And the | 9 | for anyone else on this Board |
| 10 | principal stuff in there is well, three different | 10 | MR. YOUNG: Right. |
| 11 | things, really. | 11 | MR. JOHNSTON: but I suspect that there would |
| 12 | One of them deals with a coalition monitoring of | 12 | be general consensus on the pros that are up on the slide |
| 13 | groundwater. And the other two deal with setting up a | 13 | that we're looking at right now. That there certainly are |
| 14 | little more defined process for third party groups to come | 14 | some advantages to the ideas however un-fleshed out they |
| 15 | to make proposals to the Executive Officer and a technical | 15 | are. And whatever failings they may have, either in |
| 16 | advisory committee to review and make recommendations on | 16 | policy terms or in legal terms, that there are some |
| 17 | the acceptability of those proposals. | 17 | advantages to the pros on here and those ideas. |
| 18 | And my thought on that language, frankly, is that | 18 | And I think that the question that we as a Board |
| 19 | we, as a Board, should decide which of two roads we want | 19 | face is I suspect there's general consensus on that on |
| 20 | to go down. And one road is to work to look at the | 20 | this Board. That's just my sense from our from our |
| 21 | stuff that Ag presented yesterday. And to take point by | 21 | public discussion. |
| 22 | point by point each of the policy issues on Staffs' con | 22 | I think the question we as a Board face is: |
| 23 | slide. And each of the legal issues on that slide. And | 23 | What's the best way to capture those pros in an Order that |
| 24 | resolve them, modify the Ag Order excuse me the Ag | 24 | we can pass. And one alternative is to I'm not saying |
| 25 | Alternative that was proposed yesterday. And see if we | 25 | this would involve rejecting the edits that Staff has |
| | Page 94 | | Page 96 |
| | | | |
| 1 | con come up with compthing that we wish to adopt. And I | 1 | proposed. But Staff has made a very clear recommendation |
| 1 | can come up with something that we wish to adopt. And I | 1 | proposed. But Staff has made a very clear recommendation |
| 2 | think if we're not interested in doing that and instead we | 2 | that we don't really go past those edits and use what Ag |
| 2 3 | think if we're not interested in doing that and instead we want to simply kick down the road to the Executive Officer | 2 | that we don't really go past those edits and use what Ag presented as any sort of a framework for how third party |
| 2 3 4 | 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 | 2 3 4 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 | 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. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | 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. | 2 3 4 5 6 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | 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. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | 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? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | 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. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | 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. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | 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. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | 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. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | 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. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | 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. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | 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. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | 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. JOHNSTON: I think the changes that Staff has proposed sort of stand on their own. And most, if not | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | 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. |

25 (Pages 94 to 97)

| 1 | something | 1 | the Ag group, at this time is not being at this time is |
|----|--|----|--|
| 2 | MR. YOUNG: Yes. | 2 | not part of Staffs' recommendation into the Order. |
| 3 | MR. BRIGGS: that I was going to say in the | 3 | MR. BRIGGS: Correct. |
| 4 | concluding remarks. I think it might be helpful in not | 4 | MR. JORDAN: But both the list of cons that are |
| 5 | having to go such a labor-intensive route. And that is | 5 | up there and the possible inclusion of other segments of |
| б | that I don't think you need to resolve all the cons that | 6 | the proposed Section E are contemplated within that end |
| 7 | are listed there. But I think you can realize the pros, | 7 | product of the Order as we have it right now. |
| 8 | the advantages that were listed on the previous slide. | 8 | MR. BRIGGS: Where I'm not following you is that |
| 9 | And that's because Part E can be developed as an | 9 | we're not including the list of cons. |
| 10 | alternative. | 10 | MR. JORDAN: I'm saying they're already in the |
| 11 | Right now it's kind of a cloud. It's a moving | 11 | existing Order. |
| 12 | cloud. It can be developed as a proposal. And within the | 12 | MR. YOUNG: In terms of they're addressed. |
| 13 | framework that we have provided here, plus all the changes | 13 | MR. JORDAN: Correct. |
| 14 | that we've added to encourage this flexibility, it can | 14 | MR. YOUNG: They're addressed. |
| 15 | come back as a proposal for E.O. consideration. And if | 15 | MR. BRIGGS: Okay. That's why I wasn't following |
| 16 | the E.O., whether it's me or somebody else, disagrees, | 16 | you. |
| 17 | they can come to the Board and come back to the Board. | 17 | MR. JORDAN: I'm saying those issues that are |
| 18 | That's what we've been trying to get to in terms of a lot | 18 | cons have been recognized and addressed in the existing |
| 19 | of the changes that we've been making to our proposal to | 19 | wording of the Order. |
| 20 | not only allow that but to encourage that kind of | 20 | Is that a fair statement? |
| 21 | approach. | 21 | MR. BRIGGS: Yes. |
| 22 | We've made significant changes to the Order to | 22 | MR. YOUNG: Yes. |
| 23 | support that kind of alternative development. Without the | 23 | MR. JORDAN: I also my experience is, when |
| 24 | Order in place, however, we won't have the incentives to | 24 | this can move up the food chain is to look to policy and |
| 25 | do that. We will have incentives to continue to debate | 25 | look to law and look to goals and not get too involved in |
| | Page 98 | | Page 100 |
| 1 | and to argue without making progress. | 1 | the last three lines on the cons list that have to do with |
| 2 | In trying to assist with that question, I think | 2 | my legal interpretation of the issue. |
| 3 | you framed the question really well, but I think that's a | 3 | Somebody else is going to get to chew on that |
| 4 | really reasonable route for the Board to take is to adopt | 4 | another day. And I'd be happy to offer my two cents as a |
| 5 | the Order with the flexibility that we built into it to | 5 | reminder to my peers of what the goal of this particular |
| б | encourage something like Part E to come back to the Board. | 6 | body are. I think you guys all know them, so I don't need |
| 7 | MR. YOUNG: Mr. Jordan. | 7 | to read them out. That's what I think the focus should be |
| 8 | MR. JORDAN: To that end, I guess, I'll ask my | 8 | on. Are we moving toward those goals consistent within |
| 9 | question again to Mr. Briggs. | 9 | the policy and law. And can we say that the Order meets |
| 10 | In the result of all the edits we saw today in | 10 | that criteria at the end of the day, whether it can be |
| 11 | the existing Order, wouldn't it be your opinion that the | 11 | legally challenged or not is somebody else's fight another |
| 12 | cons are already envisioned within the wording of the | 12 | day. It's not my fight today. |
| 13 | existing Order and the process you just described of | 13 | So, thanks. |
| 14 | coming back with the proposal is already existing in the | 14 | MR. YOUNG: To that end, I am not in favor of |
| 15 | existing Order as we discussed today? | 15 | going through the con list and trying to work that in |
| 16 | MR. BRIGGS: I'm not sure I understood your | 16 | terms of the Ag Alternative. I am in favor of taking the |
| 17 | question. I'm sorry. | 17 | language that I saw that you worked on, I think that that |
| 18 | MR. JORDAN: Let me try again. | 18 | has merit. And I'd like to see that offered up and |
| 19 | We added a bunch of edits today that were the | 19 | brought into the recommendation. |
| 20 | result today of public comment and proposals. | 20 | MR. JOHNSTON: How about this? I think |
| 21 | MR. BRIGGS: Right. | 21 | ultimately what we need to do is kind of just decide |
| 22 | MR. JORDAN: There were some other edits that | 22 | between one of those two approaches. |
| 23 | Staff added that both strengthened language and were | 23 | MR. YOUNG: Right. |
| 24 | givebacks as a result of comments yesterday. The | 24 | MR. JOHNSTON: I'm perfectly happy to put that |
| 25 | inclusion of the full proposal of Section E as brought by | 25 | language out now, and we can have a sense of alternatives, |
| | Page 99 | | Page 101 |

ſ

| - | | - | _ |
|----|---|----|--|
| 1 | if that language works. As I said, I've run it by the | 1 | Excuse me. |
| 2 | Executive Officer and counsel. But I think that that's | 2 | Cooperative monitoring and reporting efforts. |
| 3 | I think that's sort of the moving-forward question. | 3 | And then if you go down, we add, in cases where |
| 4 | Which of those I agree with you, Mike. What | 4 | cooperative water quality improvement efforts were local |
| 5 | we need to do is, we need to come out with an Order. We | 5 | or regional treatment strategies, and we add in |
| 6 | need to do it without further delay, and it needs to be | 6 | coordinated by a third party group. Example, watershed |
| 7 | the Order that will best improve water quality. I am very | 7 | group, water quality coalition, or other similar |
| 8 | definitely intrigued and interested in the potential for | 8 | cooperative effort, or by a group of Dischargers, |
| 9 | getting better results in some situations from the | 9 | necessitate alternative water quality monitoring or a |
| 10 | coalition approach, absolutely. | 10 | longer time schedule to achieve compliance. The |
| 11 | And the question is, what's going to give us the | 11 | Dischargers can request a different schedule. |
| 12 | best chance of doing that. If you want me to put that | 12 | And then we go on down to, Dischargers may submit |
| 13 | language out, Mr. Chairman | 13 | an alternative water quality monitoring and reporting |
| 14 | Have we got it on the thumb drive, Angela, or on | 14 | plan. And there's some language that we'll get to in the |
| 15 | the computer? Have we got copies of that for people? | 15 | next section as to why reporting is in there. |
| 16 | MS. HUNTER: We can put it up. | 16 | Then it says groups of Dischargers, added |
| 17 | MR. JOHNSTON: Yeah. | 17 | language, and/or third party groups. Example, a watershed |
| 18 | There are two different pieces. The first piece | 18 | group or water quality coalition may submit to the |
| 19 | is designed to come up with some more specificity as far | 19 | Executive Officer for approval of alternative water |
| 20 | as cooperative groundwater monitoring. And it starts with | 20 | quality monitoring and reporting programs. An alternative |
| 21 | some changes on Page 4 of the Order, to Paragraph 11. | 21 | water quality monitoring and reporting program must |
| 22 | Page 4, Paragraph 11. | 22 | include collection of data that will provide indicators of |
| 23 | MR. JEFFRIES: That's of the Order itself? | 23 | water quality improvement or pollution load reduction. |
| 24 | MR. JOHNSTON: That's of the Order itself. | 24 | And aggregate monitoring and reporting must be on a scale |
| 25 | I take it back. It's I'm in findings. It's | 25 | sufficient to track progress in small sub basins and be |
| | Page 102 | | Page 104 |
| 1 | Attachment 1. It's the Order itself. It's Attachment 1. | 1 | sufficiently representative of conditions. |
| 2 | MS. SCHROETER: We're making copies for you. | 2 | Aggregate monitoring may apply to surface and |
| 3 | MR. JOHNSTON: Should we just wait for the | 3 | groundwater. The Executive Officer will evaluate the |
| 4 | copies? Would that be easier? | 4 | alternative monitoring and reporting programs on a |
| 5 | MR. YOUNG: Yeah. | 5 | case-by-case basis considering the potential effectiveness |
| 6 | MR. JOHNSTON: That's awfully tiny to read. | 6 | of the aggregate or alternative monitoring. Example, |
| 7 | MR. YOUNG: I think we need to make more than | 7 | request to conduct aggregate monitoring for a certain time |
| 8 | just for the Board would be helpful. | 8 | frame to give new practices or treatment time to maximize |
| 9 | MR. JOHNSTON: I would point out that because | 9 | effectiveness and other factors such as whether the farms |
| 10 | this is done in red and black rather than underline | 10 | are currently significantly contributing to impaired |
| 11 | strikeout, hopefully the copies will be readable if | 11 | surface water or groundwater, with drinking water wells, |
| 12 | they're done on a monochrome printer. | 12 | or whether farms are in compliance with other provisions |
| 13 | MR. DELGADO: Just to get going, can we enlarge | 13 | such as enrollment or submittal of annual compliance |
| 14 | the | 14 | information. |
| 15 | MR. JOHNSTON: Sure. We can go there. | 15 | Dischargers who participate in an alternative |
| 16 | MR. DELGADO: Can we enlarge the font, is what | 16 | monitoring and reporting programs maintain individual |
| 17 | I'm suggesting. | 17 | responsibility to comply with the Order's provisions. And |
| 18 | MR. BRIGGS: Enlarge the font. | 18 | there's just a couple more changes in this, if you go down |
| 19 | MR. JOHNSTON: Not zoom in, but change the font. | 19 | to the next paragraph. |
| 20 | (Discussion held off the record.) | 20 | MR. YOUNG: It does say the word conditions, not |
| 21 | MR. JOHNSTON: So this is language regarding | 21 | provisions. |
| 22 | encouraging Dischargers to coordinate, and we include | 22 | MR. JEFFRIES: Yeah, conditions. |
| 23 | cooperative monitoring and reporting efforts. And my | 23 | MR. YOUNG: Mike, is that |
| 24 | intention with the word reporting is not just reporting | 24 | MR. JEFFRIES: The word up on the screen was |
| 25 | results. I take it back. It is reporting results. | 25 | conditions. You said provisions. |
| 1 | Page 103 | | Page 105 |

27 (Pages 102 to 105)

| 1 | MR. JOHNSTON: It says conditions. Thank you. | 1 | programs as set forth in Finding 11 and Condition 11. |
|----|--|----|--|
| 2 | MR. YOUNG: Yes. | 2 | That's just enabling language for what's happening in the |
| 3 | MR. JOHNSTON: Dischargers may continue to | 3 | new Condition 11. |
| 4 | implement the alternative treatment or monitoring programs | 4 | MR. JEFFRIES: Is that date still good, |
| 5 | approved, and Dischargers may seek review of E.O. | 5 | October 1st of '12? |
| 6 | decisions by the Water Board. | 6 | MR. JOHNSTON: That date may not be good. |
| 7 | Let me explain my intent with this. The Order | 7 | MR. DELGADO: Whatever the date is |
| 8 | requires basically every farm to do at least one round of | 8 | MR. JOHNSTON: Whatever the date is it is. |
| 9 | groundwater monitoring. And besides the concern that has | 9 | MR. DELGADO: We've already agreed on it as a |
| 10 | been expressed by growers around potential liability and | 10 | change. |
| 11 | other issues regarding disclosing individual results, | 11 | MR. JOHNSTON: We've talked about. We haven't |
| 12 | which has been somewhat dealt with by blurring both the | 12 | voted on anything. |
| 13 | location and identity of the farm the well's on. | 13 | MR. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman and Mr. Johnston. |
| 14 | The question I was raising was, it seems like we | 14 | MR. YOUNG: Yes. |
| 15 | need the monitoring to get a good baseline picture of | 15 | MR. THOMAS: I'm sorry I interrupted you. |
| 16 | what's going on in the groundwater. And I think that's a | 16 | Backing up, it says here, Dischargers may comply |
| 17 | mutual interest with agriculture. We don't necessarily, | 17 | with this Order by participating in third party groups. |
| 18 | in every situation, need every well. And there's a cost | 18 | And at the end of that sentence, it says, approved by the |
| 19 | involved in this. | 19 | Central Coast Water Board. The direction you're going in |
| 20 | And so the concept here is, if you can do | 20 | would be that would have to be changed to, approved by |
| 21 | monitoring in the sub watershed that's on a fine enough | 21 | the Executive Officer. |
| 22 | scale geographically and that's both north, south, | 22 | MR. JOHNSTON: I would yeah. I would say by |
| 23 | east, west and up/down geographically to get the picture | 23 | the Central Coast Water Board or the Executive Officer. |
| 24 | we need, we maybe don't need data from all the wells. | 24 | There is an appeal from the Executive Officer in the thing |
| 25 | I was looking at this as a potential cost savings | 25 | I'm about to get to. |
| | Page 106 | | Page 108 |
| | 6 | | č |
| 1 | to be able to get aggregate results on a fine enough scale | 1 | MR. THOMAS: The way this is set up, it would |
| 2 | that it's useful to us and to the affected farmers, | 2 | have to come back to you. |
| 3 | frankly. And we may well be able to do that with fewer | 3 | MR. JOHNSTON: I understand. So I would say |
| 4 | with less sampling of wells, or for that matter, there are | 4 | approved by the Executive Officer or the Central Coast |
| 5 | going to be surface water situations where this is | 5 | Water Board because what we've got down the next thing |
| 6 | applicable, as well. | 6 | we're going to go through is the process of getting |
| 7 | MR. YOUNG: Why don't you go through the other | 7 | approval for third party groups. And it goes to the |
| 8 | MR. JOHNSTON: Yeah. Let me go through the | 8 | Executive Officer, and it's appealable to the Central a |
| 9 | others. | 9 | decision a denial by the Executive Officer is |
| 10 | Page 13, Condition 10, that is we're on into | 10 | appealable to the Board. So I would assume we would want |
| 11 | the this is the language that already talks about how | 11 | to put them both in there. |
| 12 | Dischargers can comply with the Order by participating in | 12 | Thank you for catching that, Mike. |
| 13 | different kinds of groups or cooperative efforts. What | 13 | MR. DELGADO: So it would be and/or? It would be |
| 14 | was added in here is the language including implementing | 14 | the Executive Officer and/or? |
| 15 | water quality improvement projects and then it references | 15 | MR. JOHNSTON: And/or, yes. No, the Executive |
| 16 | the MRPs. | 16 | Officer or. |
| 17 | Because, we're providing below, an alternative | 17 | MR. DELGADO: Or. |
| 18 | way to do the monitoring. We're saying, or the | 18 | MR. JOHNSTON: Because it may well not come to |
| 19 | alternative monitoring and reporting programs as provided | 19 | the Central Coast Water Quality Board at all. The |
| 20 | in Condition 11 below. And Condition 11 is a new | 20 | Executive Officer approves it, they're not going to appeal |
| 21 | condition. And what you want to page down past | 21 | it. It's not going to come to us. |
| 22 | since we're already on this page, we can come back to 72 | 22 | So let's go down to the new Condition 11. This |
| 23 | and 73. Actually, let's go back up. | 23 | is all new language. And basically the point of this is |
| 24 | 72 and 73 are from the Tier 3 MRP. And we're | 24 | to set up some criteria for third party groups, to set up |
| 25 | just adding, or alternative monitoring and reporting | 25 | a process to evaluate proposals for third party groups |
| | Page 107 | | Page 109 |
| | 8 | 1 | |

28 (Pages 106 to 109)

| involving a technical advicery committee, and to set up = in provided to the Water Board. Monitoring points must be regressentative but may not always be at the edge of farms so bing as monitoring result demonstrate water quality 0 Officer, and then to set up a process where an Executive in provided to the Water Board. is obing as monitoring result demonstrate water quality 0 Officer denial is appealable to the Board. in addition, monitoring must, one, cheracterize in addition, monitoring must, one, cheracterize 0 MR, DOHSTON: Can read it. Two, demonstrate or project effectiveness. Three, and verify more project effectiveness. Three, and verify more project proposals will evaluated by a technical 11 Mile if's not bolded, if's all new language. in addition, monitoring must, one, cheracterize 12 MR, DOHNSTON: All of what's in Condition 11, valat made representative, on a fangicitural protecties and/or water 13 would remumber the Cardition is new. It valat reads as follow: Dischargers may form valat reads as follow: Dischargers may form 14 would remumber the Cardition in their if representative, on a directive, and make recommendations to the security of the project sing device may be receiving water quality improvements protections provide alternative monitoring and reporting programs may form 15 representative, on a directive project sing device proj | | | | |
|--|----|--|----|--|
| 3 So long as monitoring result demonstrate water quality 4 Officer denial is appealable to the Board. Image and the fices of a project. 6 ND in edd to read this whole thing? In addition, monitoring must, one, characterize 6 MS. HUNTER: Yes. In addition, monitoring must, one, characterize 7 MR. NONSO: Yes. In addition, monitoring must, one, characterize 9 MR. YOUNG: Right. Two, demonstrate project effectiveness. Three, and verify a progress towards water quality improvement and waste water 11 while it's not bolded, it's all new language. In addition it must be condition 11 that follows to 12 MR. JOHNSTON: The entire condition is new. It Image and inspicent attemative 13 ord read exerting down below it. Image and inspicent attemative 14 would renumber the Condition 11 that follows to Image and inspicent attemative 15 Condition 12 that follows to Image and inspicent attemative 16 and respresentative, and one regional Board Staff. 17 The TA Advise Main immediations from the commendations from the c | 1 | | | |
| 4 Officer denial is appealable to the Board. 4 improvement and the efficacy of a project. 5 Do I need to read this whole thing? 5 In addition, monitoring must, one, characterize 7 MR, DOHNSTON: I can read t. 5 In addition, monitoring must, one, characterize 9 MR, DOHNSTON: All of what's in Condition 11, 7 Two, demonstrate project effectiveness. Three, and verify programs towards water quality improvement and waste water of production. 10 MR, DOHNSTON: The entire condition is ew. It 13 advisory committee comprised to two researchers or 12 MR, DOHNSTON: The entire condition is ew. It 13 advisory commental apresentative, one 14 vould reads as follows: Dischargers may form 15 condition 12 and everything down belw it. 15 And It reads as follows: Dischargers may form 16 representative, one environmental apresentative, one 16 water quality management practices. I.e., group projects 18 evaluate project proposal and make recommentations to the 16 other the discretion of the Executive 16 the the discretion of the Executive 20 water quality improvement projects or beceutive Officer approvad 14 As stated in the NPS policy, management practice < | | | 2 | |
| 5 Do I need to read this whole thing? 5 In addition, monitoring must, one, characterize 6 MS. HUNTER: Yes. 6 and be representative of discharge to receiving water. 7 MR. DOHNSTON: 1 can read it. 7 Two, demonstrate project diffectness. Three, and verify 8 Did people get copies yet? 8 production. 10 MR. JOHNSTON: 1 and what in Condition 11, 10 Project proposals will evaluated by a technical 11 MR. JOHNSTON: The entire condition is new. It. 13 advisory committee comprised of two researchers on 13 Condition 11 that follows to 14 representative, one engonal board Staff. 14 would renumber the Condition 11 that follows to 14 representative, and one regional Board Staff. 15 Condition 12 projects or Executive Officer. At the discreption of the Executive Officer and programs may come, characters bin divisor project after recountion project series approval, the 14 Tier 2 to Tier 1, and/or provided alternative project after recounting ond reporting programs may 24 approved alternative monitoring and reporting programs may 25 be moved to a lower Tier. Example, Tier 3 to Tier 2, or 14 the description must | 3 | | 3 | |
| 6 And be representative of discharge to receiving water. 7 MR. JOHNSTON: I can read it. 7 8 MR. JOHNSTON: I can read it. 7 9 Did people get copies yet? 8 9 MR. YOUNG: Yes. 7 10 MR. JOHNSTON: I all of what's in Condition 11, 10 11 advisory committee comprised of two researchers or 12 MR. YOUNG: The entre condition is new. It 13 davisory committee comprised of two researchers or 14 woater quality improvement parcices, i.e., group projects 15 Condition 12 and everything down below it. 16 And it reads as follows: blochargers may form 17 third party groups to develop and implement parcices, i.e., group projects 19 or cooperative monitoring and reporting programs to comply 10 moter quality improvement parcices, i.e., group projects 12 approve any project after receiving project evaluation 14 programs to comply 10 MR. JOHNSTON: 11 the days as follows: blochargers may form 12 The Cancer Maine mathyse monitori | | | | |
| 7 Two, demonstrate project effectiveness. Three, and verify 8 Did people get copies yet? 8 9 MR. YOUNG: Yes. 9 10 MR. YOUNG: Yes. 9 11 while it's not bolded, it's all new language. 11 advisory committee comprised of two researchers or 12 MR. YOUNG: Right. 12 academics skilled in agricultural practices and/or water 13 would renumber the Condition 11 that follows to 14 advisory committee comprised of two researchers or 14 would renumber the Condition 11 that follows to 14 representative, one environmental inparts comprised of two researchers or 15 conductor 2 adverting down below it. 13 quilty, one farm advisor NRCS or RCD, one grower 16 And it reads as follows: Dischargers may form 16 representative, one environmental inparts 17 third party group to develop and implement atterative 10 tasket quality improvements to 18 water quality improvements projects or Executive Officer 15 representative, one environmental inparts 19 third party group to develop and implement tatemative 10 tasket one environmental inparts 10 officer, Dischargers | | Do I need to read this whole thing? | 5 | In addition, monitoring must, one, characterize |
| 9 Did people get copies yet? 9 progress towards water quality improvement and waste water 9 MR. YOUNG: Yes. 9 production. 11 MR. YOUNG: Right. 11 addemics skilled in agricultural practices and/or water 12 MR. YOUNG: Right. 12 addemics skilled in agricultural practices and/or water 13 MR. YOUNG: Right. 12 addemics skilled in agricultural practices and/or water 14 would renumber the Condition 11 that follows to 14 representative, one environmental insetscore environmental health 16 And it reads as follows: Dischargers may form 16 representative, and one regional Board Staff. 17 third party groups to develop and impelment atternative 17 The TAC must have a minimum of free members to 10 orcoperative monitoring and reporting programs to comply 10 tresults and the MSP policy, management practices, it with this Order. At the discretion of the Executive Officer and second from the committee. 12 party group that implements Executive Officer aprose and water quality improvements projects or Executive Officer denies approval, the 10 deferrent bit the MSP policy, management practice 11 tresult and the MSP policy | 6 | MS. HUNTER: Yes. | 6 | and be representative of discharge to receiving water. |
| 9 MR. YOUNG: Yes. 9 production. 10 MR. YOUNG: Yes. 9 production. 11 while its not bolled, it's all new language. 11 advisory committee comprised of two researchers or 12 MR. YOUNG: Right. 12 academics skilled in agricultural practices and/or water 13 would renumber the Condition Is new. It 13 quality, one farm advisor NRCS or RCO, ore grower 14 would renumber the Condition Is that follows to 15 representative, one environmental representative, one environmental protects or environmental protects or environmental pustce or environmental pustce, or environmental pustce, or environmental pustce, or environmental pustce or environmental representative, one environmental pustce or environmental pustce or environmental pustce or environmental pustce. 10 Order, Dischargers that are a participant in a third 16 representative online environmental representative, one environmental pustce were the environmental pustce were the lass and recommendations from the compliance with 12 party group that inplementation. 16 21 17 The Exactive Officer 18 24 As stated in the NPS policy, management practices. 25 implementation is not a sutsitute for comp | 7 | MR. JOHNSTON: I can read it. | 7 | Two, demonstrate project effectiveness. Three, and verify |
| 10 MR. JOHNSTON: All of what's in Condition 11, 11 advisory committee comprised of two researchers or 11 MR. JOHNSTON: The entire condition is new. It 12 advisory committee comprised of two researchers or 13 MR. JOHNSTON: The entire condition is new. It 13 advisory committee comprised of two researchers or 14 Would renumber the Condition 11 that follows to 14 representative, one environmental presentarive, one environmental netters or environmental presentative, one 15 Condition 2 and everything down below it. 16 representative, and one regional Board Staff. 17 third party groups to develop and implement atternative 16 representative, and one regional Board Staff. 19 or cooperative monitoring and reporting programs to comply 18 vealuate project after receiving project relations to the 20 with this Order. At the discretion of the Executive 17 The TAC must have a minimum of twe members to 21 or cooperative monitoring and reporting programs to comply 18 vealuate project after receiving project serve availation 22 party group that implements Executive Officer 18 vealuates project serve availation 23 approved ta lower quality improvements projects or Executive Officer vealuates for | 8 | Did people get copies yet? | 8 | progress towards water quality improvement and waste water |
| 11 while it's not bolded, it's all new language. 11 advisory committee comprised of two researchers or 12 MR, YOUNG: Right. 12 academics skilled in agricultural practices and/or water 14 would renumber the Condition 11 that follows to 12 academics skilled in agricultural practices and/or water 15 Condition 12 and everything down below it. 15 environmental justice or environmental health 16 Kan treads as follows: Dischargers may form 16 representative, and en ergional Board Staff. 17 The TaC must have a minimum of five members to 18 water quality management practices, i.e., group projects 19 or cooperative monitoring and reporting programs to complet 20 party group that implements Executive Officer 21 party group that implements Executive Officer 22 party group that implements Executive Officer 23 water quality improvements projects or Executive Officer 24 paproved atternative monitoring and reporting programs may 25 be moved to a lower Tire. 2 to Tier 1, and/or provided atternative project 1 16 include identification of participant's methods and 1 water quality improvements. If the project is not | 9 | MR. YOUNG: Yes. | 9 | production. |
| 12 MR. YOUNG: Right. 12 academics skilled in agricultural practices and/or water 13 MR. JOHNSTON: The entire condition is new. It 13 quality, one farm advisor NRCS or RCD, one grower 14 representative, and one regional Board Staff. 15 environmental justice or environmental health 16 And it reads as follows: Dischargers may form 16 environmental justice or environmental health 18 water quality management practices, i.e., group projects 17 The TAC must have a minimum of five members to 19 or cooperative monitoring and reporting programs to comply 10 baproved alternative one 10 baproved alternative one 21 Officer, Dischargers that are a participant in a third 12 If the Executive Officer denies approval, the 22 approved alternative monitoring and reporting programs may 24 As stated in the NS polecy, management practice 25 be moved to a lower Titer. Example, Titer 3 to Tite 2, or 25 The point of this is to - is to - if we choose 3 To be subject to titer changes or alternative 7 aster decisions today on a detailed program to give a 3 schedule for implements. Example, poliutant toda to be reduced for, schedule docose in mothe aspoliutant toda to the evaluate for, crupo | 10 | MR. JOHNSTON: All of what's in Condition 11, | 10 | Project proposals will evaluated by a technical |
| 13 MR. JOHNSTON: The entire condition is new. It 13 quality, one farm advisor NRCS or RCD, one grower 14 would renumber the Condition 11 that follows to 14 representative, one environmental representative, one 15 Condition 12 and everything down below it. 15 environmental justice or environmental health 16 And it reads as follows: Dischargers may form 16 environmental justice or environmental health 17 third party groups to develop and implement alternative 16 environmental justice or environmental health 17 third party groups to develop and implement alternative 16 environmental justice or environmental health 17 The TAC must have a minimum of five members to 16 erpresentative, and one regional Board Staff. 14 water quality improvements projects or Executive Officer 16 trepresentative, and one regional Board. 24 approve alternative monitoring and reporting programs may form 21 17 the Executive Officer denies approval, the 23 water quality improvements projects or Executive Officer. 16 the INPS policy, management practice 24 by action of participant's methods and management practices by individual Dischargers or third 4 | 11 | while it's not bolded, it's all new language. | 11 | advisory committee comprised of two researchers or |
| 14 would renumber the Condition 11 that follows to 14 representative, one environmental representative, one 15 Condition 12 and everything down below it. 15 environmental justice or environmental representative, one environmental representative, one environmental representative, one environmental representative, one 16 And it reads as follows: Dischargers may form 16 erpresentative, and one regional Board Staff. 17 Third party groups to develop and implement alternative 17 The TAC must have a minimum of five members to 18 water quality management practices, i.e., group project 18 evaluate project proposals and make recommendations to the 10 opprove any project after receiving project evaluation 20 to approve any project after receiving project evaluation 21 opprove any project after receiving project evaluation 21 results and recommedations from the committe. 22 approved alternative monitoring and reporting programs may 22 11 the NPS policy, management practice 23 specific timelines and milestones. 24 As stated in the NPS policy, management practice 3 To be subject to tier changes or alternative 14 amaagement practices by individual Dischargers or third 4 timelines, project Sa | 12 | MR. YOUNG: Right. | 12 | academics skilled in agricultural practices and/or water |
| 15 Condition 12 and everything down below it. 15 environmental justice or environmental health 16 And it reads as follows: Dischargers may form 16 representative, and one regional Board Staff. 17 third party groups to develop and implement atternative 17 The TAC must have a minimum of five members to 19 or cooperative monitoring and reporting programs to comply 10 18 evaluate project proposals and make recommendations to the 20 officer, Dischargers that are a participant in a third 21 results and recommendations from the committee. 21 approved alternative monitoring and reporting programs may 24 As stated in the NPS policy, management practice 23 approved alternative monitoring and reporting programs may 24 As stated in the NPS policy, management practice 24 approved alternative monitoring and reporting orgams may 16 water quality requirements. If the project is not 25 be moved to a lower Tier. Example, pollutants to be 10 water quality standards, additional 3 To be subject to the changes or alternative 10 water quality improvement expected. 2 schedule for implementation. 16 representative, and here windin with which such proposals as a framework | 13 | MR. JOHNSTON: The entire condition is new. It | 13 | quality, one farm advisor NRCS or RCD, one grower |
| 16 And it reads as follows: Dischargers may form 16 representative, and one regional Board Staff. 17 third party groups to develop and implement alternative 17 The TAC must have a minimum of five members to 19 or cooperative monitoring and reporting programs to comply 18 evaluate project project proposals and make recommendations to the 19 or cooperative monitoring and reporting programs to comply 18 evaluate project firer receiving project evaluation 20 third party group that implements Executive Officer approved 17 The Executive Officer dis approval, the 23 water quality improvements projects or Executive Officer 23 third party group may seek review by the regional Board. 24 paproved alternative monitoring and reporting programs my 24 As stated in the NPS policy, management practices. 25 be moved to a lower Tier. Example, Tier 3 to Tier 2, or Tage 110 Page 110 1 Tier 2 to Tier 1, and/or provided alternative project 1 water quality requirements. If the project is not 2 specific timelines and milestones. 1 water quality monoment specific. 2 3 To be subject to tier changes or alternative 1 water quality requirements. If the project is not | 14 | would renumber the Condition 11 that follows to | 14 | representative, one environmental representative, one |
| 17 The TAC must have a minimum of five members to 18 water quality management practices, i.e., group projects 19 or cooperative monitoring and reporting programs to comply 21 Officer. Dischargers that are a participant in a third 22 party group that implements Executive Officer and recommendations from the committee. 23 water quality improvements projects or Executive Officer 24 approved alternative monitoring and reporting programs may 25 25 be moved to a lower Tier. Example, Tier 3 to Tier 2, or 24 26 be moved to a lower Tier. Example, Tier 3 to Tier 2, or 25 27 specific timelines and milestones. 26 3 To be subject to ther changes or alternative 1 4 timelines, projects will be evaluated for, among other 1 1 5 include identification of participant's methods and 3 3 1 ast of decisions today on a detailed program to give a 8 Purpose. Proposal must state desired outcome for 9 as a functional group that got some to give a 9 reasonable chance of eliminating toxicity within the 1 water quality improvement expected. 13 impairment. | 15 | Condition 12 and everything down below it. | 15 | environmental justice or environmental health |
| 18 water quality management practices, i.e., group projects 18 evaluate project proposals and make recommendations to the 19 or cooperative monitoring and reporting programs to comply 10 Executive Officer. The Executive Officer has discretion 20 with this Order. At the discretion of the Executive 10 to approve any project after receiving project evaluation 21 Officer, Dischargers that are a participant in a third 11 results and recommendations from the committee. 22 party group that implements Executive Officer approved 22 If the Executive Officer denies approval, the 23 water quality improvements projects or Executive Officer approved 23 third party group may seek review by the regional Board. 24 approved atternative monitoring and reporting programs may 24 Asstated in the NPS policy, management practice 25 be moved to a lower Tier. Example, Tier 3 to Tier 2, or 25 implementation is not a substitute for compliance with 3 To be subject to tier changes or alternative 1 water quality requirements. If the project is not 2 secoritie for implementation. 1 management practices by individual Dischargers or third 4 timelies, project description. The description must 5 T | 16 | And it reads as follows: Dischargers may form | 16 | representative, and one regional Board Staff. |
| 19 or cooperative monitoring and reporting programs to comply 19 Executive Officer. The Executive Officer has discretion 20 with this Order. At the discretion of the Executive to tapprove any project after receiving project evaluation 21 Officer, Dischargers that are a participant in a third 20 to tapprove any project after receiving project evaluation 22 party group that implements Executive Officer 16 the Executive Officer denies approval, the 23 water quality improvements projects or Executive Officer 17 third party group may seek review by the regional Board. 24 approved alternative monitoring and reporting programs my 21 third party group may seek review by the regional Board. 25 be moved to a lower Tier. Example, Tier 3 to Tier 2, or 10 third party group may seek review by the regional Board. 24 asto a lower Tier. Example, Tier 3 to Tier 2, or 10 astated in the NPS policy, management practice 3 To be subject to tier changes or alternative monitoring and miestones. 1 water quality requirements. If the project is not 4 timelines, projects will be evaluated for, among other 1 water quality improvement expected. 5 The point of this is to - is to - if we choose not to use the AP proposal as | 17 | third party groups to develop and implement alternative | 17 | The TAC must have a minimum of five members to |
| 20 with this Order. At the discretion of the Executive 21 Offcer, Dischargers that are a participant in a third 22 party group that implements Executive Officer approved 23 water quality improvements projects or Executive Officer 24 approved alternative monitoring and reporting programs may 25 be moved to a lower Tier. Example, Tier 3 to Tier 2, or 26 provide the rologent, Example, pollutant to ad to be reduced, 27 mutrients to surface and groundwater, long-term solutions 28 and contingencies. Proposal must state desired outcome for 29 geals of the projects. Example, pollutant to ab to be reduced, 20 to approve any project after receiving project evaluation 21 results and recommendations from the committee. 22 If the Executive Officer denies approval, the 23 third party group may seek review by the regional Board. 24 As stated in the NPS policy, management practice 25 implementation is not a substitute for compliance with Page 110 26 include identification of participant's methods and 27 scale. Solutions must be scaled to address 28 reasonable chance of eliminating toxicity within the 29 actions will be exaler of success. Projects must demonstrate a 21 results approved at the project des not meet goals 21 and contingencies. Proposal must address what new 23 and how the project tible sustained through time, 24 that indicate progress towards goals stated as above in 25 monitoring and measuring methods and information to be 26 that indicate progress towards goals stated as above in 26 monitoring and measuring methods and information to be | 18 | water quality management practices, i.e., group projects | 18 | evaluate project proposals and make recommendations to the |
| 21 Officer, Dischargers that are a participant in a third 21 results and recommendations from the committee. 22 party group that implements Executive Officer approved 23 third party group may seek review by the regional Board. 23 water quality improvements projects or Executive Officer 23 third party group may seek review by the regional Board. 24 approved alternative monitoring and reporting programs may 24 third party group may seek review by the regional Board. 25 be moved to a lower Tier. Example, Tier 3 to Tier 2, or 23 third party group may seek review by the regional Board. 24 approved alternative monitoring and reporting programs may 24 K as stated in the NPS policy, management practices 25 be subject to tier changes or alternative 25 implementation. 1 water quality requirements. If the project is not 3 To be subject to tier changes or alternative 4 party groups will be necessary. 5 6 include identification of participant's methods and 5 The point of this is to - is to - if we choose 6 10 addressed, the amount of pollutant load to be reduced, 10 Executive Officer after evaluation by a technical advisory 12 Scale. Solutions m | 19 | or cooperative monitoring and reporting programs to comply | 19 | Executive Officer. The Executive Officer has discretion |
| 22 party group that implements Executive Officer approved 22 If the Executive Officer denies approval, the 23 water quality improvements projects or Executive Officer 23 third party group may seek review by the regional Board. 24 approved alternative monitoring and reporting programs may 25 be moved to a lower Tier. Example, Tier 3 to Tier 2, or 25 25 be moved to a lower Tier. Example, Tier 3 to Tier 2, or page 110 24 As stated in the NPS policy, management practice 24 3 To be subject to tier changes or alternative 1 water quality requirements. If the project is not 3 To be subject to tier changes or alternative 1 water quality inprovement specied. 4 timelines, project swill be evaluated for, among other effective in achieving Water Quality Standards, additional 6 include identification of participant's methods and 7 a set of decisions today on a detailed program to give a 7 addressed, the amount of pollutant load to be reduced, 1 water quality improvement expected. 12 Scale. Solutions must be scaled to address and contingencies. Proposals must address what new 1 13 impairment. 14 balanced way to evaluate stuff, provide input to the | 20 | with this Order. At the discretion of the Executive | 20 | to approve any project after receiving project evaluation |
| 23 water quality improvements projects or Executive Officer 24 approved alternative monitoring and reporting programs may 25 be moved to a lower Tier. Example, Tier 3 to Tier 2, or Page 110 1 Tier 2 to Tier 1, and/or provided alternative project 25 specific timelines and milestones. 3 To be subject to tier changes or alternative 4 timelines, project swill be evaluated for, among other 5 elements, project description. The description must 6 include identification of participant's methods and 7 schedule for implementation. 8 Purpose. Proposal must state desired outcome for 9 goals of the projects. Example, pollutant to be 9 adtors swill be taken if the project must for engines. 14 Chance of success. Projects must demonstrate a 15 reasonable chance of eliminating toxicity within the 16 permit term, five years, or reducing discharge of 17 nutrients to surface and groundwater, long-term solutions 18 and contingencies. Proposals must stemilestones 10 actons will be taken if the project does not meet goals and contingencies. Proposals must stemilestones 10 actons will be taken if the project does not meet goals 10 and conting and reporting. Description of 21 Accountability. Proposals must stemilestones 22 that indicate progress towards goals stated a sabove in 3 purpose. 3 monitoring and measuring methods and information to be 4 Monitoring and measuring methods and information to be 4 Monitoring and measuring methods and information to be 4 Monitoring and measuring methods and information to be 4 Monitoring and measuring methods and information to be 4 Monitoring and measuring methods and information to be 4 Monitoring and measuring methods and information to be 4 Monitoring and measuring methods and information to be <l< td=""><td>21</td><td>Officer, Dischargers that are a participant in a third</td><th>21</th><td>results and recommendations from the committee.</td></l<> | 21 | Officer, Dischargers that are a participant in a third | 21 | results and recommendations from the committee. |
| 24 approved alternative monitoring and reporting programs may 24 As stated in the NPS policy, management practice 25 be moved to a lower Tier. Example, Tier 3 to Tier 2, or 25 implementation is not a substitute for compliance with 25 be moved to a lower Tier. Example, Tier 3 to Tier 2, or 25 implementation is not a substitute for compliance with 26 specific timelines and milestones. 21 water quality requirements. If the project is not 27 specific timelines and milestones. 26 effective in achieving Water Quality Standards, additional 3 To be subject to tier changes or alternative 1 water quality requirements. If the project is not 28 party groups will be necessary. 5 The point of this is to is to if we choose 6 not to use the Ag Proposal as a framework and give make 7 a set of decisions today on a detailed program to give a 7 set, decisions today on a detailed program to give a 6 not to use the Ag Proposal as a framework and give make 7 a set of decisions today on a detailed program to give a 6 not to use the Ag Proposal as a framework and give make 7 a Scale. Solutions must be scaled to address 10 Executive Officer after evaluation by a technical | 22 | party group that implements Executive Officer approved | 22 | If the Executive Officer denies approval, the |
| 25 be moved to a lower Tier. Example, Tier 3 to Tier 2, or Page 110 25 implementation is not a substitute for compliance with Page 112 1 Tier 2 to Tier 1, and/or provided alternative project specific timelines and milestones. 1 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. 5 elements, project description. The description must include identification of participant's methods and rschedule for implementation. 1 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. 6 include identification of participant's methods and rschedule for implementation. 5 The point of this is to i for we choose not to use the Ag Proposal as a framework and give make 7 a set of decisions today on a detailed program to give a 8 framework within which such proposals can be brought to 9 the Board or excuse me can be brought to the 10 2 10 water quality improvement expected. 11 was a functional group that got some stuff done. And my 14 None in proposing this is that it would provide some 15 balanced way to evaluate stuff, provide input to the 15 balanced way to evaluate stuff, provide input to the 16 12 17 nutrients to surface and groundwater, long-term solutions 14 MR, YOUNG: | 23 | water quality improvements projects or Executive Officer | 23 | third party group may seek review by the regional Board. |
| Page 110Page 1121Tier 2 to Tier 1, and/or provide alternative project:water quality requirements. If the project is not3To be subject to tier changes or alternative:water quality requirements. If the project is not4timelines, projects will be evaluated for, among other:effective in achieving Water Quality Standards, additional5elements, project description. The description must:management practices by individual Dischargers or third6include identification of participant's methods and:The point of this is to is to if we choose7schedule for implementation.:a set of decisions today on a detailed program to give a8Purpose. Proposal must state desired outcome for:99goals of the projects. Example, pollutant toab to be::10addressed, the amount of pollutant load to be reduced,::11water quality improvement expected.::12Scale. Solutions must be scaled to address::13impairment.::14Chance of success. Projects must demonstrate a:15reasonable chance of eliminating toxicity within the:16permit term, five years, or reducing discharge of:17nutrients to surface and groundwater, long-term solutions:18and contingencies. Proposals must address what new:19actions will be taken if the project does not meet goals20and how the project will be sus | 24 | approved alternative monitoring and reporting programs may | 24 | As stated in the NPS policy, management practice |
| 1 Tier 2 to Tier 1, and/or provided alternative project 2 specific timelines and milestones. 3 To be subject to tier changes or alternative 4 timelines, projects will be evaluated for, among other 5 elements, project description. The description must 6 include identification of participant's methods and 7 schedule for implementation. 8 Purpose. Proposal must state desired outcome for 9 goals of the projects. Example, pollutant to be 10 addressed, the amount of pollutant load to be reduced, 12 Scale. Solutions must be scaled to address 13 impairment. 14 committee and we know that the technical advisory 12 scale. Solutions must be scaled to address 13 impairment. 14 permit term, five years, or reducing discharge of 17 nutrients to surface and groundwater, long-term solutions 18 and contingencies. Proposals must address what new 19 actions will be taken if the project does not meet goals 20 that indicate progress towards goals stated as above in 21 purpose. 22 | 25 | be moved to a lower Tier. Example, Tier 3 to Tier 2, or | 25 | implementation is not a substitute for compliance with |
| 2specific timelines and milestones.2effective in achieving Water Quality Standards, additional3To be subject to tier changes or alternativeanagement practices by individual Dischargers or third4timelines, projects will be evaluated for, among otheranagement practices by individual Dischargers or third5elements, project description. The description mustinclude identification of participant's methods and56include identification of participant's methods and5The point of this is to is to if we choose7schedule for implementation.68Purpose. Proposal must state desired outcome for99goals of the projects. Example, pollutant to beaddressed, the amount of pollutant load to be reduced,11water quality improvement expected.1012Scale. Solutions must be scaled to address1113mapagement practices by individual Discharge of14Chance of success. Projects must demonstrate a15reasonable chance of eliminating toxicity within the19actions will be taken if the project does not meet goals20and contingencies. Proposals must address what new21Accountability. Proposals must set milestones22that indicate progress towards goals stated as above in23monitoring and measuring methods and information to be24Monitoring and measuring methods and information to be | | Page 110 | | Page 112 |
| 2specific timelines and milestones.2effective in achieving Water Quality Standards, additional3To be subject to tier changes or alternativeanagement practices by individual Dischargers or third4timelines, projects will be evaluated for, among otheranagement practices by individual Dischargers or third5elements, project description. The description mustinclude identification of participant's methods and56include identification of participant's methods and5The point of this is to is to if we choose7schedule for implementation.68Purpose. Proposal must state desired outcome for99goals of the projects. Example, pollutant to beaddressed, the amount of pollutant load to be reduced,11water quality improvement expected.1012Scale. Solutions must be scaled to address1113mapagement practices by individual Discharge of14Chance of success. Projects must demonstrate a15reasonable chance of eliminating toxicity within the19actions will be taken if the project does not meet goals20and contingencies. Proposals must address what new21Accountability. Proposals must set milestones22that indicate progress towards goals stated as above in23monitoring and measuring methods and information to be24Monitoring and measuring methods and information to be | 1 | Tier 2 to Tier 1 and/or provided alternative project | 1 | water quality requirements. If the project is not |
| 3To be subject to tier changes or alternative timelines, projects will be evaluated for, among other elements, project description. The description must3management practices by individual Dischargers or third party groups will be necessary.5elements, project description. The description must5The point of this is to is to if we choose6include identification of participant's methods and schedule for implementation.5The point of this is to is to if we choose7schedule for implementation.5The point of this is to is to if we choose9goals of the projects. Example, pollutants to be6not to use the Ag Proposal as a framework and give make10addressed, the amount of pollutant load to be reduced, 118framework within which such proposals can be brought to11water quality improvement expected.10Executive Officer after evaluation by a technical advisory12Scale. Solutions must be scaled to address11committee, back before this process became so polarized, was a functional group that got some stuff done. And my14Chance of success. Projects must demonstrate a reasonable chance of eliminating toxicity within the 1915balanced way to evaluate stuff, provide input to the balanced way to evaluate stuff, provide input to the 1518and 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.18MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I think what you've done is taken what Staff has always said20and how the | | | | |
| 4timelines, projects will be evaluated for, among other5elements, project description. The description must6include identification of participant's methods and7schedule for implementation.8Purpose. Proposal must state desired outcome for9goals of the projects. Example, pollutants to be10addressed, the amount of pollutant load to be reduced,11water quality improvement expected.12Scale. Solutions must be scaled to address13impairment.14Chance of success. Projects must demonstrate a15reasonable chance of eliminating toxicity within the16permit term, five years, or reducing discharge of17nutrients to surface and groundwater, long-term solutions18and contingencies. Proposals must address what new11Accountability. Proposals must address what new12Accountability. Proposals stated as above in13purpose.24Monitoring and reporting. Description of25monitoring and measuring methods and information to be | | - | | |
| 5elements, project description. The description must include identification of participant's methods and schedule for implementation.5The 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 a8Purpose. Proposal must state desired outcome for goals of the projects. Example, pollutants to be addressed, the amount of pollutant load to be reduced, 1086not to use the Ag Proposal as a framework and give make a set of decisions today on a detailed program to give a10addressed, the amount of pollutant load to be reduced, uwater quality improvement expected.10Executive Officer after evaluation by a technical advisory committee and we know that the technical advisory12Scale. Solutions must be scaled to address impairment.11committee, 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 some14Chance of success. Projects must demonstrate a reasonable chance of eliminating toxicity within the permit term, five years, or reducing discharge of 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.18MR. 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 look12that indicate progress towards goals stated as above in purpose.10Keential down in writing what it might look13think indicate | | | | |
| 6include identification of participant's methods and schedule for implementation.6not to use the Ag Proposal as a framework and give make7schedule for implementation.7a set of decisions today on a detailed program to give a8Purpose. Proposal must state desired outcome for goals of the projects. Example, pollutant to be8framework within which such proposals can be brought to10addressed, the amount of pollutant load to be reduced, water quality improvement expected.10Executive Officer after evaluation by a technical advisory12Scale. Solutions must be scaled to address12committee and we know that the technical advisory13impairment.13was a functional group that got some stuff done. And my14Chance of success. Projects must demonstrate a14hope in proposing this is that it would provide some15reasonable chance of eliminating toxicity within the15balanced way to evaluate stuff, provide input to the18and contingencies. Proposals must address what new18MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I19actions will be taken if the project does not meet goals19think what you've done is taken what Staff has always said20and how the project will be sustained through time.20was achievable as part of what they have been proposing,21Accountability. Proposals must set milestones21incorporate in the Order and the Monitoring Program.24Monitoring and measuring methods and information to be25MR. JOHNSTON: About half. | | | 5 | |
| 7schedule for implementation.7a set of decisions today on a detailed program to give a8Purpose. Proposal must state desired outcome for9goals of the projects. Example, pollutants to be8framework within which such proposals can be brought to10addressed, the amount of pollutant load to be reduced,9the Board or excuse me can be brought to the11water quality improvement expected.10Executive Officer after evaluation by a technical advisory12Scale. Solutions must be scaled to address12committee and we know that the technical advisory13impairment.13was a functional group that got some stuff done. And my14Chance of success. Projects must demonstrate a14hope in proposing this is that it would provide some15reasonable chance of eliminating toxicity within the15balanced way to evaluate stuff, provide input to the16permit term, five years, or reducing discharge of16Executive Officer and to the Board as well stuff that's17nutrients to surface and groundwater, long-term solutions17appealed to the Board.18and contingencies. Proposals must address what new18MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I19actions will be taken if the project does not meet goals19think what you've done is taken what Staff has always said20and how the project will be sustained through time.20was achievable as part of what they have been proposing,21Accountability. Proposals must set milestones21incorporate | | | 6 | |
| 8Purpose. 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.8framework within which such proposals can be brought to the Board or excuse me can be brought to the12Scale. Solutions must be scaled to address impairment.10Executive Officer after evaluation by a technical advisory13impairment.13was a functional group that got some stuff done. And my14Chance 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.18MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I19Accountability. Proposals must set milestones 2210was achievable as part of what they have been proposing, and essentially put down in writing what it might look24Monitoring and reporting. Description of 2524So how much of this did you write?25MR. JOHNSTON: About half. | | | 7 | |
| 9goals of the projects. Example, pollutants to be9the Board or excuse me can be brought to the10addressed, the amount of pollutant load to be reduced,10Executive Officer after evaluation by a technical advisory11water quality improvement expected.11committee and we know that the technical advisory12Scale. Solutions must be scaled to address12committee and we know that the technical advisory13impairment.13was a functional group that got some stuff done. And my14Chance of success. Projects must demonstrate a14hope in proposing this is that it would provide some15reasonable chance of eliminating toxicity within the15balanced way to evaluate stuff, provide input to the16permit term, five years, or reducing discharge of16Executive Officer and to the Board as well stuff that's18and contingencies. Proposals must address what new18MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I19actions will be taken if the project does not meet goals19think what you've done is taken what Staff has always said20and how the project will be sustained through time.21and essentially put down in writing what it might look21Accountability. Proposals must set milestones21and essentially put down in writing what it might look22that indicate progress towards goals stated as above in22like, and make that part of what we're going to23purpose.23incorporate in the Order and the Monitoring Program.24 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><th>8</th><td></td></td<> | | | 8 | |
| 10addressed, the amount of pollutant load to be reduced, water quality improvement expected.10Executive Officer after evaluation by a technical advisory11water quality improvement expected.11committee and we know that the technical advisory12Scale. Solutions must be scaled to address12committee, back before this process became so polarized,13impairment.13was a functional group that got some stuff done. And my14Chance of success. Projects must demonstrate a14hope in proposing this is that it would provide some15reasonable chance of eliminating toxicity within the15balanced way to evaluate stuff, provide input to the16permit term, five years, or reducing discharge of16Executive Officer and to the Board as well stuff that's17nutrients to surface and groundwater, long-term solutions17appealed to the Board.18and contingencies. Proposals must address what new18MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I19actions will be taken if the project does not meet goals19think what you've done is taken what Staff has always said20and how the project will be sustained through time.21and essentially put down in writing what it might look22that indicate progress towards goals stated as above in22like, and make that part of what we're going to23purpose.23incorporate in the Order and the Monitoring Program.24Monitoring and measuring methods and information to be25MR. JOHNSTON: About half. <td></td> <td></td> <th></th> <td></td> | | | | |
| 11water quality improvement expected.11committee and we know that the technical advisory12Scale. Solutions must be scaled to address12committee, back before this process became so polarized,13impairment.13was a functional group that got some stuff done. And my14Chance of success. Projects must demonstrate a14hope in proposing this is that it would provide some15reasonable chance of eliminating toxicity within the15balanced way to evaluate stuff, provide input to the16permit term, five years, or reducing discharge of16Executive Officer and to the Board as well stuff that's17nutrients to surface and groundwater, long-term solutions17appealed to the Board.18and contingencies. Proposals must address what new18MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I19actions will be taken if the project does not meet goals19think what you've done is taken what Staff has always said20and how the project will be sustained through time.21and essentially put down in writing what it might look21Accountability. Proposals must set milestones21and essentially put down in writing what it might look22that indicate progress towards goals stated as above in22like, and make that part of what we're going to23incorporate in the Order and the Monitoring Program.24So how much of this did you write?24Monitoring and measuring methods and information to be25MR. JOHNSTON: About half. | 10 | | 10 | - |
| 12Scale. Solutions must be scaled to address1.2committee, back before this process became so polarized,13impairment.1.3was a functional group that got some stuff done. And my14Chance of success. Projects must demonstrate a1.4hope in proposing this is that it would provide some15reasonable chance of eliminating toxicity within the1.5balanced way to evaluate stuff, provide input to the16permit term, five years, or reducing discharge of1.6Executive Officer and to the Board as well stuff that's17nutrients to surface and groundwater, long-term solutions1.7appealed to the Board.18and contingencies. Proposals must address what new1.8MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I19actions will be taken if the project does not meet goals1.9think what you've done is taken what Staff has always said20and how the project will be sustained through time.2.0was achievable as part of what they have been proposing,21Accountability. Proposals must set milestones2.1and essentially put down in writing what it might look22that indicate progress towards goals stated as above in2.2like, and make that part of what we're going to23purpose.2.3incorporate in the Order and the Monitoring Program.24Monitoring and measuring methods and information to be2.5MR. JOHNSTON: About half. | | - | | |
| 13impairment.13was a functional group that got some stuff done. And my14Chance of success. Projects must demonstrate a14hope in proposing this is that it would provide some15reasonable chance of eliminating toxicity within the15balanced way to evaluate stuff, provide input to the16permit term, five years, or reducing discharge of16Executive Officer and to the Board as well stuff that's17nutrients to surface and groundwater, long-term solutions17appealed to the Board.18and contingencies. Proposals must address what new18MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I19actions will be taken if the project does not meet goals19think what you've done is taken what Staff has always said20and how the project will be sustained through time.20was achievable as part of what they have been proposing,21Accountability. Proposals must set milestones21and essentially put down in writing what it might look22that indicate progress towards goals stated as above in23incorporate in the Order and the Monitoring Program.24Monitoring and reporting. Description of24So how much of this did you write?25MR. JOHNSTON: About half. | | | | |
| 14Chance 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.14hope 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.18and 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.18MR. 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 tike, and make that part of what we're going to incorporate in the Order and the Monitoring Program.24Monitoring and reporting. Description of monitoring and measuring methods and information to be25MR. JOHNSTON: About half. | | | | |
| 15reasonable chance of eliminating toxicity within the15balanced way to evaluate stuff, provide input to the16permit term, five years, or reducing discharge of16Executive Officer and to the Board as well stuff that's17nutrients to surface and groundwater, long-term solutions17appealed to the Board.18and contingencies. Proposals must address what new18MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I19actions will be taken if the project does not meet goals19think what you've done is taken what Staff has always said20and how the project will be sustained through time.20was achievable as part of what they have been proposing,21Accountability. Proposals must set milestones21and essentially put down in writing what it might look22that indicate progress towards goals stated as above in23incorporate in the Order and the Monitoring Program.24Monitoring and reporting. Description of24So how much of this did you write?25MR. JOHNSTON: About half. | | • | | |
| 16permit term, five years, or reducing discharge of16Executive Officer and to the Board as well stuff that's17nutrients to surface and groundwater, long-term solutions17appealed to the Board.18and contingencies. Proposals must address what new18MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I19actions will be taken if the project does not meet goals19think what you've done is taken what Staff has always said20and how the project will be sustained through time.20was achievable as part of what they have been proposing,21Accountability. Proposals must set milestones21and essentially put down in writing what it might look22that indicate progress towards goals stated as above in22like, and make that part of what we're going to23purpose.23incorporate in the Order and the Monitoring Program.24Monitoring and measuring methods and information to be25MR. JOHNSTON: About half. | | - | | |
| 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 MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I MR. | | | | |
| 18and contingencies. Proposals must address what new18MR. YOUNG: I think it's a great proposal. I19actions will be taken if the project does not meet goals19think what you've done is taken what Staff has always said20and how the project will be sustained through time.19think what you've done is taken what Staff has always said21Accountability. Proposals must set milestones21and essentially put down in writing what it might look22that indicate progress towards goals stated as above in21incorporate in the Order and the Monitoring Program.23purpose.23incorporate in the Order and the Monitoring Program.24Monitoring and reporting. Description of24So how much of this did you write?25MR. JOHNSTON: About half. | | | | |
| 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 MR. JOHNSTON: About half. | | | | |
| 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 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. | | | | |
| 21Accountability. Proposals must set milestones21and essentially put down in writing what it might look22that indicate progress towards goals stated as above in21and essentially put down in writing what it might look23purpose.23like, and make that part of what we're going to24Monitoring and reporting. Description of24So how much of this did you write?25monitoring and measuring methods and information to be25MR. JOHNSTON: About half. | | | | |
| that indicate progress towards goals stated as above in purpose. Monitoring and reporting. Description of monitoring and measuring methods and information to be MR. JOHNSTON: About half. | | | | |
| 23purpose.23incorporate in the Order and the Monitoring Program.24Monitoring and reporting. Description of24So how much of this did you write?25monitoring and measuring methods and information to be25MR. JOHNSTON: About half. | | | | |
| 24Monitoring and reporting. Description of24So how much of this did you write?25monitoring and measuring methods and information to be25MR. JOHNSTON: About half. | | | | |
| 25 monitoring and measuring methods and information to be 25 MR. JOHNSTON: About half. | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | Page 113 |

29 (Pages 110 to 113)

| 1 | MR. YOUNG: Good. It's great. | 1 | projects that are geared towards one or the other. You're |
|----|--|----|--|
| 2 | MR. BRIGGS: Mr. Chair. | 2 | likely to not have the perfect silver bullet for both |
| 3 | MR. YOUNG: Yes. | 3 | toxicity and nutrients. |
| 4 | MR. BRIGGS: Mr. Johnston asked | 4 | So, for example, the wood chip, pretty simple |
| 5 | MR. JOHNSTON: In answer to your question about | 5 | technology that can be pretty effective with nitrates, but |
| 6 | what I wrote, this was a back and forth between | 6 | it's not really targeting toxicity. |
| 7 | MR. YOUNG: I understand. | 7 | MR. JOHNSTON: So what could fit within this |
| 8 | MR. JOHNSTON: myself, Roger, Frances. And I | 8 | framework is a variety of things, from something like what |
| 9 | would imagine that Roger was consulting other Staff on it. | 9 | Ag was proposing, which was a large scale coalition |
| 10 | MR. YOUNG: Right. | 10 | across I would suspect they were looking at across |
| 11 | Is this acceptable to Staff? | 11 | multiple growing areas, multiple crops that could fit |
| 12 | MR. BRIGGS: That was the reason Mr. Johnston | 12 | within this. But what could also fit within this is a |
| 13 | wanted to vet it instead of dropping it here was to see if | 13 | much more limited scale project that's addressing maybe |
| 14 | it would be acceptable. Mr. Johnston asked me to help | 14 | not even addressing every issue in the Order, but |
| 15 | flesh out some ideas for a technical advisory committee. | 15 | addressing certain issues in the Order. |
| 16 | But I wanted just one I think it's a typo type of | 16 | It may be that such now, the Ag Proposal calls |
| 17 | admission. In the last paragraph that you just referred | 17 | for participation in that proposal brings you to |
| 18 | to, the second line, that parenthetical I think my | 18 | Tier 1. This says it can drop you down Tier 3 to Tier 2, |
| 19 | intent was for that to be an, e.g., for example NRCS, or | 19 | Tier 2 to Tier 1. So it could be that this is a very |
| 20 | RCD. And we should spell that out, too, instead of using | 20 | limited scope project that tries to accomplish one thing, |
| 21 | acronyms. | 21 | and it moves you from Tier 3 to Tier 2. There's the |
| 22 | MR. DELGADO: Can I ask a specific question? | 22 | ability to propose a lot of different kinds of projects in |
| 23 | MR. YOUNG: Yes. | 23 | here. |
| 24 | MR. DELGADO: On New Condition 11, all new | 24 | MR. YOUNG: Okay. |
| 25 | language, there's about seven black dot bullets. And the | 25 | MR. JEFFRIES: Good job. |
| | Page 114 | | Page 116 |
| | | | |
| 1 | fourth bullet is Chance of Success. It says, must | 1 | MR. YOUNG: Good job. All right. |
| 2 | demonstrate reasonable chance of eliminating toxicity | 2 | So what would we like to do? Do you want to have |
| 3 | within the permit term of five years. And I just wondered | 3 | a motion put on the table? Is there more discussion |
| 4 | if you meant to say eliminate toxicity or more | 4 | needed? |
| 5 | realistically would substantially reduce or reduce or | 5 | Dr. Hunter. |
| 6 | something? | 6 | MS. HUNTER: Well, I do appreciate this last |
| 7 | MR. JOHNSTON: It says, within the permit term or | 7 | conceptual and also very well-defined and spelled-out |
| 8 | unless this got let me compare. | 8 | opportunity to open the door to the intent New Part E. So |
| 9 | MR. YOUNG: The first part deals with toxicity; | 9 | I really appreciate that language, and I believe and |
| 10 | the second part deals with nutrients. | 10 | I'm glad to know that there was time for Staff and |
| 11 | MR. JOHNSTON: Right. | 11 | Mr. Briggs and Frances McChesney to also consider the |
| 12 | MR. DELGADO: Toxicity theoretically could remain | 12 | language. Knowing that, I would like to propose that we |
| 13 | high, low, or medium. But then if you reduced nitrates to | 13 | accept those suggest revisions wholesale. |
| 14 | surface and to the groundwater, the toxicity would be let | 14 | With that in mind, I would like to move the |
| 15 | lie. | 15 | motion to approve. So unless others have anything they |
| 16 | MR. JOHNSTON: What it says is, if these are | 16 | want to add to that. |
| 17 | the it says that it has to demonstrate a reasonable | 17 | Mr. Johnston. |
| 18 | chance of eliminating toxicity within the five years, | 18 | MR. YOUNG: As part of your motion, are you |
| 19 | which is a goal of this, or reducing the nutrients. | 19 | incorporating the Staffs' recommendation? |
| 20 | Everybody knows we're not going to eliminate those | 20 | MS. HUNTER: Why don't I go ahead and make the |
| 21 | nutrients in five years. That's no secret. | 21 | motion. |
| 22 | Go ahead, Roger. You look like you're about to | 22 | MR. JORDAN: Okay. |
| 23 | jump | 23 | MS. HUNTER: I want to move to approve the |
| 24 | MR. BRIGGS: I was going to point out that there | 24 | renewal of the Conditional Waiver of Waste Discharge |
| 25 | could very well be projects most likely will be | 25 | Requirements for discharge from irrigated lands, which is |
| | Page 115 | | Page 117 |

| Order Number R3-2012-0011. And that's the revisions isted 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 he 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. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 | 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 |
|---|---|--|
| as the changes in language noted by Ms. McChesney to nsert specific language that is consistent with language in the Non Point Source Policy. And that the revisions to he Order pardon me and that revisions to the Order with noted corrections submitted by Mr. Johnston be | 3 4 5 | 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 |
| nsert specific language that is consistent with language in the Non Point Source Policy. And that the revisions to he Order pardon me and that revisions to the Order with noted corrections submitted by Mr. Johnston be | 4 5 | probably some regular intervals after that. I do think that from my perspective of having |
| n the Non Point Source Policy. And that the revisions to he Order pardon me and that revisions to the Order vith noted corrections submitted by Mr. Johnston be | 5 | I do think that from my perspective of having |
| he Order pardon me and that revisions to the Order vith noted corrections submitted by Mr. Johnston be | | |
| vith noted corrections submitted by Mr. Johnston be | 6 | |
| - | | worked on a lot of contentious issues in a few decades |
| ncorporated into the final language of the Order. | 7 | here that in 6 months 3 months, 6 months, whenever, |
| | 8 | that you will probably look back and say, gee, what was |
| So I'm proposing that the motion to approve | 9 | all the fuss about? Because we've prompted management |
| nclude all of the Staff edits that we reviewed and | 10 | practices that are more effective. We've acquired some |
| liscussed today, that Ms. McChesney's noted consistency | 11 | accountability for those. And we're on the road to |
| vith Non Point Source Policy, and then your printed and | 12 | improvements. |
| vritten out, submitted revisions that we just reviewed, | 13 | When you consider that perspective, if you can |
| hat all of those changes be incorporated into the permit | 14 | find yourself to accept that, and you weigh that against |
| and that we ask Mr. Briggs to oversee the final revisions | 15 | the urgency of acting in the face of severe toxicity |
| o ensure accuracy and that they be taken from the record. | 16 | problems we have throughout the region, as we discussed |
| MS. McCHESNEY: Can I just add one more thing? | 17 | over and over again, and severe public health threats that |
| MR. YOUNG: Yes. | 18 | are unprecedented in their scope in this region, |
| MS. HUNTER: Yes. | 19 | unprecedented in this region's history, it's clear to me |
| MS. McCHESNEY: I did check the Non Point Source | 20 | now is the time to act on this motion. |
| olicy and the quote is actually accurate from the policy. | 21 | MS. McCHESNEY: I want to make sure your motion |
| | 22 | includes a certification of the subsequent EIR right |
| | 23 | include certification of the subsequent EIR that's part of |
| _ | 24 | the Staffs' |
| - | 25 | MR. THOMAS: It's on the screen. |
| Page 118 | | Page 120 |
| equire groundwater stuff would be moved into a finding | 1 | MS. McCANN: Okay. Good. |
| nstead of in the Order part, which would be Number 46. | 2 | MR. THOMAS: Also the MRP. |
| hat wasn't specifically included in the Staffs' proposal. | 3 | MS. McCHESNEY: Also I wanted to clarify that |
| MS. HUNTER: We would want to include that | 4 | yesterday there were quite a few slide presentations that |
| orrection, as well or that revision? | 5 | included slides about the report that came out on Tuesday. |
| MS. McCHESNEY: It's Page 21 of the Order, and | 6 | And I want to make clear that the record does not include |
| 's Number 46 would be moved to a finding. I don't know | 7 | those slides that were the record generally includes |
| hat finding number, but that's okay. | 8 | the slide it includes the slide presentations, but |
| MR. YOUNG: Okay. | 9 | we'll specifically delete those slides that had anything |
| MS. McCHESNEY: And then Roger did have something | 10 | to do with that. |
| e does need to add. Right? | 11 | MR. YOUNG: Which report? Can you be more clear. |
| MR. BRIGGS: I think you actually covered a | 12 | MS. McCHESNEY: The I what's the |
| ouple of logistics things because you said all edits that | 13 | MS. HUNTER: Davis |
| | 14 | MR. THOMAS: The U.C. Davis Harter SBX2 Report. |
| the Staff report as well as the supplemental sheet that | 15 | MR. YOUNG: I just want to make sure the record |
| | 16 | is clear. |
| em consideration of this item includes the entire | 17 | MS. McCHESNEY: And I made a list of those slide |
| ecord for this matter. | 18 | numbers and presentations to be sure that Staff |
| | 19 | MR. YOUNG: Okay. |
| | 20 | MS. McCANN: excludes those from the record. |
| | 21 | And then the other thing to clarify is that the |
| MR. BRIGGS: I also want to point out that I | 22 | record it starts with the 2004 Order and goes through |
| and Endected a abortant to point out that I | | |
| ank with the motion it would be a good idea to direct me | 2.3 | today. There are some things that may be necessary |
| hink with the motion it would be a good idea to direct me | 23 24 | today. There are some things that may be necessary |
| hink with the motion it would be a good idea to direct me o have Staff monitor the implementation of this Order. Ind after a quarter, perhaps four months, something like | 23 24 25 | 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 |
| | rritten out, submitted revisions that we just reviewed, nat all of those changes be incorporated into the permit ind that we ask Mr. Briggs to oversee the final revisions of 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. HUNTER: Yes. MS. McCHESNEY: I did check the Non Point Source olicy and the quote is actually accurate from the policy. MR. JEFFRIES: That's good. MS. McCHESNEY: The second thing is that the taff had agreed that the Order part of the Order number 6 that referred to the authority to issue Orders and Page 118 equire groundwater stuff would be moved into a finding stead of in the Order part, which would be Number 46. hat wasn't specifically included in the Staffs' proposal. MS. HUNTER: We would want to include that orrection, as well or that revision? MS. McCHESNEY: It's Page 21 of the Order, and s Number 46 would be moved to a finding. I don't know hat finding number, but that's okay. MR. YOUNG: Okay. MS. McCHESNEY: And then Roger did have something e does need to add. Right? MR. BRIGGS: I think you actually covered a puple of logistics things because you said all edits that e discussed today, which includes the two the changes the Staff report as well as the supplemental sheet that as in your folders, we want to point out that this em consideration of this item includes the entire | rritten out, submitted revisions that we just reviewed,13nat all of those changes be incorporated into the permit14ind that we ask Mr. Briggs to oversee the final revisions15o ensure accuracy and that they be taken from the record.16MS. McCHESNEY: Can I just add one more thing?17MR. YOUNG: Yes.18MS. HUNTER: Yes.19MS. McCHESNEY: I did check the Non Point Source20olicy and the quote is actually accurate from the policy.21MR. JEFFRIES: That's good.22MS. McCHESNEY: The second thing is that the23taff had agreed that the Order part of the Order number246 that referred to the authority to issue Orders and25Page 11823equire groundwater stuff would be moved into a finding1stead of in the Order part, which would be Number 46.3hat wasn't specifically included in the Staffs' proposal.3MS. McCHESNEY: It's Page 21 of the Order, and6s Number 46 would be moved to a finding. I don't know7hat finding number, but that's okay.8MR. YOUNG: Okay.9MS. McCHESNEY: And then Roger did have something10e does need to add. Right?11MR. BRIGGS: I think you actually covered a12ouple of logistics things because you said all edits that13e discussed today, which includes the two the changes14the Staff report as well as the supplemental sheet that15as in your folders, we want to point out that this16< |

| 1 | preceding the 2004 adoption is not part of this record. | 1 | different numbers. |
|--|---|--|--|
| 2 | MR. YOUNG: Are those changes acceptable? | 2 | MS. SCHROETER: It has a dash 01, 02 and 03 |
| 3 | MS. HUNTER: Yes. | 3 | MS. McCHESNEY: Okay. |
| 4 | MR. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman. | 4 | MS. SCHROETER: in all of them. |
| 5 | MR. YOUNG: Yes. | 5 | MS. McCANN: The numbers are consistent. |
| 6 | MR. THOMAS: No one has said out loud yet, but we | 6 | MR. YOUNG: Mr. Johnston and then Mr. Jeffries. |
| 7 | are also recommending adoption of the monitoring and | 7 | Go ahead. |
| 8 | reporting program that goes with this Order. | 8 | MR. JOHNSTON: I hate to tie myself on the tracks |
| 9 | MS. HUNTER: I would add to my motion that we | 9 | in front of the train here. I know we all want to go |
| 10 | adopt the monitoring and reporting program Number | 10 | home. But, quite frankly, my purpose in running through |
| 11 | R3-2012-0011. | 11 | that language was to lay out a choice for the Board for |
| 12 | MR. THOMAS: And the CEQA resolution. | 12 | two alternatives that we take to move forward on passing |
| 13 | MS. HUNTER: I'm sorry. I thought we already | 13 | an Order tonight. |
| 14 | agreed to that. Yes, the CEQA resolution. | 14 | And given the everybody on all sides has put a |
| 15 | MR. YOUNG: Mr. Jordan. | 15 | huge amount of work into this. But given the work that |
| 16 | MR. JORDAN: Not to stop the momentum, but I'll | 16 | went into what was put before us yesterday, I still think |
| 17 | be happy to support the direction we're going and to thank | 17 | it appropriate to see if there is interest on the Board |
| 18 | Mr. Johnston for his efforts, but I'll continue to want to | 18 | in and I'm prepared to stay tonight as late as I need |
| 19 | note the significant giveback that Staff made on the | 19 | to in working through the Ag Proposal and seeing if we |
| 20 | nitrate loading. I continue to feel that that was | 20 | can accommodate and resolve the policy issues raised by |
| 21 | significant concession on the part of Staff. | 21 | Staff and the legal issues raised by Staff. |
| 22 | One of the provisions of Board work alone is not | 22 | I am interested in extracting the maximum amount |
| 23 | just to improve but to protect from degradation. I take | 23 | of collaboration possible without diminishing our results |
| 24 | that phrase as an aggressive statement, not a reactionary | 24 | in terms of water quality can add to our results in |
| 25 | statement, but one that puts the burden on this Board to | 25 | terms of water quality. So I mean, I'm mentally counting |
| | Page 122 | | Page 124 |
| | | | |
| - | | | and successive that the sale as the same the Decad |
| 1 | act to protect rather than just seek actions to improve | 1 | noses and suspecting that there's not support on the Board |
| 2 | situations. In fact, along with outside the box, I think | 2 | for that, but it's a question I'd like to ask. |
| 2 3 | situations. In fact, along with outside the box, I think improving water quality is probably one of the misused | 2 | for that, but it's a question I'd like to ask. And I'd hoped to ask it before a motion was made. |
| 2 3 4 | 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 | 2 3 4 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | 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. | 2 3 4 5 6 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | 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. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | 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. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | 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. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | 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. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | 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. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | 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. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | 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? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | 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, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | 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. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | 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. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | 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. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | 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? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | 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. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | 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. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | 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 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | 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 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | 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. |

ſ

| | | 1 | |
|----|--|----|--|
| 1 | She'll provide the answers. | 1 | us their focus was in labeling and application of |
| 2 | MR. JORDAN: We can count noses that way. | 2 | pesticides. It's not in looking at protecting beneficial |
| 3 | MR. YOUNG: Yeah, yeah. | 3 | uses. |
| 4 | Let me just state how I feel about this. I know | 4 | We have had Fish and Game come before us and tell |
| 5 | Russ and I have been through this from the beginning. We | 5 | us they and the Department of Health all really in |
| 6 | enjoy the experience of having seen the development of | 6 | concurrence with what we're trying to do. So I appreciate |
| 7 | this whole process from its very beginning to where it is | 7 | ag's added effort. I mean, they have moved this process, |
| 8 | today. | 8 | I think, immensely in a direction to where they'd like to |
| 9 | There's been a huge amount of effort put into | 9 | go. I know they'd like to get it further, but I think, |
| 10 | this by everybody, both the Ag community, the | 10 | practically speaking, we're at a point now where we can go |
| 11 | environmental community, and now we have the environmental | 11 | ahead and vote and adopt what's being proposed. |
| 12 | justice interests involved in this, which we've never had | 12 | I feel comfortable with it. I think my only |
| 13 | before. That wasn't part of our first permit. This is a | 13 | remaining issue would be and this is something |
| 14 | new element. | 14 | Dr. Wolff had mentioned. |
| 15 | We've had the revelation of the extent of the | 15 | I wish you would have approached Roger, which you |
| 16 | groundwater contamination with nitrate that was not there | 16 | could have done before the Board meeting, that this may be |
| 17 | before. We had a little bit of indication that it was | 17 | a huge implementation task for the agency in terms of |
| 18 | there, but it had become really apparent with a lot of | 18 | getting everybody on board, making sure we have all the |
| 19 | data that it is quite widespread, and people are drinking | 19 | growers, making sure they know what they're supposed to be |
| 20 | water that needs to be addressed in terms of, you know, | 20 | doing, and making sure that the agency has shifted some |
| 21 | remediation, source control. | 21 | Staff, at least, to get the ball rolling in this, and that |
| 22 | The list of the cons, I'm not interested in going | 22 | there should be some kind of an additional technical |
| 23 | through and trying to piece by piece address them. I | 23 | advisory committee, if you want to call it that. I think |
| 24 | appreciate the offer up of the choice that we could do | 24 | Dr. Wolff called it a management advisory committee. |
| 25 | that and spend the time to do it. I think there are some | 25 | MS. McCHESNEY: Can I just interrupt to |
| | Page 126 | | Page 128 |
| 1 | fundamental differences when you really boil everything | 1 | MR. YOUNG: Yes. |
| 2 | down to what Ag has proposed that I don't think we're | 2 | MS. McCHESNEY: Dr. Wolff had his conflict of |
| 3 | going to be able to reconcile. | 3 | interest precluded him from discussing this with Staff. |
| 4 | I think what we've had for many years is an | 4 | You mentioned him talking to Roger, and he couldn't do |
| 5 | approach that takes the data and keeps it, to some degree, | 5 | that. |
| 6 | from public scrutiny, kind of camouflages it somewhat. I | 6 | MR. YOUNG: He couldn't? I thought he could. |
| 7 | know Tess Dunham is of the opinion that that can be done. | 7 | MS. McCHESNEY: No. He can only comment as an |
| 8 | It can be done through coalitions. It can be aggregate | 8 | individual representing himself. He could not discuss |
| 9 | collection and then reporting summaries. | 9 | MR. YOUNG: He could never have discussed it? |
| 10 | I'm just not comfortable with that approach. | 10 | THE WITNESS: No. |
| 11 | Fundamentally I'm not comfortable with that. I read the | 11 | MR. YOUNG: Okay. |
| 12 | Water Code statute, and my take from that is that this | 12 | MS. McCHESNEY: I just wanted to clarify that. |
| 13 | agency has a responsibility to be transparent to the | 13 | MR. WOLFF: So I'm off the hook. |
| 14 | public process in terms of requiring efforts that will | 14 | MR. YOUNG: But after today, there will be no |
| 15 | change over time these sources of contamination, that | 15 | pending matter, and he could participate in |
| 16 | there will be accountability to those that are making | 16 | MS. McCHESNEY: Yeah. I'll check on that, but I |
| 17 | changes on the ground. | 17 | don't think we need to go there right now. |
| 18 | And it's a public these are public resources | 18 | MR. YOUNG: That would be my I think he made a |
| 19 | that we are addressing and are statutorily mandated to | 19 | good suggestion with that, to make sure that things get on |
| 20 | protect both the groundwater, surface waters. We're the | 20 | board and implemented properly. |
| 21 | only agency in this State for this region that has that | 21 | To answer your question, Mike, I'm in favor of |
| 22 | responsibility. It's not going to be the Department of | 22 | the motion as it stands. But let's hear |
| 23 | Pesticide Regulations. | 23 | Russ has a keen interest in this issue. I do |
| 24 | We have had them come before us actually, | 24 | because of how far back we go with this firm's origin. |
| 25 | before the three of you came on board, but they did tell Page 127 | 25 | How do you feel? |
| | Page 127 | | Page 129 |

| 1 | MR. JEFFRIES: I have mixed emotions. I was | 1 | doesn't work. You've got to do something. We need some |
|----------|--|----------|---|
| 2 | really in favor after I heard all the testimony yesterday | 2 | help. We need some direction from Staff, and we're not |
| 3 | ask what the Ag presented and all the testimony. I was | 3 | getting it. |
| 4 | really after I heard all the testimony because I'm the | 4 | I thank Mr. Johnston for doing what he's done. I |
| 5 | type of person it's a public hearing. I like to hear | 5 | think it's a great compromise. But I think you and I are |
| 6 | all the information before I make a decision. I was | 6 | probably thinking on the same lines. I'll stay here and |
| 7 | really leaning toward the Ag Proposal, and then the | 7 | hammer it out if you want to. |
| 8 | legality issues came up. | 8 | MR. YOUNG: He just offered it up as an option. |
| 9 | And, Mike, if you're looking for an answer, I'd | 9 | MR. JEFFRIES: I know he did. I'm trying to tell |
| 10 | be willing to stay here and iron this out. But I don't | 10 | him |
| 11 | know if we would be that much further along than we are | 11 | MR. YOUNG: Right. |
| 12 | today, what you've just proposed and what the motion is in | 12 | MR. JEFFRIES: there's still the opportunity |
| 13 | front of us. | 13 | to have that happen. And those folks can come back and |
| 14 | We have to remember that there's always the | 14 | say, these are the areas that we're having problems with, |
| 15 | opportunity, if there's some refinement that can be | 15 | and this is what we're proposing to make that better. |
| 16 | brought to the Executive Officer and to the Board for us | 16 | So I'll stop. |
| 17 | to open up the Order again and change the Order to make it | 17 | MR. YOUNG: Mr. Delgado. |
| 18 | better. | 18 | MR. DELGADO: If I was an Ag member or a |
| 19 | Orders are always in flux because each time that | 19 | grower and I considered the Ag Proposal I had some |
| 20 | they come up for renewal, there's a little bit of changes | 20 | ownership. It's kind of like my preferred alternative; |
| 21 | and hopefully they're for the better. So I'm looking | 21 | it's my plan. I might feel some relief that there seems |
| 22 | you know, you'd like to have a win-win situation for | 22 | to have been some changes in my direction and fairly |
| 23 | everybody. | 23 | significant ones. |
| 24 | And I think the from where the first Order the | 24 | We now have the spelled-out option of aggregate |
| 25 | Staff proposed for us and for what they've done today, the | 25 | monitoring and aggregate reporting being a potential which |
| | Page 130 | | Page 132 |
| 1 | Staff has conceded considerably. | 1 | wasn't part of the plan, you know, half an hour ago. |
| 2 | I think what Ag has proposed, from what they | 2 | We have some extensions on some of the the |
| 3 | originally proposed, they have conceded some and made some | 3 | most immediate near-term deadlines. Something that they |
| 4 | moves in the right direction. | 4 | were asking for. We have a new carrot process to move |
| 5 | So my interpretation of this is that it is kind | 5 | down from Tier 3 or down from Tier 2. That was a big |
| б | of a win-win type situation. Again, I think it's time | 6 | message that we heard. So that would give me some relief |
| 7 | I think I said this a couple meetings back I'd like to | 7 | and hope if this was my Ag plan that I wanted. I would |
| 8 | have this Order completed before I leave the Board that | 8 | want more. But I would be getting more than I had when I |
| 9 | we can move forward. | 9 | came in this morning or came in yesterday and that would |
| 10 | I think that if we give that direction and I | 10 | make me feel good. |
| 11 | like the cooperative monitoring. I really like that. I | 11 | If I was a member of the environmental justice |
| 12 | think it's got some real merit in there. Not only that, | 12 | community or the environmental community, I would think, |
| 13 | but it really puts responsibility back on to the people | 13 | oh, God. Now they've moved further toward Ag and further |
| 14 | that are using it. And I think that's kind of good. And | 14 | away from what I wanted. I wanted something that was |
| 15 | I think they kind of proposed that and said, look at, you | 15 | similar to 2010. And we've made so many changes in the Ag |
| 16 | know, we'll take that responsibility on, and we'll be the | 16 | direction before today. Now there's more changes, more |
| 17 | ones that monitors that. | 17 | significant changes. I would feel frustrated in hearing |
| 18 | It would relieve the Staff. And I questioned | 18 | this option to stay later tonight to potentially adopt the |
| 19 | yesterday and I've questioned before, do we have enough | 19 | Ag Alternative. |
| 20 | Staff to handle all this to implement it. And, quite | 20 | As an environmental justice or environmental |
| 21 | frankly, I still have that question. And I'm not really | 21 | member, I'd feel the opposite of relief and hope. But I |
| 22 | sure. But I guess I'm going to find out pretty soon | 22 | am willing personally now to stay until midnight if need |
| <u></u> | because if it doesn't work, all these folks that are here | 23 | be. But I think one option is to approve the motion |
| 23 | | | |
| 23 24 | today and the ones that were here yesterday are going to | 24 | before us with a friendly amendment that subsequent to |
| | | 24 25 | before us with a friendly amendment that subsequent to that approval, and as soon as we're done approving it, |

| | | 1 | |
|----|--|----|--|
| 1 | that we take a shot at staying tonight to address the | 1 | environmental side and the E.J. side, I think we're going |
| 2 | fundamental differences that remain between what we | 2 | to start to see and develop greater understanding of our |
| 3 | approved in the Ag Alternative with the option of a second | 3 | watersheds in coastal systems that are both contributing |
| 4 | vote later tonight to accept a revised Ag Proposal. | 4 | to marine degradation as well as to the fresh water |
| 5 | Yesterday we talked about non-negotiability and | 5 | issues. |
| б | whether there were any nonnegotiable items. And Sam Farr | 6 | So for that reason, I do believe we are ready to |
| 7 | and others seemed to indicate, well, maybe they're not if | 7 | implement this permit program now. And I don't think that |
| 8 | you get down to it. But we left that question unanswered. | 8 | it would serve any of us to try to now address this kind |
| 9 | If we can negotiate those fundamental differences | 9 | of parking lot of elements that we know are not being |
| 10 | to our satisfaction I don't mind staying later, but I | 10 | accommodated at this point; however, I want to thank |
| 11 | really like the idea from an environmental justice and | 11 | Mr. Jordan for pointing out some important changes have |
| 12 | environmental perspective to get something done today | 12 | occurred. I think Reese Nelson said the same thing, and |
| 13 | that's been in motion for a long time. | 13 | in spirit, of course, Mr. Johnston. |
| 14 | MS. HUNTER: Can I speak to my own motion? | 14 | Some important changes have occurred in a very |
| 15 | MR. DELGADO: That wasn't a friendly amendment. | 15 | short period of time. And the framework that we have now |
| 16 | | 16 | |
| | MR. YOUNG: I want to know if you were facetious | | before us allows us to do all of these positive and |
| 17 | with that amendment. | 17 | progressive things in the right direction. So I would |
| 18 | MR. DELGADO: No, it wasn't facetious. | 18 | urge my fellow Board members to support the motion and |
| 19 | MR. YOUNG: Okay. | 19 | that we look forward to Mr. Briggs suggested that we |
| 20 | Dr. Hunter. | 20 | regularly schedule updates and presentations to the Board |
| 21 | MS. HUNTER: I will speak to my own motion. I | 21 | in a way that Staff could accommodate that mode. Because, |
| 22 | will be very brief. | 22 | again, we're working with great limits right now. |
| 23 | I am with you on that last element. What I'm | 23 | But that we want to shepherd the implementation |
| 24 | satisfied in is the way this Order has taken shape at this | 24 | of this. And the Board will have a good and close sense |
| 25 | point in time. What satisfies me is that now we'll start | 25 | of how it's working. And that there will be opportunity |
| | Page 134 | | Page 136 |
| 1 | to see some groundwater data coming out of the program. | 1 | for stakeholders to come to us with feedback and where are |
| 2 | And that has been my priority all along. | 2 | the gaps and where they need some assistance. |
| 3 | I also have tried to be, along with the other | 3 | So I fully anticipate that we're going to |
| 4 | Board members, prior to your all joining us, as responsive | 4 | continue in that spirit which started about a year and a |
| 5 | as we could be to the sensitive issues that emerged from | 5 | half ago when the Board became more engaged. |
| 6 | the stakeholder process. | 6 | So that's my final statement. |
| 7 | As Chair Young led in his leadership in | 7 | MR. YOUNG: Before I call for a vote on |
| 8 | recognizing that the Board needed to be more involved and | 8 | Dr. Hunter's motion, I just want to say to the Ag |
| 9 | opened up the process to workshops and some other ways in | 9 | community and the public that I certainly don't expect to |
| 10 | which we supported Staff to get things back on track, that | 10 | see possibly even immediate, you know, water quality |
| 11 | we've seen this process come an enormous distance back to | 11 | changes. I don't care if it says five years in there. |
| 12 | a place where I think we at least I believe we all see | 12 | What I'm looking for and this is my own |
| 13 | the potential and the openings that have been discussed | 13 | personal opinion with this and perspective is that |
| 14 | | 14 | we're seeing a good faith effort to work towards improving |
| 14 | both conceptually. To some degree, there's been more | | |
| | specificity that's emerged in that process and then the | 15 | the water quality degradation. That's what I'm looking |
| 16 | potential involvement of very talented individuals like | 16 | for. |
| 17 | Dr. Marc Los Huertos. | 17 | I know that this is going to take in some |
| 18 | That all gives us great energy now; whereas, we | 18 | regions some part of our regions years and years and |
| 19 | were all weary, I feel like there's some energy back in | 19 | years to get to where we want to be. And I know that |
| 20 | the room. I want to thank Ms. Dunham for her | 20 | we're at the point we are because of decades of acceptable |
| 21 | extraordinary work in moving the Ag Proposal to a point | 21 | practices. And these have been culturally acceptable. |
| 22 | where we could see the connections. | 22 | The public has been okay with them. There hasn't been |
| 23 | I hope that's true for all of you who support | 23 | scrutiny on them before. And I think we have to recognize |
| 24 | in support of the Ag Alternative. | 24 | that to expect a huge, diverse complex entity, if you want |
| 25 | At the same time, I want to say to the | 25 | to call it an entity, is Ag, to be able to change so |
| | Page 135 | 25 | Page 137 |

35 (Pages 134 to 137)

| 1 | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| 1 | quickly, I'm not expecting that in terms of the | 1 | already passed the recommendation by Staff. |
| 2 | groundwater and surface water improvements. But I am | 2 | MR. JOHNSTON: The motion for reconsideration. |
| 3 | looking for the good faith effort to make progress in that | 3 | MR. YOUNG: Okay. Well |
| 4 | end. | 4 | MR. DELGADO: I don't know if it's a motion for |
| 5 | Having said that, Mr. Johnston. | 5 | reconsideration. It's a motion for a subsequent step to |
| 6 | MR. JOHNSTON: Couple of things. | 6 | the last motion passed. |
| 7 | First of all, the question I posed to Staff | 7 | MR. BRIGGS: May I speak on that? |
| 8 | before the break regarding Paragraph 27, Page 7, the | 8 | MR. YOUNG: Yes. Go ahead. |
| 9 | coupling between filing a pesticide use permit and being | 9 | MR. BRIGGS: I really think that what you're |
| 10 | required to submit a Notice of Intent. | 10 | doing is talking about doing Staff work, not only that, at |
| 11 | Did you guys have a chance to take a look at | 11 | a late hour. And, actually, I think maybe the ball would |
| 12 | that? If so, what is your recommendation? | 12 | be in the court of Ag to take a look at the cons, see if |
| 13 | MS. SCHROETER: I think the changes that you | 13 | they're interested in talking about those cons. |
| 14 | suggest, I think are fine. I don't have any objection to | 14 | And as I said before, what we have adopted now |
| 15 | the changes. | 15 | allows the flexibility for that proposal to come forward. |
| 16 | MR. YOUNG: Is that included in your motion, | 16 | I think it makes a lot more sense for that proposal to be |
| 17 | Dr. Hunter? | 17 | developed by the folks on the ground who have proposed |
| 18 | MS. HUNTER: Yes. I would ask that Staff include | 18 | that in the first place. And if you know, if the Order |
| 19 | that in the list of revisions. | 19 | being adopted allows for it to come to the Board, if it's |
| 20 | MR. JOHNSTON: Speaking to the motion, were there | 20 | stymied, in other words, if a proposal comes to me and I |
| 21 | four votes for proceeding to try and see if we can make | 21 | say, no, it's still not there, you have the option to come |
| 22 | sausage out of the Ag Proposal. I think that would have | 22 | to the Board, but then it would be a cooked proposal. |
| 23 | been the appropriate way to proceed. It does not appear | 23 | A proposal that is fleshed out, that is not a |
| 24 | there are. So I will support Dr. Hunter's motion. | 24 | moving cloud, as I said. I think that is appropriate. I |
| 25 | MR. YOUNG: All those in favor of the motion say | 25 | don't think it makes sense for this Board to not only take |
| | Page 138 | | Page 140 |
| 1 | aye. | 1 | your time I appreciate your offer to do that but |
| 2 | MR. JORDAN: Aye. | 2 | basically you would be taking everybody else's time, too, |
| 3 | MS. HUNTER: Aye. | 3 | after two very long hearing days, and I just don't think |
| 4 | MS. McCHESNEY: Aye. | 4 | that is reasonable. |
| 5 | MR. JEFFRIES: Aye. | 5 | MR. YOUNG: Also, I think that there are some |
| 6 | MR. JOHNSTON: Aye. | 6 | things that aren't reconcilable with the cons. |
| 7 | MR. DELGADO: Aye. | 7 | MR. BRIGGS: Yes. |
| 8 | MR. BRIGGS: Aye. | 8 | MR. YOUNG: There are some that may be; there are |
| 9 | MR. YOUNG: Any opposed? | 9 | some that are not. |
| 10 | The motion is carried unanimously. | 10 | MR. BRIGGS: By the way when I mentioned taking |
| 11 | - | 11 | |
| | Is there another motion being proposed. | | everyone's time, I'm willing to stav here myself. I'm |
| 12 | Is there another motion being proposed, Mr. Delgado? | 12 | everyone's time, I'm willing to stay here myself. I'm talking about everyone else here, the folks out there, |
| 12 | Mr. Delgado? | | talking about everyone else here, the folks out there, |
| | Mr. Delgado? MR. DELGADO: Sure. I'll throw it out there. | 12 | talking about everyone else here, the folks out there, it's not fair to them. |
| 12 13 14 | Mr. Delgado? MR. DELGADO: Sure. I'll throw it out there. MR. YOUNG: You can throw it out there. | 12 13 | talking about everyone else here, the folks out there, |
| 12 13 | 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 | 12 13 14 | talking about everyone else here, the folks out there, it's not fair to them. MR. JORDAN: Mr. Chair. MR. YOUNG: Yes. |
| 12 13 14 15 | 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 | 12 13 14 15 | 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 |
| 12 13 14 15 16 | 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 | 12 13 14 15 16 | 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. |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 | 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 | 12 13 14 15 16 17 | 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 |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | 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 | 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | 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 |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | 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 | 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | 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 |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | 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. | 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | 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. |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | 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? | 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | 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 |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | 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 | 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | 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 |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | 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? | 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | 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 |

36 (Pages 138 to 141)

ſ

| | | - | |
|----|--|----|--|
| 1 | modifying the Ag Alternative for approval would be within | 1 | clear on the positions that are reflected among the |
| 2 | those same sideboards. | 2 | stakeholders that are involved, that have been involved, |
| 3 | MS. McCHESNEY: I am looking at this. So when | 3 | that have engaged in this process. |
| 4 | you adopt when you make a motion and you vote on the | 4 | I want to see that discussion take place over |
| 5 | motion, you can make a motion to reconsider at your same | 5 | time in a thoughtful and productive way. I don't see that |
| 6 | meeting if the main motion is carried or lost. There was | 6 | occurring in the course of the next few hours. |
| 7 | a motion. It was carried. You could make a motion to | 7 | I would urge you to reconsider. |
| 8 | reconsider your motion. But to make the motion like you | 8 | MR. YOUNG: Mr. Johnston. |
| 9 | did, you know, isn't in the list. You could rescind your | 9 | MR. JOHNSTON: I do not believe that it would be |
| 10 | motion or repeal your motion, whatever you | 10 | appropriate tonight for us engage in a discussion with |
| 11 | MR. YOUNG: What are you reading from, Frances? | 11 | agricultural stakeholders about whether they're willing to |
| 12 | Roberts? | 12 | modify their Proposal. We have closed public comment. |
| 13 | MS. McCHESNEY: No. Sturgis rules that apply to | 13 | And we're at the point that it's we can ask questions |
| 14 | your proceedings. | 14 | of Staff, or whatever. We're at the point where it's us, |
| 15 | MR. DELGADO: I'd like to ask the Chair you | 15 | the Board, figuring out what we're going to do. And |
| 16 | just mentioned that you thought there might be some | 16 | MS. McCHESNEY: Right. |
| 17 | irreconcilable differences between the Ag Alternative and | 17 | MR. YOUNG: Yeah. |
| 18 | what we approved just a few minutes ago. I thought I | 18 | MR. JOHNSTON: Let me just finish, Counselor. |
| 19 | don't know what those are, but they sound like the | 19 | I think that if we were to pass a motion to |
| 20 | nonnegotiable potential that we heard last night and we | 20 | reconsider, really our only option would be, can we now |
| 21 | discussed last night. | 21 | sufficiently amend what was offered in order to make it |
| 22 | Are there really irreconcilable differences? And | 22 | satisfy our policy and legal concerns. I think it would |
| 23 | if there are, I would think it would be a short list. I | 23 | be patently unfair to all of the stakeholders for us to |
| 24 | would like to know what that short list was, and then my | 24 | start discussion with one group of stakeholders hoping |
| 25 | motion was to stay tonight to work on that short list to | 25 | that's not practical. |
| | Page 142 | | Page 144 |
| 1 | see if Ag was willing to change their alternative so that | 1 | MR. YOUNG: Right. |
| 2 | those irreconcilable differences were resolved. | 2 | MS. McCHESNEY: What I was just going to say is |
| 3 | MR. YOUNG: Dr. Hunter. | 3 | that it would be hard for me to give you advise given that |
| 4 | MS. HUNTER: Okay. I'm with you on that, the | 4 | we got the Proposal yesterday, and I would rather be able |
| 5 | idea that we need to explore and really understand where | 5 | to sit down with Ms. Dunham and others. If you want to |
| 6 | those irreconcilable differences fall. In order to have | 6 | schedule that for some other time, to have a discussion, |
| 7 | that discussion, however, we need stakeholder input, and | 7 | then you can do that. It's not noticed to have that |
| 8 | we need to have a thoughtful process. And I think the | 8 | discussion with stakeholders participating so they're not |
| 9 | review that created that set of pros and cons was the | 9 | all here. |
| 10 | result of Mr. Johnston's request to the Staff. And I | 10 | MR. YOUNG: Right. |
| 11 | think that satisfied his request. But I don't believe | 11 | MS. McCHESNEY: So, anyway. |
| 12 | that that set of points was intended to drive the changes | 12 | MR. DELGADO: I appreciate that, what you just |
| 13 | or the building out, if you will, the filling in of the | 13 | said, Frances. |
| 14 | details of the permit that is to be implemented. | 14 | I'll withdraw my motion. What I wouldn't want is |
| 15 | So I would hesitate to take that summary which | 15 | to leave tonight and not start implementing what's been |
| 16 | was created for a different purpose and use it now to | 16 | approved because there might be something else coming down |
| 17 | drive a new discussion, or at least the next generation of | 17 | the pipes. Everyone just remains in limbo. |
| 18 | this discussion, and expect that both the regulated | 18 | I would hope that if we stay later tonight, we |
| 19 | community and interested stakeholders are going to be able | 19 | would either learn more that is helpful to everybody or we |
| 20 | to participate in a discussion at this point in the | 20 | would come up with a revised product that we are even |
| 21 | evening really fully prepared. So what would we | 21 | happier with. I do understand that that's highly |
| 22 | accomplish? | 22 | unlikely, but I just thought the time spent trying would |
| 23 | I think we'd hear a lot of the ideas that have | 23 | be of benefit. |
| 24 | already been stated over the last three years. We've been | 24 | MR. YOUNG: Okay. So you're withdrawing your |
| 25 | hearing these things evolve forward, and I think we're | 25 | motion? |
| | Page 143 | | Page 145 |
| | | 1 | |

٦

| - | | |
|--|---|--|
| 1 | MR. DELGADO: Yes. | |
| 2 | MR. YOUNG: All right. | |
| 3 | I think that concludes this agenda time. | |
| 4 | Thank you very much. | |
| 5 | We are off the record. | |
| 6 | (Proceedings were concluded at 6:09 p.m.) | |
| 7 | | |
| | | |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | 000 | |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | | |
| 12 | | |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| | Page 146 | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 1 | DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY | |
| 1 2 | DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY | |
| | DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY | |
| 2 | DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY | |
| 2 3 4 | | |
| 2 3 4 5 | I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on the 29th | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on the 29th | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on the 29th | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on the 29th | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on the 29th | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on the 29th day of March, 2012. | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on the 29th | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on the 29th day of March, 2012. | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 12 13 14 | I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on the 29th day of March, 2012. | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on the 29th day of March, 2012. | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 12 13 14 | I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on the 29th day of March, 2012. | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on the 29th day of March, 2012. | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on the 29th day of March, 2012. | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on the 29th day of March, 2012. | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on the 29th day of March, 2012. | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on the 29th day of March, 2012. | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on the 29th day of March, 2012. | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on the 29th day of March, 2012. | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on the 29th day of March, 2012. | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on the 29th day of March, 2012. | |

actual 12:11 39:13 82:1 affected 107:2 almost 89:20 appear 138:23 А actually 9:22 14:6 16:17 afraid 80:10,17 alone 122:22 appeared 58:7 ability 14:16 116:22 after 70:15 72:5 87:22 27:23 28:19 34:9 35:6 along 10:19 18:21 19:7 appears 84:3 able 4:11 10:15,19 48:6 40:16 45:9,12 46:21 89:3,4 112:20 113:10 19:25 123:2 130:11 applicable 107:6 59:13 68:4.5 70:9 119:25 120:4 129:14 47:1 66:15 71:15 135:2,3 applicant 66:8 75.6 79.1 107.1.3 77:11 78:10.20 79:8 130:2.4 141:3 application 11:21,22 already 12:12 27:8 127:3 137:25 143:19 31:23 32:21 38:13 79:18 81:14 82:20,23 afternoon 8:17 24:15 128:1 145:4 84:6 90:4 92:12 93:1 Ag 3:15 4:5,20 13:16 41:8 43:13 47:12,13 applies 23:236:24 about 4:23 9:24 12:3 93:19 94:1 95:24 26:24 37:1 76:10 57:5 59:14 64:23 65:1 74:15 85:6 13:16,22,22 14:18 107:23 118:21 119:12 79:18 88:22 94:21,24 78:4 81:11 99:12,14 apply 12:1 23:12 24:12 15:11,13 18:1 19:17 127:24 140:11 94:24 95:10,18 97:2 100:10 107:11,22 26:21 44:10 85:9 21.12 23.15 29.12 105:2 142:13 add 7:4 20:12 25:22 97:15 100:1 101:16 108:9 122:13 123:4 30:5 32:10 33:20 26:24 30:21,25 36:6 140:1 143:24 appreciate 7:25 8:3 113:6 116:9.16 34:21,23 36:21,24 37:13 42:16 66:10 124:19 125:20 126:10 alteration 28:18 29:2 75:7 117:6,9 126:24 37:2,11 42:19 43:2 69:2,8,14 78:10 89:3 127:2 130:3,7 131:2 alternative 9:3 59:1 128:6 141:1 145:12 44:18 45:11,12,16,24 104:3,5 117:16 132:18,19 133:7,13 61:12 71:22 77:7 approach 11:25 47:17 46:6,13,15 51:1,16 52:17 54:22,23 56:12 118:17 119:11 122:9 133:15,19 134:3,4 94:25 95:18 96:24 52:16 60:15 61:11 135:21,24 137:8,25 138:22 139:18,20,21 97:6,21 98:10,23 101:16 104:9,13,19 87:24 98:21 102:10 127:5.10 124.24 57:1,16,22 59:25 added 4:4 24:1 26:5 61:19,22 62:15 64:1 28.16 50.22 68.17 104:20 105:4,6,15 140.12 141.24 25 approached 128:15 65:1 66:17 67:17 98:14 99:19,23 142:1,17 143:1 106:4 107:17,19,25 approaches 59:1 68:14,15 71:6 78:5 104:16 107:14 128:7 again 8:17,20 12:16 110:17,24 111:1,3 101:22 79:11 85:23 86:10.11 adding 41:24 58:21 47:18 62:20 78:4 99:9 132:20 133:19 134:3 appropriate 4:6,16 14:4 87:23 88:18 89:1,12 107:25 99:18 120:17 123:14 135:24 141:25.25 28:12 65:6,9,14,20 90:6 93:9 96:3 97:13 addition 27:570:16 130.17 131.6 136.22 142.1 17 143.1 66.6 124.17 125.4 101:20 107:11 108:11 71:17 72:6 112:5 against 120:14 alternatives 60:18,24 138:23 140:24 144:10 108:25 113:25 114:5 additional 4:14 9:6 agency 127:13,21 61:5,16,17 72:9 73:2 approval 61:6 104:19 114:25 115:22 120:9 36:11 37:17 41:18 128:17,20 95:5 97:5 101:25 . 109:7 112:22 133:25 121:5 123:14 125:12 44:10 63:12 64:19 agenda 3:5 141:23 124:12 142:1 125:15.16 126:4 approve 112:20 117:15 146:3 although 94:6 65:19 71:15 73:4 134:5 137:4 140:10 agendize 120:1 always 112:2 113:19 117.23 118.9 133.23 92:10.13 113:2 140:13 141:12 144:11 128:22 aggregate 50:17,18,23 130:14,19 approved 6:3 77:7 above 65:1 111:22 address 4:1 9:10 13:21 50:24 104:24 105:2,6 ambiguity 36:19 57:22 . 106:5 108:18,20 absence 38:21 105:7 107:1 127:8 21:24 41:7 54:16 ambiguous 26:17 36:15 109:4 110:22,24 absolutely 5:25,25 amend 125:5 144:21 55.20 56.24 65.17 132.24.25 134:3 139:17 142:18 102:10 amendment 133:24 111:12,18 120:3 aggregating 50:25 145:16 academics 112:12 aggressive 122:24 125:17,25 126:23 134:15,17 139:15 approves 109:20 accept 31:19 117:13 ago 88:5133:1137:5 among 111:4 144:1 134:1 136:8 139:16 approving 133:25 120:14 134:4 addressed 18:4 100:12 142:18 amount 47:13 73:19 approximately 85:9 acceptability 94:17 100:14,18 111:10 agree 15:14 16:10,11 111:10 124:15,22 aquatic 9:18 16:9 27:7 123:5 126:20 20:11,12 21:3,11 24:2 126:9 .28:10,20 29:1 acceptable 70:4 95:16 114:11,14 122:2 25:13 26:22 27:22.24 analysis 70:12 71:8,10 aquifer 69:17,19,20 addressing 116:13,14 116:15 127:19 27:25 31:3 34:3 35:7 analytical 67:8 aguifers 69:12 137:20,21 adequacy 5:10 and/or 104:17 109:13 area 10:14 33:21 39:2 35:11 37:16 46:15 acceptance 139:21 adequate 65:12 50:7 65:18 67:11 109:14,15 111:1 39:15 41:3,4 69:12 access 69:19 Adequately 69:11 69:13,24 78:8 86:9 112:12 areas 10:25 27:7 36:24 accessible 32:15 adjacent 37:24 39:16 Angela 2:13 13:3 16:18 41:8 57:22 58:14 97:14 102:4 accommodate 124:20 agreed 35:12 68:16 adjusted 78:18 17:20 29:7 40:19 116:11 132:14 136:21 62:16 65:23 70:22 admin 16:20 108:9 118:24 122:14 argue 61:22 99:1 accommodated 136:10 administrative 90:15 agreeing 16:13 20:14 71:678:2584:986:18 arguments 61:23 62:2,7 accomplish 116:20 admission 114:17 21:4 25:19 26:1,14 102:14 around 56:11,21 87:23 143:22 annual 105:13 admit 30:8 28:4 34:19 106:10 according 40:24 adopt 15:9,15 95:1 99:4 agreement 29:2 41:24 another 49:8 80:11 articulate 82:21 accountability 111:21 122:10 128:11 133:18 agreements 28:18 90:18 101:4,11 aside 83:11 84:1 120:11 127:16 agricultural 2:13 33:21 asked 8:24 9:2 14:23 142:4 139:11 accuracy 118:16 answer 22:16 31:15 adopted 16:10 53:14 88:7 89:3.9 112:12 34:2,11 59:5,20 114:4 accurate 39:10 74:5 61:10 140:14,19 144:11 34:7 39:3,10,18,24 114:14 93:2 118:21 adopting 61:19 agriculture 3:6,11 79:10 42:18 59:24 114:5 asking 37:18 43:451:12 achievable 113:20 adoption 70:15 119:19 , 106:17 129:21 130:9 133:4 achieve 49:10.11.12 answers 126:1 assessment 50:7 ag's 128:7 122:1.7 73:14,22 74:4 78:12 adopts 53:20 61:10 ahead 10:23 16:1 18:6 anticipate 137:3 assigned 58:10 78:17 104:10 advance 9:17 21:7 51:4 56:23 58:16 73:8 anybody 34:11 assignment 8:23 achieving 47:15 113:2 advanced 52:12 60:12 115:22 117:20 123:22 anyone 45:9 80:4 91:24 assist 99:2 acquired 120:10 advancing 11:25 50:15 124:7 128:11 140:8 96:9 assistance 14:8 45:1 acreage 12:15,17,18 advantages 96:14,17 Alba 80:25 anything 7:1 25:6 82:24 67:15,17 78:9,15,16 acres 12:15,18,18 83:12 87:10 94:3 108:12 98:8 alert 6:21 78:23 79:21 81:4,4 acronyms 114:21 117:15 121:9 advice 52:19,22,23 allocated 3:16 82:17 137:2 across 116:10,10 advise 31:18 145:3 allow 26:12 50:18 57:5 anyway 145:11 Assistant 2:12 act 33:24 120:20 123:1 61:16 66:2 72:8 73:1 advised 125:4 apologize 20:1 associated 29:4 76:10 acting 120:15 apparent 126:18 advisor 89:18,19 112:13 86:15 98:20 assume 109:10 125:11 action 141:18,20 allowed 4:10 6:5 23:7 apparently 64:12 advisory 59:3 94:16 assuming 41:24 53:19 actions 54:11 62:8 95:4 110:1 112:11 37:2 87:16 appeal 108:24 109:20 assure 9:16 111:19 123:1 allows 23:19 37:25 appealable 109:8,10 ATKINSON-BAKER 113:10.11 114:15 activities 28:12,17,22 128:23,24 38:21 61:13 71:21 110:4 1:19 28:22 29:20,20 affect 88:9 89:10 136:16 140:15,19 appealed 113:17 attachment 15:8,8,9,10

(800) 288-3376

| | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|--------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| 15:10,15,17 16:3 | becomes 9:18,19 25:4 | 131:8 135:4,8 136:18 | carried 139:10 142:6,7 | 69:16 112:5 |
| 17:21 42:11,13 43:16 | 33:23 | 136:20,24 137:5 | carrot 86:23 133:4 | characterizing 68:24 |
| 44:1 62:22 63:24 | before 21:7 24:12 48:1 | 140:19,22,25 144:15 | case 8:19 12:17 28:20 | check 40:24 41:5 81:16 |
| 92:11 103:1,1 | 58:25 59:6,9 70:10 | Boards 7:19 33:2 53:14 | 33:19,20 34:6 43:2 | 93:1,6118:20 129:16 |
| attachments 18:21 42:6 | 71:23 72:9 77:5,11,18 | Board's 7:23 30:11 | 55:3 57:25 | checkbox 37:23,23 |
| attempting 125:20 | 79:10 87:21 88:20 | 44:22 52:23 53:25 | cases 9:25 104:3 | 38:10,17,18,21 |
| attended 79:25 80:3,16 | 89:5 91:1 93:19 94:1 | 60:9,10 68:24 93:24 | case-by-case 105:5 | checklist 38:9 |
| attorney 34:10 52:17 | 113:12 124:16 125:3 | body 12:12 101:6 | catch 123:8 | chemical 22:11 |
| attorneys 52:21,21 | 125:18 126:13,17 | bogged 24:20 | catching 71:3 109:12 | chemicals 12:10 |
| audience 16:19 19:14 | 127:24,25 128:4,16 | boil 127:1 | categories 33:15 39:4 | chew 101:3 |
| 25:24 | 130:6 131:8,19 | bolded 110:11 | Caucasian 82:16 | Chinese 79:6 80:20 |
| audios 119:21 | 133:16,24 136:16 | both 11:11,19 17:10 | cause 12:10 41:25 46:4 | chip 116:4 |
| audit 4:7,11 50:4 | 137:7,23 138:8 | 53:23 69:6 82:19 | causing 11:17,20,22 | chlorpyrifos 12:5,11 |
| auditor 4:12 | 140:14 | 86:19 99:23 100:4 | CCA 90:8 | choice 124:11 126:24 |
| authority 31:17 57:7,11 | begin 93:14 | 106:12,22 109:11 | centered 32:1 | choose 7:13 37:4 113:5 |
| 57:12 60:9,10 118:25 | beginning 6:24 83:16 | 116:2 126:10 127:20 | central 1:1 2:4 6:4 9:20 | choosing 29:23 |
| authorizes 83:10 | 83:20 126:5,7 | 135:14 136:3 143:18 | 30:23,25 31:24 46:10 | chose 3:16 |
| automatically 31:25 | being 3:11 17:5 32:11 | bottom 10:5 16:7 | 46:12 54:7,10 57:8 | chrysanthemum 79:6 |
| 65:18 | 37:2 75:25 77:2 88:21 | box 5:17 40:24 41:5 | 78:11,14 88:10 89:11 | circle 56:11,21 87:22 |
| available 30:23 31:4 | 100:1 128:11 132:25 | 81:16 123:2 | 108:19,23 109:4,8,19 | circumstances 36:17 |
| 83:11,25 | 136:9 138:9 139:11 | break 87:17 93:8 138:8 | cents 87:5 101:4 | clarification 4:18 59:7 |
| awards 45:2 | 140:19 | brief 134:22 | CEQA 121:25 122:12,14 | 68:15 71:4 123:24 |
| aware 94:5 | believe 24:16 41:23 | Briggs 2:9 3:13,15 8:10 | certain 22:16 73:15 | clarified 58:15 |
| away 76:9 133:14 | 89:16 117:9 135:12 | 8:11 10:16 48:18 | 78:11 83:19,20 105:7 | clarify 4:3 10:11 17:4 |
| awfully 103:6 | 136:6 143:11 144:9 | 50:16 63:24 64:5,8 | 116:15 | 18:8 19:18,22 22:21 |
| aye 139:1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8 | belong 43:18 | 70:22 71:5,9 74:10,12 | certainly 34:5 56:18 | 28:17,23 49:20 58:12 |
| A6 64:3 | below 107:17,20 110:15 | 77:22 83:2 90:11,13 | 96:13 97:21 137:9 | 75:12 121:3,21 |
| A6028BE 1:25 | beneficial 53:10 128:2 | 90:21 91:1,4,6,22 | 141:18,20 | 129:12 |
| | benefit 145:23 besides 63:21 90:21 | 92:1,5 97:23,25 98:3 | certificate 89:18 90:9 | clarifying 57:20 |
| B | 106:9 | 99:9,16,21 100:3,8,15 | certification 29:3,3 50:4 | clarity 33:12 |
| B 42:6 43:16 44:1 62:22 | best 9:17 96:23 102:7 | 100:21 103:18 114:2 | 120:22,23 certifications 28:19 | Clark 46:6,14 |
| back 7:208:14 15:23 | 102:12 | 114:4,12 115:24 | 73:3 | clean 68:1 |
| 17:18,21 25:4 26:3 | - | 117:11 118:15 119:12 119:22 136:19 139:8 | certified 67:4 89:17,19 | cleaned 29:13,14 |
| 32:8,12 33:25 50:16 | better 12:9 55:5 58:15 60:19,21 61:13 87:2 | 140:7,9 141:7,10 | | clear 32:10 43:22 53:24 54:6 55:7 58:24,25 |
| 56:11,21 65:25 70:22 | 102:9 123:6,12 | bringing 65:15 | certifying 50:3 cetera 26:7,25 83:21 | 97:1 120:19 121:6,11 |
| 84:6,10 85:22 87:4,12 | 130:18,21 132:15 | brings 78:3 116:17 | chain 100:24 | 121:16 144:1 |
| 87:22 95:17 98:15,17 | between 49:3 50:8 66:7 | broad 45:4 | Chair 2:8 3:9 29:11 30:5 | clearly 8:16 22:3 33:6 |
| 99:6,14 102:25 | 74:8,20 84:11 101:22 | brought 8:19 17:12 25:4 | 38:3 51:19 55:8,25 | 36:16 75:23 86:3 |
| 103:25 107:22,23 | 114:6 134:2 138:9 | 66:15 99:25 101:19 | 65:25 74:10 90:11,22 | 123:9 |
| 109:2 113:12 114:6 | 139:17 142:17 | 113:8,9 130:16 | 92:7 97:23 114:2 | click 41:10 |
| 120:8 129:24 131:7 | big 21:12,16 31:8,11 | 139:19 | 135:7 141:14 142:15 | close 136:24 |
| 131:13,25 132:13 | 33:19 46:20 133:5 | Bruce 2:7 92:9 | Chairman 2:5 8:2 18:16 | closed 144:12 |
| 135:10,11,19 | biostimulation 16:5 | bugger 21:8 | 24:18 63:24 94:6 | cloud 98:11,12 140:24 |
| background 22:4 | bit 9:23 10:17 33:19 | build 12:23 | 102:13 108:13 122:4 | clumsy 125:6 |
| Backing 108:16 | 44:5,19 126:17 | building 143:13 | challenged 101:11 | coalition 44:17 47:4 |
| bag 68:1 bait 22:18 | 130:20 | built 99:5 | chance 102:12 111:14 | 54:9 86:13,20,21,22 |
| balance 73:6,9,13,23 | black 103:10 114:25 | bullet 115:1 116:2 | 111:15 115:1,2,18 | 94:12 102:10 104:7 |
| 75:15 | blue 91:10,21 | bullets 114:25 | 120:2 138:11 | 104:18 116:9 |
| balanced 113:15 | blurring 106:12 | bunch 55:16 99:19 | change 17:19,25 18:3 | coalitions 44:21 45:4 |
| balancing 13:12 | board 1:1 2:4 4:2,5,19 | burden 122:25 | 21:4,9 25:13,14,19 | 46:3,20 97:4 127:8 |
| ball 87:1,2 123:9 128:21 | 5:24 6:3,11,18 7:17 | burdensome 70:10 | 26:227:1,1,2,23 | coast 1:1 2:4 9:20 30:23 |
| 140:11 | 8:25 16:7 17:12 18:20 | bureaus 81:1 | 28:19 36:9 39:23,25 | 30:25 46:10,12 78:11 |
| bar 52:19,20 89:20 | 18:23 19:6 20:4 25:4 | buried 41:1 | 54:23 65:22 66:18,19 | 78:14 88:10 89:11 |
| Barbara 2:5,9 | 29:23 30:24 31:1,16 | business 60:13 | 69:9,13 71:5 77:12,23 | 108:19,23 109:4,19 |
| base 95:11 | 31:19,22 32:4,13,20 | | 78:1 86:14 89:1 92:14 | coastal 136:3 |
| based 5:7 11:6,12 12:24 | 34:10,24 41:20 42:8 | C | 97:19 103:19 108:10 | Code 5:3 6:6,10 31:16 |
| 31:5 41:17 47:14,15 | 42:17 45:12 48:2,7 | C 2:1 42:6 | 127:15 130:17 137:25 | 57:23 88:12 127:12 |
| 64:20 65:14,20 66:2,6 | 52:18,18,19 53:20 | Cachuma 81:1 | 143:1 | coincide 33:15 |
| 82:24 83:2,3,5,8 | 56:12 57:4,7 60:1,13 | California 1:3 3:1 147:6 | changed 54:13 55:14 | collaboration 45:2 |
| baseline 106:15 | 61:9,11 62:2 64:22 | call 45:6 50:11 74:14 | 90:16 108:20 | 46:22 124:23 |
| bases 81:7 | 65:12 66:16 75:24 | 79:14,21 81:24,24 | changes 11:1,2 18:9,18 | collecting 90:6 |
| basic 5:4 55:1 | 78:11,14 79:15 88:10 | 128:23 137:7,25 | 27:24 28:1 42:8 43:25 | collection 104:22 127:9 |
| basically 15:10 32:23 | 89:11 91:8 93:14,21 | called 75:15 78:21 80:4 | 44:3 48:9 55:15 84:10 | color 83:5 |
| 71:20 88:13 106:8 | 93:23 94:7,19 95:8 | 82:5 125:10 128:24 | 87:8 88:17 90:14,17 | column 65:4 |
| 109:23 141:2 | 96:1,9,18,20,22 97:6 | calling 49:15 | 95:14,22 97:16 98:13 | come 7:6 29:9 53:18 |
| Basin 2:13 | 97:14 98:17,17 99:4,6 | calls 116:16 | 98:19,22 102:21 | 94:14 95:1,11 98:15 |
| basins 104:25 | 103:8 106:6 108:19 | came 87:11,13 88:2 | 105:18 111:3 118:3 | 98:17,17 99:6 102:5 |
| basis 33:3 105:5 | 108:23 109:5,10,19 | 121:5 127:25 130:8 | 118:14 119:14 122:2 | 102:19 107:22 109:2 |
| bearings 64:17 | 110:4 112:1,16,23 | 133:9,9 | 127:17 130:20 132:22 | 109:18,21 127:24 |
| beat 77:16 | 113:9,16,17 118:2 | camouflages 127:6 | 133:15,16,17 136:11 | 128:4 130:20 132:13 |
| became 113:12 137:5 | 120:1 122:22,25 | capture 42:9 96:23 | 136:14 137:11 138:13 | 135:11 137:1 140:15 |
| become 32:15 43:20,21 | 124:11,17 125:1,18 | care 29:12 137:11 | 138:15 143:12 | 140:19,21 145:20 |
| 44:4,4,13 68:6 126:18 | 125:19 127:25 128:16 | carefully 54:15 | characterization 40:6 | comes 4:9 76:11 78:19 |
| | 128:18 129:20 130:16 | 1 | characterize 69:6,11,14 | 140:20 |
| | I | 1 | I | I |

comfortable 127:10,11 128:12 coming 51:8 99:14 135:1 145:16 comma 29:19 comment 8:22 19:19 31:7 41:7 53:12 66:15 66:19 78:5 99:20 129:7 144:12 comments 8:13 9:7,13 11:11 18:8 80:14 87:10 88:2 89:13,16 93:21,23 99:24 119:20 123:19 commissioner 88:8 89:3,9 committee 59:3 94:16 95:4 110:1 112:11,21 113:11,12 114:15 128.23.24 commodity 79:7 80:23 communicate 19:20,21 communication 66:7,11 communities 9:19 community 79:4 126:10 126:11 133:12,12 137:9 143:19 compare 115:8 compared 5:1971:13 complaint 75:3 complete 121:24 completed 88:10 89:11 131:8 completely 125:7 complex 19:9137:24 compliance 14:8 47:21 53:8,15,21 54:1,25 55:6 58:6 73:10,16,24 74:3,16 75:21,22 77:8 77:15 78:13,17 104:10 105:12,13 112:25 complicated 40:9,11 comply 5:14 36:20 53:10.16 55:2 58:4 88:11,12 97:20 105:17 107:12 108:16 110:19 complying 54:11 component 141:25 components 4:4 comprehend 7:10 comprehensive 39:3 comprised 112:11 compromise 85:19 132:5 **computer** 102:15 **con** 94:22 101:15 conceded 131:1,3 concept 18:10 44:17 46:23,24,25 47:8,18 51:8 106:20 concepts 45:7 conceptual 117:7 conceptually 135:14 concern 12:3 32:11,12 32:13 34:23 36:14 53:7 55:20 57:6 58:15 65:17 66:16 81:3 106:9 concerned 30:7 34:21 concerns 53:4 78:5 144.22 concession 122:21 concessions 123:11

concluded 146:6 concludes 146:3 concluding 98:4 conclusions 7:22 concurrence 128:6 condition 26:21 35:4,17 63:21 73:10,17 74:4 75:16 77:3,15 107:10 107:20,20,21 108:1,3 109:22 110:10,13,14 110:15 114:24 Conditional 3:5 5:5 6:4 117.24conditioned 88:21 conditions 5:11 12:23 12:25 15:12,14 44:10 61:18 73:22.24 76:19 76:22 86:3 88:11 105:1,20,22,25 106:1 conduct 31:1 67:3,16 79:4 105:7 conducting 66:17,24 conducts 60:13 67:2 confidential 32:24 33.22 34.14 confirm 65:13 conflict 3:10 129:2 conflicting 52:21,22 confused 24:7 44:6 confusion 30:13 connect 17:18 connections 135:22 cons 42:18 46:23 51:6 59:13 95:17 96:3,4,5 98:6 99:12 100:4,9,18 101:1 126:22 140:12 140:13 141:6 143:9 consensus 96:12,19 consider 4:19,20 33:13 33:14 42:18 54:21 56:12 68:10 71:22 88:17 94:1 117:11 120:13 141:25 considerably 131:1 consideration 6:8 26:18 26:20 86:4 98:15 119:17 considerations 56:16 56:17.18 considered 8:5 26:9 132:19 considering 23:10 27:5 72:9 105:5 consistency 118:11 consistent 5:25 48:4 60:15 71:11 74:13,22 74:24 75:4 77:24 101:8 118:4 124:5 constitute 23:3 consultant 66:24 consulting 114:9 contamination 126:16 127:15 contemplated 100:6 contend 5:13 contentious 120:6 context 22:14 23:14 45:19 47:20 contingencies 111:18 continuation 1:8 61:21 continue 18:15 34:15 36:2 61:22,23 62:8 86:3 98:25 106:3 122:18,20 137:4 continued 3:7

continuing 3:4 61:20 contributing 105:10 136:3 control 1:1 2:4 22:12 126:21 conversation 86:10 cooked 140:22 cooperative 37:3,14,15 63:22 64:1 66:24 67:2 68:19,23 69:18,22 70:1,8 73:3 102:20 103:23 104:2,4,8 107:13 110:19 131:11 cooperatively 70:3 coordinate 79:7 103:22 coordinated 104:6 coordination 45:1 copied 31:9 copies 16:18,24 102:15 103:2,4,11 110:8 copy 16:23,23 30:23 91:24,25 92:4,4 correct 29:24 32:18 33.16.17 35.23.24 38:8 39:22 46:8 49:1 51:13 63:19 71:3,14 73:21 75:11 77:10 80:2 84:3,25 85:4,8 85:13,14,19 86:17 88:23 90:4 100:3.13 147:7 corrected 30:11,14 correction 119:5 corrections 118:7 cost 68:8.9 106:18.25 costs 64:2 counsel 2:8 52:23,24 94:8 102:2 Counselor 144:18 counsel's 52:19 count 25:11 126:2 counter 141:22 counting 124:25 County 2:6 88:7 89:9 couple 5:4 53:3 84:6,11 88:1 94:9 105:18 119:13 131:7 138:6 coupling 138:9 course 5:13.23 6:17 136:13 144:6 court 1:20 87:2 123:10 140:12 cover 23:7 26:6 81:6 covered 22:23 23:16 42:5 119:12 covering 22:23 cracks 80:8 create 29:5 57:22 created 143:9,16 creates 36:19 creek 38:17,19 40:14 45.25 creeks 26:6 39:14 criteria 11:9 12:1 47:24 51:20 60:3 101:10 109:24 critical 46:25 47:19 crop 12:14,20 13:6 89:17,19 crops 116:11 cross 20:11 **CSB** 83:12 CSR 1:24 147:13 culling 16:5 culturally 137:21

curious 59:10 current 11:25 30:22,23 31:23 57:9 currently 20:8 22:18 54:8 61:1 67:1 72:22 105:10 CUSDA 82:7,11,12 D dangling 86:24 dash 124:2 data 71:21,24 104:22 106:24 126:19 127:5 135:1 date 48:12 49:12,14,24 70:13,14,17,20,23 71:5,9,19 72:2,3,4,7 72:10.13.15.20.23 73:15 75:20.20.21 77:8 84:23 108:4,6,7 108:8 dates 70:7 71:17 73:1,1 75:22,23 84:10 86:12 90:17 Davis 7:6 121:13.14 day 58:19 101:4,10,12 147:8 days 141:3 dead 77:16 deadlines 61:3 133:3 deal 14:2 33:2 36:4 63:13 94:13 deals 63:13 83:18 94:12 115:9,10 dealt 106:12 debate 98:25 125:10,11 DEBORAH 1:24 147:13 decades 120:6 137:20 decide 4:20 56:14 62:3 85:22 94:19 95:9 97:14 101:21 decides 6:11 decision 6:11 109:9 130:6 decisions 106:6 113:7 declaration 147:1,7 declare 147:5 defensible 60:16 defer 10:1 18:12 define 26:16 defined 54:15 94:14 definitely 102:8 definition 14:7 34:6 39:13 40:8,10,16,20 41:1,9,10 78:20,21 81:22 82:2,8,11,12,22 82:23 definitional 25:2,3 definitive 39:12 degradation 122:23 136:4 137:15 degraded 123:8 degree 127:5 135:14 delay 61:20 62:8 102:6 delaved 90:16 delete 16:11,13 29:19 34:17 37:18 57:2,10 66:20 72:6 121:9 deleted 17:5 32:24 deleting 23:17 35:2 deletion 28:14 34:19 37:22 38:2 Delgado 2:7 16:13 19:14,24 20:16,20,23

curiosity 33:8

21:8,16,22 22:6,13 23:10,17 24:5 25:24 26:3,22 27:9,12,18 29:11,15,17 30:1,4,15 31:7 35:1 36:10,25 38:3,540:2,7,10,13 40:23 41:3,7 43:23 44:5 49:2,18 50:2 51:18,24 52:4 55:8,22 64:13 65:23.25 67:5 67:10,21 68:11 71:12 72:12 73:18 74:5,17 75:1 76:6,10 77:16,20 81:19,20 82:3,7,12,15 83:7,14,22 90:22,25 91:11,17,20 92:10,15 92:20 93:4.7 103:13 103:16 108:7,9 109:13,17 114:22,24 115:12 132:17,18 134:15,18 139:7,12 139:13,15 140:4 141:22 142:15 145:12 146:1 deliberate 93:15 deliberately 67:20 deliberations 6:16 demonstrate 60:4 111:14 112:3,7 115:2 115:17 denial 109:9 110:4 denies 112:22 Department 67:24 127:22 128:5 depending 39:24 described 18:10 47:10 57:5 99:13 describing 24:22 description 111:5,5,24 descriptor 75:14 design 47:15 designed 52:14 61:8 102:19 desired 111:8 detail 44:16,19 47:13 62:15,21,22 detailed 113:7 details 29:12 30:2,6 95:5 143:14 determination 66:3 determinations 5:21 7:22 determine 48:5 67:5 determined 5:19 determines 67:10 develop 59:1 60:22 61:14 84:14,24 85:5 86:22 110:17 136:2 developed 45:7 47:2 68:22 85:11 98:9,12 140:17 developing 84:12,23 development 5:9 61:4 72:9,16 73:2 98:23 126:6 diazinon 12:5,11 difference 21:12.16 25:2 44:9 49:2,5 74:7 74:19,20,21,22 75:1,5 75:18 84:11 differences 127:1 134:2 134:9 139:17 142:17 142.22 143.2 6 different 6:12.13 12:21 20:4 27:9,12 32:22

40:14 50:10 51:17 54:16 55:17 83:15 94:9,10 102:18 104:11 107:13 116:22 124:1 125:7 143:16 differently 11:5 63:9 81:22 difficult 26:16 82:20 difficulties 78:12 difficulty 26:19 dig 56:21 diminishes 60:8,9 diminishing 124:23 direct 119:23 directed 42:17 direction 37:5 76:25 79:15 108:19 122:17 128:8 131:4,10 132:2 132:22 133:16 136:17 disadvantage 14:6 disadvantaged 78:6,12 78:25 81:23 82:4,21 83:12,14 disagree 28:14 37:22 38.2 disagreement 21:10 disagrees 69:17 98:16 discharge 1:9 12:6,11 22:23 23:7,9,19 57:24 58:1.2 70:7.17.18.20 71.18 23 72.1 88.8 89:9 111:16 112:6 117:24,25 discharged 1:10 23:15 23.23 discharger 3:11 55:1 58:11,13 Dischargers 26:5 28:12 44:11 53:9 65:11 69:13 73:12 103:22 104:8,11,12,16 105:15 106:3,5 107:12 108:16 110:16 110:21 113:3 Discharger's 58:3 123:10 discharges 54:3 57:23 discharging 23:1 disclosing 106:11 discover 81:7 discretion 72:17 110:20 112:19 discriminate 83:5,7 discuss 15:23 37:11 41:19 47:21 125:23 129.8 discussed 9:14 65:1 99:15 118:11 119:14 120:16 129:9 135:13 142:21 discussing 78:4 129:3 discussion 4.25 10.10 14:14 15:4,25 17:1 18:7,11,14 19:13 38:23 41:20 42:8 64:10,22 73:5,7 87:8 96:7,21 103:20 117:3 143:7,17,18,20 144:4 144:10,24 145:6,8 discussions 18:12 85:16,21 distance 135:11 distinction 77:14 distinguish 50:8

distribute 81:2 distributed 31:980:23 disturbance 28:10,20 29:1.6 ditched 141:24 diverse 137:24 document 27:3 31:8 33:24 36:11 43:3 66:3 documents 81:2 doing 15:2 34:10 45:16 46:17,20 79:5 80:16 95:2 102:12 128:20 132:4 140:10,10 **Dollars** 81:24 domestic 52:10 69:21 done 4:7,12 6:1 14:15 29:2 46:4,24 47:12,13 56:2 84:7 103:10,12 113:13.19 127:7.8 128:16 130:25 132:4 133:25 134:12 door 32:12 117:8 dot 114:25 down 10:16 12:2 14:19 24.20 38.5 94.20 95.3 95:16 104:3,12 105:18 107:21 109:5 109:22 110:15 113:21 116:18 125:21 127:2 133.5.5 134.8 145.5 145:16 Dr 3:8 5:18 45:5,22 47:7 62:17 117:5 125:18 125:21 128:14,24 129:2 134:20 135:17 137:8 138:17.24 143:3 draft 4:10 47:22 63:18 123:25 drinking 9:19 34:22 69:4,7 105:11 126:19 drive 102:14 143:12,17 drivers 11:19 drop 116:18 dropping 114:13 due 3:10 86:12 Dunham 2:20 3:19,20 3:22 6:23 7:4 8:2,7,9 9.23 10.22 38.12 53.6 69:15 127:7 135:20 145:5 Dunham's 95:15 Dunn 3:22 during 7:1 9:7,7 D-u-n-h-a-m 3:22 Ε E 2:1,1 18:10,10,12 36:4 37:10 41:14,21,23 42:1,2,6,11,14,15,16 42:17,25 43:9,14,14 43:16.17.19.20.20.23 43:24 44:3,4,4,6,7,8 57:19 58:18,21 62:21 98:9 99:6,25 100:6 117:8 each 11:9 12:16 18:24 19:15 64:11.13 94:22 94:23 95:14,17 130:19 earlier 7:16 74:8 75:8 90:1 easier 25:17 68:10 103:4

easiest 9:21 east 106:23 easy 39:1 edge 112:2 edit 16:11 18:24,25 20:15 21:3 30:24.25 31:3,19 41:16 42:7 65:19 70:5,16 73:11 73:22 78:3 81:25 90:23,25 92:14 edits 9:3,5,11,12 10:13 14:12 15:3.6 16:17 17:9.17 18:19 41:15 41:16,18 56:9 61:2,25 62:13 63:5 64:19 65:2 68:16 69:10,25 72:25 73:4 96:25 97:2 99:10 99:19,22 118:10 119:13 education 45:1 effect 139:25 effective 8:25 42:19 48:8,10 54:3 59:21 60:18 61:15 113:2 116:5 120:10 effectiveness 5:10,17 47:6 48:5 49:24 60:2 105:5,9 112:7 efficacy 112:4 effort 4:14 60:25 70:8.9 86.13 104.8 126.9 128:7 137:14 138:3 efforts 45:3 64:2 73:3 79:3 103:23 104:2,4 107:13 122:18 127:14 eight 48:16,25 49:16 **EIR** 120:22.23 either 36:17 37:2 57:25 66:6 96:15 145:19 electronic 37:9 80:21 88:11 element 4:8.16 126:14 134:23 elements 5:14 7:13 59:2 72:18,20 84:13,18 111:5 136:9 elevate 14:16 elevating 13:17 eleventh 34:5 eliminate 84:19.23 115:4,20 eliminating 111:15 115:2,18 else's 101:11 141:2 emerged 135:5,15 emotions 130:1 emphasizing 59:25 employee 67:4 enabling 108:2 encourage 22:5 58:25 60:24 98:14,20 99:6 encouraging 103:22 end 37:17 48:6 99:8 100:6 101:10,14 108:18 138:4 ended 69:1 ends 29.23 energy 135:18,19 enforceable 75:23 76:1 76:6,12,16,17 enforcement 54:11 75:22 enforcements 76:2 engage 144:10 engaged 137:5 144:3

engineer 66:21 English 29:12 37:1,6 enjoy 126:6 enlarge 103:13,16,18 enormous 135:11 enough 21:16,24 106:21 107:1 131:19 enrolled 81:12 enrollment 66:12 79:9 105:13 ensure 48:10 69:7 118:16 ensuring 69:3 entered 10:6 entire 110:13 119:17 entity 137:24,25 environmental 8:18 34:21,25 112:14,15 112:15 126:11,11 133:11,12,20,20 134:11,12 136:1 envisioned 99:12 EPA 22:15 ephemeral 37:20 eauip 78:23 equipped 83:11 equivalent 60:19,20 61:13 63:3 especially 10:25 74:18 78.6 essentially 68:16 113:21 establishes 61:11 estimates 16:7 et 26:6.25 83:21 ethnicity 82:24 evaluate 11:16 31:21 32:8 42:17 74:1 105:3 109:25 112:18 113:15 evaluated 111:4 112:10 evaluation 69:23 112:20 113:10 even 18:21 34:12 47:8 80:11 85:12 88:15 116:14 137:10 145:20 evening 143:21 events 8:11 eventually 81:7 ever 23:12 34:11 every 26:21,23 38:18 55:1 60:14 106:8,18 106:18 116:14 everybody 7:7,98:15 16:22 53:20 82:13 115.20 124.14 125.24 126:10 128:18 130:23 141:2 145:19 everybody's 84:7 everyone 19:25 141:12 145:17 everyone's 141:11 everything 3:17 46:18 51:25 59:12,12 97:9 97:12 110:15 119:21 127:1 everywhere 27:3,3 evidence 8:5 evolve 143:25 exact 92:24 exactly 3:24 10:19 27:20 example 12:19,25 15:7 22:17.19 36:25 37:6 49:13 63:25 66:23 67:1,4,22 68:12 70:12

75:19 79:5,8 80:24,25 81:1 104:6,17 105:6 110:25 111:9 114:19 116:4 121:25 examples 22:17 exceedance 32:1 except 32:13 97:12 exception 20:13 excessive 11:22 excludes 121:20 excuse 48:25 65:23 76:24 94:24 104:1 113.9 executed 147:7 Executive 2:9,12 13:17 32:3 61:6 65:13 66:2 66:8 87:18 88:19 94:8 94:15 95:3 102:2 104:19 105:3 108:21 108:23,24 109:4,8,9 109:14,15,20 110:2,3 110:20,22,23 112:19 112:19,22 113:10,16 130:16 existing 27:6 44:7 53:13 59:13 82:22,23 99:11 99:13,14,15 100:11 100:18 exists 82:13 expanding 23:11 expect 137:9,24 143:18 expected 111:11 expecting 39:17 138:1 experience 34:12 . 100:23 126:6 expert 24:10 39:18 explain 21:17 49:2,5 68:4 75:17 106:7 explore 143:5 expressed 32:11 34:22 53:6 106:10 extend 61:3 86:12 extended 73:1 extends 70:19 extension 71:12,15 extensions 133:2 extent 7:10 19:23 25:23 26:4,5,8,16,25 50:11 56:5 126:15 extracting 124:22 extraordinary 135:21 extras 16:21 e.g 78:17 114:19 E.J 136:1 **E.O** 14:16 98:15,16 106:5 F **F** 43:20,21 44:4,4,8,13 face 96:19,22 120:15

face 96:19,22 120:15 face 96:19,22 120:15 facetious 134:16,18 facilitate 45:4 fact 90:15 123:2,7 factors 105:9 failings 96:15 fair 40:5 49:14 82:19 83:22 100:20 141:13 fairly 39:3,8 132:22 faith 137:14 138:3 fall 80:8 143:6 familiar 67:18 far 31:10 50:21 57:20 77:18 102:19 129:24 farm 4:8,8,10 12:21,21 24:15 30:22,22 31:1

distracted 20:3

Page 5

| | | | | 1 |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| 31:14 32:7 33:11 | 137:11 | 77:2,12 80:14 85:10 | 97:22 98:5 103:15 | 104:6,7,8,18 110:18 |
| 37:21 38:14,15,19,25 | five-year 48:2 | 88:7 89:8 92:23 93:13 | 104:3,12 105:18 | 110:22 112:23 113:13 |
| 57:3 65:13 66:5 81:1 | fix 55:17,17,18 | 93:21,23,25 96:20,20 | 107:7,8,23 109:6,22 | 144:24 |
| 106:8,13 112:13 | flesh 114:15 | 102:9 106:24 107:24 | 115:22 117:20 123:13 | groups 57:20 58:25 |
| farmer 24:12 29:5 33:13 | fleshed 140:23 | 108:24 112:21 116:8 | 123:22 124:7,9 128:9 | 61:18 63:14,17 73:3 |
| 33:18,25 78:21 79:1 | flexibility 72:8 78:17 | 116:21 117:25 118:16 | 128:10 129:17,24 | 79:7 80:3,23 81:13 |
| 79:14 82:6,7 farmers 3:23 9:4,5,11 | 85:5 98:14 99:5 140:15 | 118:21 119:19 120:5 121:20 122:23 123:12 | 140:8 goal 49:22 101:5 115:19 | 94:14 104:16,17 107:13 108:17 109:7 |
| 14:7 15:5 17:11,16 | flexible 60:23 67:20 | 126:5,7 127:6,12 | goals 34:24 100:25 | 109:24,25 110:17 |
| 37:19 40:13 41:17 | flux 130:19 | 129:3 130:24 131:2 | 101:8 111:9,19,22 | 113:4 |
| 64:21 65:17 68:14,25 | focus 19:1 52:9 60:10 | 132:2 133:5,5,14 | God 133:13 | grow 67:23 |
| 78:12,15,22 81:5,23 | 101:7 128:1 | 134:11 135:5 142:11 | goes 76:9 109:7 121:22 | grower 26:19 66:11 |
| 82:4 83:12,17,18,20 | focused 10:24 | front 17:8,16 64:18 65:5 | 122:8 | 80:3 82:16 83:23 |
| 107:2 | focusing 52:8 | 124:9 130:13 | going 3:18,24 7:9,12 | 112:13 132:19 |
| farming 80:15,16 farms 12:5,25 13:19,22 | folded 59:13 folder 91:21 | frustrated 133:17 full 10:18 85:4 99:25 | 9:10,25 10:3,4,16,17 12:2 14:2 15:2,19,21 | growers 5:19 11:4 23:11,19 48:8 51:1 |
| 13:23 14:2,5,8 38:1 | folders 91:8,10 119:16 | fully 137:3 143:21 | 18:1,11,12 19:21 20:8 | 67:15 71:21 74:18 |
| 50:3 85:9 105:9,12 | folks 3:4 22:3 80:8,9,15 | full-time 79:17 | 20:10 21:5,5 25:1,14 | 75:5 78:6,9,21 79:5 |
| 112:2 | 81:7 93:11 131:23 | functional 113:13 | 27:1,23 29:9 35:12 | 80:24 81:18 106:10 |
| Farr 134:6 | 132:13 140:17 141:12 | fundamental 127:1 | 36:3,4,6 37:10 40:24 | 128:19 |
| favor 23:11 101:14,16 | follow 10:19 18:21 19:7 | 134:2,9 139:16 | 40:25 41:12 42:5 44:3 | growing 116:11 |
| 129:21 130:2 138:25 | 19:25 25:17 | Fundamentally 127:11 | 46:8 51:22 53:21 | guess 95:9 99:8 131:22 |
| favorable 23:18,20 | following 73:13 100:8 100:15 | funds 78:23 83:11,19 further 37:5 61:4 66:7 | 55:16 59:17 61:20 62:12,15 64:24 68:4 | guesses 3:25 guidance 7:19 |
| feasibility 26:20 27:17 feasible 25:23 26:4,5,8 | follows 110:14,16 | 66:11 86:12,12 102:6 | 62:12,15 64:24 68:4 70:9 74:3 75:25 76:2 | guidance 7:19 guys 88:17 101:6 |
| 26:16,25 27:13 | followup 95:25 | 128:9 130:11 133:13 | 77:13 79:1 80:7,8,17 | 138:11 |
| federal 83:18 | font 103:16,18,19 | 133:13 | 84:10 87:13,22 93:8 | |
| feedback 137:1 | food 100:24 | fuss 120:9 | 93:11,25 97:15,19 | н |
| feel 69:17 82:16 122:20 | foregoing 147:6 | | 98:3101:3,15102:11 | H 48:23 |
| 126:4 128:12 129:25 132:21 133:10,17,21 | foresee 66:4 forest 24:21 | G | 103:13 106:16 107:5 108:19 109:6,20,21 | habitat 2:12 9:18 27:7 |
| 135:19 | forget 33:9 | G 44:4 48:20,21,22,24 | 113:22 115:20,24 | 28:10,20 29:1 39:2,15 |
| fellow 136:18 | forgot 14:24 | Game 128:4 gaps 137:2 | 120:2,3 122:17 | 40:2 habitats 37:21 |
| fertilizer 11:21,22 | form 4:18 5:20 6:2 | gather 94:5 | 123:20 125:19 126:22 | hair 50:16 |
| few 32:21 36:4 61:3 | 18:17 65:2,2 80:20 | gave 8:22 | 127:3,22 131:22,24 | half 61:22 64:23 113:25 |
| 120:6 121:4 142:18 144:6 | 110:16 format 6:5,9 10:4 | geared 116:1 | 136:1 137:3,17 141:19 143:19 144:15 | 133:1 137:5 |
| fewer 107:3 | formed 97:4 | gee 120:8 | 145:2 | hammer 132:7 |
| fifteen 49:16 | forms 80:22 | general 10:24 18:9 23:21 33:15 36:18 | gone 89:21,22 | handed 18:22 handing 16:16 |
| fight 101:11,12 | formulate 87:18 | 68:24 69:5 96:12,19 | good 8:17 30:9 44:17,20 | handle 31:14 78:20 |
| figuring 38:25 144:15 | forth 108:1 114:6 | generally 9:10 24:22 | 59:3,19 68:12 106:15 | 131:20 |
| file 1:25 24:13,14,17 88:15 | forward 4:18 5:18 80:10 124:12 131:9 136:19 | 26:21 121:7,25 | 108:4,6114:1 116:25 117:1 118:22 119:23 | handout 10:3,22 |
| filing 138:9 | 140:15 143:25 | generation 143:17 | 121:1 129:19 131:14 | hands 93:25 |
| fill 40:24 68:2 | found 64:9 | gentleman's 13:21 geographically 106:22 | 133:10 136:24 137:14 | handy 91:6 happen 35:20 57:5 |
| filling 143:13 | four 6:1 64:19 79:23 | 106:23 | 138:3 | 132:13 |
| final 8:14 58:19 87:15 | 91:15 119:25 138:21 | geologist 66:21 | Gotcha 42:2 | happened 19:5 |
| 87:18,22 94:1 118:8 118:15 137:6 | fourth 115:1 frame 48:21 49:9,11 | gets 16:23 | gotten 91:22 | happening 50:19 108:2 |
| find 21:6 43:1 82:1 | 105:8 | getting 24:20 31:22 | Government 2:6,7 grammar 29:12 30:6,7 | happens 33:1 |
| 120:14 131:22 | framed 99:3 | 102:9 109:6 128:18 132:3 133:8 | 30:11 | happier 145:21 happy 54:22 101:4,24 |
| finding 34:20 35:8,14 | frames 47:25 49:3,4,15 | give 7:19 17:14 26:9 | grant 78:16,23 | 122:17 123:18 |
| 35:15,22 63:22 78:10 | 75:3 | 84:20 85:22 86:22 | grants 45:1 82:17 | hard 22:3145:3 |
| 92:11,13 108:1 119:1 119:7,8 | framework 97:3,7,16,20 98:13 113:6,8 116:8 | 97:8 102:11 105:8 | great 46:3 47:13 57:18 113:18 114:1 132:5 | Harter 121:14 |
| findings 15:8,11 53:23 | 136:15 | 113:6,7 131:10 133:6 | 135:18 136:22 | hate 21:8 30:4,8 124:8 |
| 63:12 92:10 102:25 | Frances 2:8 10:1 53:1 | 145:3 giveback 85:16 86:4 | greater 52:14 136:2 | having 14:16 37:23 51:20 83:23 98:5 |
| fine 21:6 37:16 56:23 | 56:18,24 59:10 114:8 | 122:19 | greatest 52:11 | 120:5 126:6 132:14 |
| 67:3 88:19 106:21 | 117:11 125:8 142:11 | givebacks 99:24 | grid 12:15 | 138:5 |
| 107:1 138:14 finish 56:4 144:18 | 145:13 frankly 94:18 107:3 | given 5:24 87:25 95:15 | ground 127:17 140:17 groundwater 11:18,23 | head 43:5 |
| firm's 129:24 | 124:10 131:21 | 123:10 124:14,15 | 13:7 37:14 42:4 52:9 | heading 15:17 74:15 |
| first 11:4 15:3 29:19 | frequently 4:2 | 145:3 gives 69:25 135:18 | 60:11 64:2 66:14,14 | heads 24:14 health 52:8,11 60:6 |
| 31:16 48:16 53:6 71:5 | fresh 136:4 | give-ups 123:15 | 66:18 67:3 68:15,20 | 67:24 112:15 120:17 |
| 75:16 84:20 88:4 95:8 | friendly 133:24 134:15 | giving 52:22 | 68:21,23,25 69:6,7,12 | 128:5 |
| 102:18 115:9 125:20 | 139:15 from 1:10 3:7 10 7:18 | glad 117:10 | 69:16,18,22 70:1 88:9 89:5 10 90:6 94:13 | healthier 9:18 |
| 126:13 130:24 138:7 140:18 | from 1:10 3:7,10 7:18 9:3,5,11 12:23 17:16 | go 9:21,22 10:3,23 11:1 | 89:5,10 90:6 94:13 102:20 105:3,11 | hear 22:3 53:3 81:3 |
| Fish 2:9 128:4 | 19:19 31:22 35:2 | 15:23 16:1 17:2,15,18 | 106:9,16 111:17 | 89:14 93:25 129:22 |
| fit 116:7,11,12 | 38:12,23,24 39:5 | 18:6 23:8 28:1 32:7 33:25 38:18 40:25 | 115:14 119:1 126:16 | 130:5 143:23 heard 3:18 4:2 7:2,3 |
| fits 13:9,10 27:17 | 41:17 45:15,24 46:6 | 51:4 55:17,18 56:23 | 127:20 135:1 138:2 | 35:2 40:19 45:20,24 |
| five 3:13,17 6:1 48:3,6 | 50:16 52:20 56:13 | 58:16 59:6 61:20 62:3 | group 4:13,24 5:7,16 | 46:6 52:1 56:13 81:21 |
| 48:25 83:11,25 | 58:5 61:17 62:22 65:16 67:11 68:1 | 67:25 68:2 73:8,23 | 6:9 36:17,21 44:1,12 44:13 46:11 12 54:10 | 87:10 90:5 93:13 |
| 111:16 112:17 115:3 115:18,21 123:12 | 65:16 67:11 68:1 71:11 73:23 76:21 | 77:22 86:10 87:14,14 | 44:13 46:11,12 54:10 58:5,9 80:25 100:1 | 130:2,4 133:6 139:18 |
| | | 94:20 95:16,17 97:2 | 00.0,0 00.20 100.1 | 142:20 |
| L | | | | |

Page 6

hearing 1:2,9 7:24 19:19 73:5 90:16 130:5 133:17 141:3 143:25 hearings 45:12 held 10:10 12:19 14:14 15:4,25 17:1 18:7,14 19:13 64:10 79:22 96:7 103:20 help 10:20 14:22 39:18 44:25 45:4 46:19,20 79:15 114:14 132:2 helpful 44:21 98:4 103:8 145:19 helps 19:24 her 39:2 54:17,20,22,23 56:19 65:17 135:20 hesitate 143:15 high 34:20 50:13,17,20 50:23,24 52:19 73:12 89:20 115:13 higher 11:14 13:6 14:17 52:13 60:13 65:18 81:3 83:23 85:12 highest 60:7 highly 46:15 145:21 him 45:11 46:19 80:13 129:3,4 132:10 himself 129:8 hire 39:18 historical 85:25 history 120:19 hit 76:2 hold 14:19 22:2 62:16 67:15 88:20 HOLDEN 1:24 147:13 holding 7:17 home 97:22 124:10 homemade 24:11 homework 8:23 hook 129:13 hope 6:7 47:1 113:14 123:12,13 133:7,21 135:23 145:18 hoped 125:3 hopefully 10:18 103:11 130:21 hoping 144:24 Horowitz 2:12 horse 77:16 hour 34:5 133:1 140:11 hours 144:6 household 82:25 Huertos 5:18 45:5,22 47:7 135:17 huae 86:23 124:15 126:9 128:17 137:24 human 52:8,11 60:6 Hunter 2:7 6:19 13:3,9 13:14 14:15.23 15:1 17:4 25:9 42:13,15,20 42:22,24 43:5,11,13 43:17,21 46:10 48:20 50:17 51:3 62:17,19 63:6,8,11,19 64:7,9 64:11.16 91:14 102:16 110:6 117:5,6 117:20,23 118:19 119:4 121:13 122:3,9 122:13 134:14,20,21 138:17,18 139:3 143:3,4 Hunter's 125:18,21 137:8 138:24 hurt 36:10

hydrology 89:18 90:8 **IACT** 83:10 idea 45:17,18 47:1 59:3 119:23 125:23 134:11 143:5 ideas 45:5,6,7,8,10 96:14,17 114:15 143:23 identification 111:6 identified 53:4 59:11.12 identify 29:25 32:19 33:7,18,22 34:13 37:14,25 79:7 identity 106:13 imagine 114:9 immediate 53:8 133:3 137:10 immensely 128:8 impaired 12:6,6,12 .105:10 impairment 111:13 impairments 11:17,23 implement 28:12 32:5 45:16,21 46:19 47:2.3 54:2 56:13 60:18 62:8 67:19 71:22 72:16 106:4 110:17 131:20 136:7 implementation 5:9 44:22 45:5 59:1 72:7 92:16 111:7 112:25 119:24 128:17 136:23 implemented 45:23 47:12 129:20 143:14 implementing 26:19 71:22 83:24 107:14 145:15 implements 54:14 60:14 110:22 implication 76:18 important 7:7 12:15 20:2 69:18 71:3 75:5 136:11.14 impression 24:8 81:13 impressive 56:2 improve 9:1 59:21 . 102:7 122:23 123:1 improvement 28:11,21 28:24 29:19 50:15 57:19 62:23 74:2 104:4,23 107:15 111:11 112:4.8 improvements 9:18 76:4 110:23 120:12 138:2 improving 123:3 137:14 inappropriate 35:4 Inc 1:19 46:1 67:1 incentives 45:2 98:24 98.25 include 15:15 23:12 35:4 36:9,11 44:23 60:17,23 68:20 69:22 103:22 104:22 111:6 118:10 119:4 120:23 121:6 138:18 included 15:12 16:6 36:7 38:14 47:18 119:3 121:5 125:11 138:16 includes 15:8,11 17:9 23:3 36:20 44:23 45:5 52:8 59:24 61:11

119:14,17 120:22 121:7,8 123:24 including 33:20 69:25 78:15 100:9 107:14 119:20 inclusion 34:20 99:25 100.5inclusive 22:10 income 82:25 83:23 incomplete 66:1 incorporate 113:23 incorporated 118:8,14 incorporating 117:19 incorrect 38:7 increased 79:3,9 independent 4:7,12 indicate 49:13 111:22 134.7 indicates 28:9 indication 126:17 indicative 86:2 indicator 12:4,9 50:25 75:13 indicators 47:5 49:13 52:12 60:1,11 83:1 104:22 individual 4:24 5:6 14:17 33:13 36:17 58:3,5,10,13 66:14,24 68:15 69:6 70:7 12 17 70:19 71:7 10 18 23 72:1 105:16 106:11 113:3 129:8 individually 37:2 45:11 individuals 34:21 57:21 135:16 industry 31:13 47:3 60:21 61:13 79:10 industry's 60:25 infeasible 26:9 inferring 74:23 infers 123:4 information 7:23 9:24 11:16 17:10 31:4,23 32:14,16,19,24 33:21 37:18 38:24 47:17 50:25 64:20 65:12,14 65:20 66:6,10 75:24 105:14 111:25 130:6 informational 35:25 infrastructure 45:14 initiate 70:17 initiating 71:16 input 41:17 113:15 143:7 inquire 80:11 insert 43:7 118:4 inspect 4:9 inspection 31:1 inspections 45:2 instance 76:11,12 instead 18:20 34:18 70:14 73:14.16 76:13 82:4 87:12,13 92:19 92:20 95:2 114:13,20 119:2 integrative 55:4 intend 77:21 intended 67:14 90:5,5,7 143:12 intending 22:9 intensive 97:22 intent 27:23 37:9,18 38:11 41:8 57:25 65:15,21 66:1,7 69:3

80:22 81:3.16 88:11 88:16 89:12 106:7 114:19 117:8 138:10 intention 103:24 interchangeable 74:9 75:10 interchangeably 49:7 interest 3:11 4:1 9:13 14:9 15:20 86:13 95:10 106:17 124:17 125:19 129:3,23 interested 95:2 102:8 124:22 126:22 140:13 143:19 interesting 58:11 interests 126:12 intermediary 85:2 intermittent 37:20 interpret 79:1 interpretation 39:12 40:375:11 101:2 131:5 interpretations 52:22 interpreted 53:8 interrupt 128:25 interrupted 108:15 intervals 120:4 intrigued 102:8 introduced 55:14 involve 41:23 96:25 involved 18:11 24:24 100:25 106:19 126:12 135:8 141:17 144:2,2 involvement 135:16 involving 110:1 iron 130:10 irreconcilable 142:17 142:22 143:2,6 irrigated 1:11 3:6 88:6 88:21 89:8 117:25 irrigating 88:15,22 irrigation 72:7,18,20 84:12,17 89:17 issue 14:16 18:23 24:23 25:4 31:8.11 33:20.23 34:12,23 50:10 53:18 54:17 72:18,20 78:19 85:17 97:14,14 101:2 116:14 118:25 128:13 129:23 141:17 issues 4:1 9:2,6,14 12:23 17:12 51:7 53:4 54:20 55:14,21 87:11 87:13 94:22,23 97:11 100:17 106:11 116:15 120:6 124:20.21 130:8 135:5 136:5 item 3:5,10 17:22 38:9 52:15 91:14,15 119:17,17 items 10:25 11:19 15:24 37:8 59:10,11 134:6 i.e 110:18 J jar 68:1 JEFFREY 2:5 Jeffries 2:8 15:19 24:7 24:11 25:3,15,17 35:21 36:1 68:8 70:25 74:23 75:7 78:25 80:7 81:6,10 89:25 92:2 102:23 105:22.24

108:4 116:25 118:22

124:6 130:1 132:9,12

139:5 job 56:2 116:25 117:1 Johnston 2:6 8:24 32:9 32:10 33:8,11 34:4 38:23 39:8,23 41:2 42:4,10 51:5,11,15 55:23,24 57:14 63:21 64:4 76:17,21 77:2 87:20,21 88:23,25 89:22,24 90:3,10 91:12,25 93:18 94:3,5 95:19,22 96:4,8,11 101:20,24 102:17,24 103:3,6,9,15,19,21 106:1,3 107:8 108:6,8 108:11,13,22 109:3 109:15,18 110:7,10 110:13 113:25 114:4 114:5,8,12,14 115:7 115:11,16 116:7 117:17 118:7 122:18 124:6,8 125:17 132:4 136:13 138:5,6,20 139:6 140:2 144:8,9 144.18 Johnston's 143:10 joining 135:4 Jordan 2:9 17:20,24 59:6,9,16,18 64:15 84.5.6.9.16.19.25 85:2,6,11,15,20 86:23 93:17,21 99:7,8,18,22 100:4,10,13,17,23 117:22 122:15,16 123:18,21 125:14 126:2 136:11 139:2 141:14,16 judgment 12:8 jump 12:2 14:11 35:1 38:3 51:18 52:25 115:23 iust 3:24 6:21,25 8:20 9:13 10:5,9,11 12:2 13:1,3,4 14:10,11,21 16:14,15 17:4,14 18:8 18:22,22 19:1,18 20:4 20:14,16 21:6 22:9,21 22:25 23:2,2,6,21 24:2.19.21 26:13 27:16 28:1,4,23 29:21 30:5 32:10 33:5,8 35:18,24 37:5,8,23 38:9,10,20,24 39:11 41:14 45:7,10,18 46:8 47:19 50:16 23 51:5 51:24 52:19 55:9.16 55:19,24 56:19 57:17 58:19 62:1 63:2 64:16 67:22 68:10 72:11 75:5 76:3 77:16 78:1 79:13 80:25 82:10,18 84:11.20 85:2 87:5.14 88:17,25 89:15 90:18 91:2 92:5 95:15 96:20 99:13 101:21 103:3,8 103:13,24 105:18 107:25 108:2 114:16 114:17 115:3 118:13 118:17 121:15 122:23 123:1,5,23 125:9 126:4 127:10 128:25 129:12 130:12 132:8 137:8 139:18 141:3 141:18 142:16.18 144:18 145:2,12,17

ATKINSON-BAKER, INC., COURT REPORTERS

| Page | 7 |
|------|---|
|------|---|

| 145:22 | 59:4 60:8,14,23 74:24 | 50:17,18,23,24 81:4 | looking 4:20 7:19 13:18 | March 1:4 3:2 11:12 |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| justice 34:21,25 112:15 | 79:20 81:17 82:1,8,23 | 123:5 | 39:14 82:25 95:7 | 44:2 70:14 71:1,10,19 |
| 126:12 133:11,20 | 87:4,5 90:8 92:23 | leveraging 45:3 | 96:13 106:25 116:10 | 72:2,491:5 147:8 |
| 134:11 | 94:9,18 95:6 99:23 | liability 80:18 106:10 | 125:23 128:2 130:9 | Marina 2:7 |
| justification 11:3 15:13 | 101:17,25 102:1,13 | lie 115:15 | 130:21 137:12,15 | marine 136:4 |
| 21:17 26:14 justify 21:9 34:1 | 103:21 104:14,17 107:11,14 108:2 | life 16:9 like 6:207:13,14 17:22 | 138:3 142:3 looks 29:7 40:14,14 | markups 10:23 marsh 40:18 |
| Justify 21.9 34.1 | 109:23 110:11 114:25 | 20:1 21:17,25 22:18 | 44:18 70:23 | match 19:8 |
| К | 117:9,12 118:3,4,4,8 | 25:6 28:3,18 29:7,21 | Lopez 45:24 47:9 | materials 20:10 |
| keen 129:23 | 124:11 | 35:18 40:15 41:23 | Los 2:7 5:18 45:5,22 | matter 8:6 23:5 87:24 |
| keep 21:5 32:20 34:13 | large 18:10 116:9 | 44:18 51:1 55:16,16 | 47:7 135:17 | 95:12 107:4 119:18 |
| 37:6 125:23 | last 3:17 8:21 10:6 18:12 35:12 39:6 | 67:3 69:2 70:13,23 74:7 78:8,9 82:12,24 | losing 24:20,21 lost 91:22 142:6 | 123:7 129:15 maximize 105:8 |
| keeps 33:1 127:5 | 45:21 51:12 52:15,17 | 83:25 85:15,20 88:1 | lot 7:5,5 12:3 16:21 | maximum 124:22 |
| kept 30:22,22 35:21,22 key 47:5 59:2 60:1 | 59:9 68:18 78:3 94:8 | 88:16 89:15 99:6 | 21:23 27:25 45:20 | may 5:6,6,77:16,18 |
| 74:12 | 97:12,17 101:1 | 101:18 106:14 113:22 | 62:21 90:16 98:18 | 13:18 20:12 24:11,25 |
| kick 70:11 95:3 | 114:17 117:6 134:23 | 115:22 116:8 117:2 | 116:22 120:6 126:18 | 24:25 38:7 40:8 41:4 |
| kidding 8:20 | 140:6 142:20,21 143:24 | 117:12,14 119:25 125:2 128:8,9 130:5 | 136:9 140:16 143:23 lots 20:3 21:25 | 41:5 44:2 47:3 50:2 55:8 68:20 78:7,12 |
| kill 22:1 47:1 kind 24:22 36:15,18 | late 59:23 124:18 | 130:22 131:7,11,11 | loud 122:6 | 88:8 89:2 90:17 91:22 |
| 46:14,22 47:17,17 | 140:11 | 132:20 134:11 135:16 | loudly 8:15 | 92:15,17,19,20 93:3,4 |
| 49:4 62:25 80:18 | later 29:13,14 36:19 | 135:19 141:22 142:8 | low 115:13 | 96:15 97:25 104:12 |
| 93:25 95:8 98:11,20 | 41:19 133:18 134:4 | 142:15,19,24 | lower 84:1 110:25 | 104:18 105:2 106:3,5 |
| 98:23 101:21 125:6 | 134:10 139:20 145:18 latest 79:5 | likely 115:25 116:2 limbo 145:17 | lowest 11:13 LUIS 1:3 3:1 | 107:3 108:6,16 109:18 110:16,24 |
| 127:6 128:22 131:5 131:14,15 132:20 | launch 14:21 | limit 82:5 | | 112:2,23 116:16 |
| 131:14,15 132:20 | law 32:20 33:19,20 34:6 | limited 14:7 68:21 78:15 | M | 121:23 128:16 140:7 |
| kinds 23:11,22,22 31:24 | 35:3 48:5 53:16 54:14 | 78:21 82:7 83:17,18 | M 2:8 | 141:8 |
| 35:19 107:13 116:22 | 54:25 58:4,4,6 60:15 | 83:20 116:13,20 | made 5:11 16:20 30:23 | maybe 4:5 14:19 19:15 |
| knew 11:18,21 74:19,20 | 61:18 83:18 97:20 100:25 101:9 | limits 136:22 line 85:23,25 89:3 | 31:4 35:12,14,15 54:6 | 42:5 48:19 49:7,8 75:12 94:4 106:24 |
| knock 45:18 | laws 32:5 147:5 | 114:18 | 55:6 58:25 69:9 75:25 | 116:13 134:7 140:11 |
| know 4:15,20 6:21 14:4 21:11 23:23 24:20 | lay 81:25 124:11 | lines 101:1 132:6 | 95:24 97:1 98:22 121:17 122:19 125:3 | McCann 2:12 8:17,18 |
| 25:10 27:17 28:3 30:9 | lead 2:11 93:18 | link 41:8 | 129:18 131:3 133:15 | 10:11,17 25:8 43:4,6 |
| 33:5,10 34:4 39:1,21 | leadership 135:7 | Lisa 2:12 8:17 50:16 | main 6:15 26:15 125:10 | 43:9 44:9 48:14,19,23 |
| 40:19 43:3 46:7 47:4 | leads 87:3 leaning 130:7 | list 37:8 51:6,6,12 56:15 56:25 62:13 97:9 | 125:11 142:6 | 49:6,20 50:7,21 63:4 63:7,10,18,20 75:12 |
| 48:8 50:19 52:19,25 | learn 145:19 | 100:4,9 101:1,15 | maintain 105:16 | 121:1,20 124:5 |
| 53:2 54:18,21 55:25 56:2 63:2,6 74:21 | least 50:3 75:9 95:7 | 121:17 126:22 138:19 | major 11:19 make 5:21 7:21 8:19 9:3 | McChesney 2:8 16:18 |
| 79:13 80:24 89:19 | 106:8 128:21 135:12 | 142:9,23,24,25 | 9:15 16:22,24 17:14 | 17:6 19:18 20:1 22:21 |
| 101:6 113:11 117:10 | 143:17 | listed 98:7,8 118:2 | 20:4 21:4,6 25:1,14 | 23:20 27:15,20 29:7 |
| 119:7 124:9 126:4,20 | leave 6:15 72:12,14 81:12 131:8 145:15 | 141:23 liter 16:8 | 26:13 29:24 36:8 48:9 | 29:10,22 30:3,10 31:15 32:18 33:5,10 |
| 127:7 128:9,19 130:11,22 131:16 | leaving 23:18 31:9 | little 9:23 10:17 24:7 | 53:24 55:5 58:24 60:22 66:3 73:8 77:23 | 33:17 34:8 35:5,14,16 |
| 132:9 133:1 134:16 | led 135:7 | 25:17 30:2 44:5,19 | 82:18 86:6 91:2 92:4 | 35:18,24 36:14 40:19 |
| 136:9 137:10,17,19 | left 59:9 65:16 134:8 | 56:3 58:11 63:8 91:21 | 92:5 93:2 94:15,16 | 42:1 43:8,10,12,15,19 |
| 140:4,18 142:9,19,24 | left-hand 65:3 | 94:14 123:6 126:17 | 97:16 103:7 112:18 | 43:25 48:22 52:2 53:2 |
| Knowing 117:12 | legal 5:1,1 6:10,14 9:1,2 9:25 22:7,14 51:6,19 | 130:20 load 104:23 111:10 | 113:6,22 117:20 | 55:12 57:1,18 65:8 75:17 76:7,14,20 77:1 |
| known 12:10 knows 31:10,10 82:13 | 51:20,23,25 52:3,16 | loading 12:14 13:6 46:3 | 120:21 121:6,15,24 123:23 129:19 130:6 | 77:5 83:4,10,16 84:3 |
| 115:20 | 52:23 55:21 56:15,18 | 60:5,11 73:12 122:20 | 130:17 132:15 133:10 | 90:20 91:3,10 92:3,9 |
| | 57:6 59:10,22 61:23 | local 69:12 81:1 88:7 | 138:3,21 142:4,5,7,8 | 92:19,23 93:6,16 |
| L | 62:2,7 82:19 83:9 87:23 94:23 96:16 | 104:4 located 38:15 52:10 | 144:21 | 117:11 118:3,17,20 118:23 119:6,10,19 |
| L 1:24 147:13 | 97:18 101:2 124:21 | location 36:11 37:19 | makes 21:11 28:25 | 120:21 121:3,12,17 |
| lab 67:4 68:1 | 144:22 | 106:13 | 33:24 68:9 110:2 140:16,25 | 123:23 124:3 125:9 |
| label 68:2 labeled 76:18,22,22 | legality 130:8 | locations 38:14 | making 3:25 31:12 | 125:15,22 128:25 |
| labeling 128:1 | legally 101:11 | lodged 6:21 | 43:25 50:14 98:19 | 129:2,7,12,16 139:4 |
| labor 97:21 | less 10:18 107:4 lesser 13:1 | logging 30:1 logistics 119:13 | 99:1 103:2 127:16 | 139:23 142:3,13 144:16 145:2,11 |
| labor-intensive 98:5 | lesson 67:11 | long 48:1,13 67:18 68:4 | 128:18,19,20 | McChesney's 118:11 |
| lacks 57:14 | let 24:19 49:20 51:15 | 68:22 77:22 112:3 | management 5:20 49:24 54:2,5 55:4 | mean 4:23 13:11 17:21 |
| lake 40:3 Landowners 88:6 89:7 | 56:4,9 62:1 63:8 | 134:13 141:3 | 72:8,19,21 84:12,17 | 47:18 50:17,20 66:3 |
| lands 1:11 88:6,21 89:8 | 67:22 87:12,14 88:25 | longer 77:17 104:10 | 92:16 110:18 112:24 | 70:23 77:6 83:17 |
| 117:25 | 99:18 106:7 107:8 115:8,14 125:15 | long-term 111:17 look 12:15 14:5 17:19 | 113:3 120:9 128:24 | 84:13 88:22 90:21 93:21 124:25 128:7 |
| language 16:6 20:13 | 126:4 144:18 | 20:7 28:5 32:7 38:19 | manager 8:18 Manager/Aquatic 2:12 | means 7:11 40:2 53:19 |
| 23:24 24:1 25:23 | letter 79:20 | 40:20,25 47:11 48:17 | mandated 127:19 | 54:2 73:19 74:25 |
| 26:12 27:6,8 28:15,16 30:21,25 35:21 36:6,7 | letters 79:19 | 55:11,12 76:3 82:11 | many 16:24 33:1 61:9 | 80:18 82:21 |
| 36:21 41:25 42:16,18 | lettuce 12:19 | 87:3 94:20 96:6 97:18 | 61:10 81:11,18 127:4 | meant 93:24 115:4 |
| 44:15,16 47:6,20 | let's 10:9 11:8 17:2 18:15 75:2 91:1 96:2 | 100:24,25,25 113:21 115:22 120:8 125:15 | 133:15 | measure 49:23 74:3 measures 28:13 |
| 49:25 50:21 52:7,15 | 97:7,7 107:23 109:22 | 131:15,25 136:19 | map 38:14,15,19,25 | measuring 111:25 |
| 53:13,13,19 54:7,9 | 125:24 129:22 | 138:11 140:12 | 41:5 Marc 135:17 | mechanism 79:13 |
| 55:20 58:18,20,22 | level 30:4 39:11 50:13 | looked 125:9 | | media 7:6 |
| | 1 | 1 | I | 1 |

Page 8

median 82:25 medium 115:13 meet 6:9,13 52:16 54:3 59:21 61:7,18 74:14 77:3,7,18 85:24 86:21 95:18 111:19 meeting 92:17,22 93:12 128:16 142:6 meetings 131:7 meets 9:1 68:23 101:9 member 41:20 42:8 64:22 66:16 91:8 132:18 133:11,21 members 4:5 17:12 19:7 52:18 93:22,23 94:7 112:17 135:4 136:18 memory 46:9 mentally 124:25 mention 90:13 mentioned 7:16 9:15 34:25 59:4 128:14 129:4 141:10 142:16 merely 40:1 merit 101:18 131:12 message 133:6 met 75:2 methods 67:8,9,19 111:6,25 mic 50:16 Michael 2:6,9,12 16:16 48:11 57:13 58:16 62:12,22 70:6 middle 65:3 midnight 56:1 133:22 might 14:21 21:20 24:3 25:10 34:7 36:25 67:10,11 82:16 83:24 98:4 113:21 132:21 142:16 145:16 Mike 102:4 105:23 109:12 129:21 130:9 milestone 48:16 49:9 73:7,9,16 74:2 75:16 75:24 77:13,13,15 85:3 milestones 47:24 49:3 49:5,6,16 60:3 73:14 73:14 74:1,6,8,14,20 74:24 75:3,10 76:13 76:22 111:2,21 milestones/targets 49:18 milligram 16:8 mind 37:6 40:3,14 82:19 117:14 134:10 minds 40:13 mindset 40:25 mine 92:3,10 minimize 27:7,16 64:2 minimizing 27:16 minimum 112.17 minor 88:1 minute 3:14 44:14 88:5 minutes 3:16,17 36:4 61:3 91:11 93:9 142.18 missed 52:4 90:3 missing 47:5 mistake 35:11 misused 123:3 mixed 130:1 mode 136.21 modification 15:22 modify 94:24 144:12

modifying 142:1 moment 12:22 37:11 42:9 momentum 122:16 money 83:25 Monica 2:7 14:18 80:1 monitor 119:24 monitoring 5:4,5,6,8,11 36:7,18,22 37:3,14,15 42:5 62:24 63:5,14,15 63:22,25 64:2,3,5,11 66:25 67:2 68:15,20 68:23 69:6,19,22 70:1 70:7,18,18,20 71:19 71:24 72:1 75:19 77:23 78:18 94:12 102:20 103:23 104:2 104:9,13,20,21,24 105:2,4,6,7,16 106:4 106:9,15,21 107:18 107:19,25 110:19,24 111:24,25 112:1,3,5 113:23 122:7,10 131:11 132:25 monitors 131:17 monochrome 103:12 months 70:15 119:25 120:7.7.7 more 6:12 19:22 23:19 32:1 35:18 36:16.23 40.8.10 41.9 44.16.18 44:19,19 46:4 47:3 56:24 62:21 66:9 70:10 75:4 76:3 83:22 86:6 87:4,6 90:11 94:14 97:21 102:19 103:7 105:18 115:4 116:13 117:3 118:17 120:10 121:11 123:14 125:15 133:8,8,16,16 135:8,14 137:5 140:16 145:19 morning 10:7 52:17 133.9 most 8:25 20:15 42:19 52:10 59:21 61:14 69:20,21 80:3 95:23 115:25 133:3 139:18 mostly 90:15 motion 117:3,15,18,21 118:9 119:23 120:20 120:21 122:9 123:17 125:3,6,10,11,12,18 125:21,25 129:22 130:12 133:23 134:13 134:14,21 136:18 137:8 138:16,20,24 138:25 139:10,11,16 139:17 140:2,4,5,6 141:17,19 142:4,5,5,6 142:7,7,8,8,10,10,25 144:19 145:14.25 move 28:7 72:19,22 100:24 117:14,23 124:12 131:9 133:4 moved 35:12 76:21 77:2 110:25 119:1,7 128:7 133:13 moves 116:21 131:4 moving 41:14,21 73:16 73:22 98:11 101:8 135:21 140:24 moving-forward 102:3 MRP 15:23 36:16,19,20 36:23 37:5 67:17

76:11 78:2 107:24 121:2 123:24 MRPs 36:20 107:16 123:25 much 11:20 12:21,21 16:20 27:1 36:16.23 44:7 50:14 56:21 74:12 95:10 113:24 116:13 130:11 146:4 multiple 116:11,11 mumbling 22:4 Municipal 2:7 must 5:5,8,9,11 26:5,23 27:4 28:12 30:22,23 60:15 69:22 73:12,14 76:25 85:24,24 88:9 88:15 89:11 104:21 104:24 111:5,8,12,14 111:18,21 112:1,5,17 115:1 mutual 106:17 myself 3:9 67:25 114:8 124:8 141:11 M-c-C-a-n-n 8:18 Ν N 2:1 39:5,7 name 13:22,24 46:8 narrative 16:5 nation 83:5 near-term 133:3 necessarily 11:6 39:9 92:21 106:17 necessary 16:8 25:22 27:7,12 28:10,15,21 36:8 38:1,13 46:21 48:10 55:20 67:6 78:16 113:4 121:23 necessitate 104:9 need 4:2 7:20 9:2 16:22 20:2 21:23 27:19 29:5 37:4 38:6 48:5,6,8 49:7 56:10.14.20 57:10 60:6,10,17 64:16 66:17 75:12 76:3 79:8,21 88:18 91:24,25 92:4 97:13 97:13,17,19 98:6 101:6,21 102:5,5,6 103:7 106:15,18,24 106:24 110:5 119:11 124:18 129:17 132:1 132:2 133:22 137:2 139:22 143:5.7.8 needed 23:12 117:4 135:8 needing 30:11 needs 19:20 55:10,10 62:3 83:2,3 102:6 126:20 negotiate 134:9 Neither 8:2 Nelson 136:12 never 92:15,17,19,20 93:3,4 126:12 129:9 new 42:17 43:9.12.16 43:17,20 44:4,11,15 44:16 54:4 55:14 58:18,18 62:20 105:8 107:20 108:3 109:22 109:23 110:11,13 111:18 114:24.24 117:8 126:14 133:4 143:17

newer 57:19 58:12 next 9:9 15:18 20:24,25 21:1 25:7,20 27:21,22 28:934:1636:3,5 41:12 52:6 66:13 70:5 71:16 72:17 73:5.21 77:22 86:2 87:3 97:8 104:15 105:19 109:5 143:17 144:6 nice 21:9 34:5 74:19,21 night 8:21 10:6 35:12 51:13 52:17 142:20 142.21 nitrate 16:8 60:11 73:12 84:10 122:20 126:16 nitrates 115:13 116:5 nitrate-loading 52:12 nitrogen 12:14 13:6 73:9,13,22 76:15 nobody 86:25 89:20 Nods 43:5 NOI 37:14 65:2,2 Non 53:25 92:23,25 118:5,12,20 none 55:25 94:7 nonnegotiable 134:6 142:20 nonpoint 54:1 55:3 non-English 78:7 79:2,4 81:18 non-negotiability 134:5 non-substantive 30:10 normal 32:4 normally 29:17 north 79:24 106:22 noses 125:1 126:2 notation 72:23 note 20:16 29:23 72:24 122:19 noted 118:3,7,11 notes 10:4,6,12,13,15 38:16 nothing 8:4 49:22 55:5 notice 35:19 37:9,18 38:11 41:8 57:25 64:25 65:15,21 66:1,7 80:21 81:16 88:11,16 89:12 138:10 141:19 noticed 141:18.21 145:7 noticing 141:17 November 11:11 NPS 92:12 112:24 NRCS 112:13 114:19 nuisance 53:11 number 3:5 17:7 30:18 63:12 64:7,8,12 91:14 91:15 92:11 118:1,24 119:2,7,8 122:10 123.24.25 numbered 21:2 numbers 15:16 25:8,9 25:12 51:1 79:22 121:18 124:1,5 numeric 50:573:19 numerous 53:22,23 nutrient 72:7 73:6 75:15 nutrients 13:1 84:12 111:17 115:10,19,21 116:3 0 **OBISPO** 1:3 3:1 object 40:15

objected 7:2 objection 16:6 138:14 objections 6:21 objective 16:5 obligated 32:20 obstructive 97:11 obtain 57:25 88:6,13 89:8 obvious 7:5 39:8 obviously 3:24 4:25 31:8 86:24 occurred 19:19 136:12 136:14 occurring 144:6 October 70:19,21 71:20 72:3,10,22,23 73:11 108:5 off 10:6,10 14:14 15:4 15:25 17:1 18:7,14 19:13 64:10 96:7 103:20 129:13 146:5 offer 67:22 101:4 126:24 141:1 offered 101:18 132:8 144:21 Officer 2:9 13:17 32:3 61:6 65:13 66:2,8 87:18 88:19 94:8,15 95:3 102:2 104:19 105:3 108:21 23 24 109:4.8.9.14.16.20 110:3,4,21,22,23 112:19,19,22 113:10 113:16 130:16 Officer/Ombudsman 2.12 official 40:10 oh 41:25 69:10 71:2 89:22 133:13 okay 8:8,15 13:14 14:25 15:18 16:1 17:24 18:13,15 19:10 20:23 25:6 27:21 28:6 29:10 29:15,17 30:19,20 31:7 33:4 34:15 36:2 40:22 42:2 43:21,22 44:5 51:3,15,18 52:4 55:17,22 57:13 61:25 62:1.6.7.10.19 63:7 63:10,20 64:9,15 67:21 68:3,11 74:17 76:3 77:20 82:14 83:22 84:8 85:22 87:9 87:20 89:24 90:10 92:7 93:11 95:21 100:15 116:24 117:22 119:8,9 121:1,19 123:21 124:3 129:11 134:19 137:22 140:3 143:4 145:24 once 29:18 32:14 34:11 one 4:17 5:4 6:20 11:4 12:14 13:9,10,11,15 14:3 16:2,8 17:7 18:24 22:2 26:15 27:2 27:21,22 29:8 31:12 31:25 32:1,2 37:4,12 37:13 39:6 41:6 47:4 48:1 53:6 55:16.21 57:1 61:2 62:16 64:25 65:1,11,15 66:13 68:13 70:5,14,22 71:11.16 72:14.17.21 73:6 76:11 78:4 80:10 80:25 88:4 90:6,7,11

ATKINSON-BAKER, INC., COURT REPORTERS

path 95:16 90:21 91:4,18 92:2 118:1,6,6,8,24,24 ovsters 67:23 please 22:5 94:12,20 96:24 97:6 119:2,6,24 121:22,24 **o0o** 146:9 patiently 8:21 plus 49:9 98:13 97:21,22 101:22 122:8 124:13 130:17 pay 56:19 point 14:22 20:18 22:21 106:8 112:5,13,13,14 130:17,24 131:8 Peechee 91:21 29:12 33:11,12 47:4 Ρ 112:14,16 114:16 134:24 140:18 141:24 peers 101:5 47:19,21 53:25 56:15 **P** 2:1,1 penalty 147:1,5 116:1,20 118:17 56:15 57:14 65:25 143:6 144:21 page 2:19 15:5,16,18,19 Orders 48:1 53:14 61:9 pending 92:8 129:15 122:6,22,25 123:3,23 82:9 85:21 86:4,4 15:19 17:2,19 21:7 133:23 144:24 63:14 118:25 130:19 people 16:18 24:13 92:24 93:1,13,14,24 29:8 30:16,19 34:16 ones 15:22 24:11 27:24 Order's 105:17 35:19 62:9 68:5 83:25 94:4,21,22,22 97:25 36:5 41:24 43:6,14 27:25 28:1,4 29:25 organic 20:9,10 23:25 84:1 86:15,19 102:15 103:9 109:23 113:5 59:9,12,13 64:1,3,4,7 48:17 69:25 131:17 organization 45:15,15 110:8 126:19 131:13 115:24 118:5,12,20 64:13,23,24,25 65:3 per 16:8 39:13 44:13 131:24 132:23 46:8 119:16,22 123:8 69:10,11 88:4 91:16 only 4:22 7:4 19:14 origin 83:6 129:24 128:10 134:25 135:21 67:7 91:20 92:11,12 28:23 29:18 33:23 original 69:3 90:14 percent 50:3 83:11,24 136:10 137:20 141:16 102:21,22 107:10,21 143:20 144:13,14 34:11 63:11,16 75:13 originally 77:6 131:3 83:25 107:22 119:6 138:8 76:7,15,16 77:12 85:6 **Osos** 2:7 percentage 83:19 pointing 136:11 pages 7:9 18:17 41:22 64:19 points 6:15 97:12 112:1 85:8 98:20 125:17 other 4:22 9:12.14 10:9 perennial 37:20 127:21 128:12 129:7 131:12 140:10,25 perfect 82:14 116:2 perfectly 101:24 12:9,16,23 15:24 23:8 26:17 28:17.22 29:20 PANEL 1:2 143.12 polarized 113:12 papers 77:17 perhaps 19:15 119:25 policies 60:15 144:20 31:13.13 34:22 37:4 paragraph 29:8 30:18 open 117:8 130:17 39:14,17 41:7,22 125:4 policy 6:11 9:2 18:19 34:16 36:5 41:23 opened 135:9 48:17 49:21 50:9 period 3:14 7:1 136:15 51:6 52:3 53:25 54:1 64:13,25 65:1,3 68:18 openings 135:13 52:24 53:14,14 55:14 perjury 147:1,5 56:16,17 59:11 74:21 88:4,5 102:21,22 permit 23:8 29:6 88:7 74:22 87:23 92:12,24 open-ended 72:12.14 56.8 57.1 58.15 59.10 105:19 114:17 138:8 operation 11:7 13:5 60:20 61:25 62:13 88.14 89.8 111.16 93.1 94.22 96.16 Paragraphs 54:17 14:17 66:21 68:22 69:9,24 115:3,7 118:14 97:11 100:24 101:9 pardon 118:6 operations 13:19 52:13 69:24 75:4 76:8 77:7 126:13 136:7 138:9 112:24 118:5,12,21 parenthetical 114:18 52:13 78:23 82:15 83:1 87:1 143:14 118:21 124:20 144:22 parking 136:9 operators 88:6 89:7 87:8,9,10,11 94:7,13 permitted 28:17,22 polling 95:9 parliamentary 125:5 opinion 12:8 99:11 99:22 100:5 104:7 29:20 pollutant 111:10 part 4:7 8:5 18:10,10,12 person 33:6 57:23 pollutants 111:9 127:7 137:13 105.9.12 106.11 20:9,15 29:2 35:8,9 opinions 86:25 107:7 111:4 114:9 130:5 pollution 47:5 49:13,23 35:10 36:4 37:10 opportunities 78:16,24 116:1 121:21 135:3,9 personal 137:13 50:14 55:3 60:1,5 41:14 42:1,2,6,13,14 82:17 140:20 145:6 personally 133:22 62:9 69:20 104:23 42:15,16,17,25 43:9 opportunity 6:25 7:3 8:12 10:2 19:22 73:2 PERSONS 2:11 pond 40:3 others 45:3 107:9 43:12,14,14,16,17,23 117:15 120:2 134:7 perspective 31:10 pop 81:9,10 43:24 44:6,7,13 48:20 86:15 117:8 130:15 52:20 120:5,13 pops 41:10 145:5 48:21,23,24 49:21 132:12 136:25 otherwise 23:7 76:12 134:12 137:13 portion 35:6 53:24 57:19 58:18.21 opposed 4:17 74:14 77:14 pesticide 11:19 13:5 posed 138:7 62:21 74:18 76:17 139:9 ourselves 7:21,21 48:7 22:10,19,24 24:17 posing 95:13 84:20 98:9 99:6 100:2 opposing 61:23 62:2,6 95:9 88:7,14 89:8 127:23 positions 144:1 113:20,22 115:9,10 opposite 133:21 positive 73:19 136:16 out 7:6.13 14:5 16:5.16 117:8,18 118:24 138:9 option 37:10 60:18 possibility 66:4 18:22 19:6 20:11,13 pesticides 11:20 12:7 119:2 120:23 122:1 possible 21:19 100:5 61:20 132:8.24 21:18 23:18 32:12 12:12 20:10,12,14 122:21 126:13 133:1 133:18.23 134:3 33:8 38:25 40:24 21:13,13,14,19,22 124:23 137:18 139:19 140:21 144:20 47:19 48:16 49:17 22:7,14 23:2,3,13,25 possibly 46:18 137:10 participant 110:21 options 17:15 60:20 53:21 62:25 67:25 potential 12:20 13:6 24:1,4,8,10,13,24 participant's 111:6 order 4:10 5:21 6:3 8:11 68:2 69:14,15 73:1 128:2 44:17 102:8 105:5 participate 7:23 97:4 8:25 9:9 11:25 14:4 77.8 80.15 82.11 pests 21:24 22:1,12 106:10,25 132:25 105:15 129:15 143:20 15:11,12,22 17:17,18 86:24 88:2 90:8 95:11 photo 75:19 135:13,16 142:20 participating 3:10 50:3 17:22 18:21 19:8 20:7 96:14 101:7,25 102:5 phrase 49:21 122:24 potentially 133:18 69:13 107:12 108:17 pounding 131:25 PowerPoint 10:14 102:13 103:9 114:15 20:15 21:4 23:16 phrases 123:4 145:8 26:24 31:23,24 33:5 114:20 115:24 118:13 pick 7:12 participation 44:12 34:24 35:8,9,9,9,13 119:16,22 121:5 picture 106:15,23 43:10 116:17 piece 16:14 89:16 practical 26:25 28:13 36:9 40:17.20 41:1.16 122.6 124.11 130.10 particular 14:16 22:22 42:19 43:1,4,8 44:22 131:22 132:7 135:1 102:18 126:23,23 144:25 24:15 58:20 85:23 44:22,23,24,24 47:22 136:11 138:22 139:13 pieces 92:6 94:9 102:18 practically 128:10 101:5 47:24,25 48:2,4,6,8 139:14 140:23 141:12 pipes 145:17 practice 47:660:2 parts 68:17 48:10,25 49:22,25 141:16 143:13 144:15 place 27:2,4 37:13 82:25 92:16 112:24 party 4:12 44:1,12,13 50:22 52:14 53:7.13 outcome 111:8 63:11.16 65:13 66:5 practices 5:20 49:24 57:20 58:5,9,25 61:5 75:13 79:14 85:16 51:2 54:2,5 55:4 53:23,24 54:6,7,8,15 outreach 45:1 79:4 61:14.17 63:1.12.13 outside 45:12 48:24 55:5.15 57:9.9 58:22 98:24 135:12 140:18 105:8 110:18 112:12 63:17 66:23 67:18.20 59:14,21,24 60:4,8,17 123:2 144:4 113:3 120:10 137:21 70:8 73:3 94:14 95:5 60:17,22 61:1,4,8,15 outstanding 46:16,18 placed 65:18,20 preceding 121:24 122:1 97:3 104:6,17 108:17 61:19 63:16,18 73:25 over 7:8 8:19 29:8,21,21 places 55:17 preclude 24:4 31:22 109:7,24,25 110:17 74:24 76:10 78:10,13 61:10,10,21 65:16 plain 37:1,6 precluded 129:3 110:22 112:23 113:4 78:17 80:18 86:2.14 90:18 94:8 120:17.17 plan 4:8,8,10 31:14 precondition 88:24 party's 87:2 prefer 92:21 95:16 86:20 88:4,12 94:24 127:15 143:24 144:4 33:11 70:13 71:8,10 pass 8:25 14:4 96:24 95:12 96:23 97:20 overall 44:21 71:15 72:2,8,10,16,19 preference 81:17 141:19 144:19 98:22,24 99:5,11,13 overly 46:25 47:19 72:21 84:15,17,23,24 preferred 82:8 132:20 passed 19:6 140:1,6 85:5 89:17 104:14 prepare 10:2 99:15 100:2,7,11,19 oversee 118:15 passing 124:12 prepared 9:8 89:17 91:5 101:9 102:5,7,21,23 own 7:22 57:6,10,12 132:21 133:1,7 past 34:4 61:10,21 97:2 Planning 2:13 102:24 103:1 106:7 124:18 143:21 95:23 134:14,21 107.21107:12 108:17 110:20 137:12 plans 30:22 57:4 presence 37:19 38:21 patently 144:23 113:23 116:14,15 ownership 132:20 plats 5:18 present 9:9

ATKINSON-BAKER, INC., COURT REPORTERS

Page 10

| presentation 9:22 10:5 | 112:4,7,10,18,20,20 | public 2:7 5:12,23,25 | quote 22:24 25:23 | 54:13 58:17,19,20 |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| 10:25 11:9 15:21 | 113:1 116:13,20 | 8:22 19:18,21,25 20:2 | 92:25 118:21 | 87:15,19,22 94:1 97:1 |
| 46:16 56:5,10 75:8 95:15 | projects 46:19 107:15 | 32:25 33:24 48:7 96:21 99:20 120:17 | | 100:2 101:19 110:2 117:19 138:12 140:1 |
| presentations 121:4,8 | 110:18,23 111:4,9,14 115:25 116:1,22 | 127:6,14,18,18 130:5 | R | recommendations |
| 121:18 136:20 | promote 60:24 61:4 | 137:9,22 144:12 | R 2:1 race 83:5 | 93:16 94:16 112:18 |
| presented 17:11 21:3 | 86:14 | publically 32:15 141:21 | raised 9:6 54:20 89:13 | 112:21 |
| 48:1 94:21 97:3 130:3 | promoting 86:13 | pull 11:8,8 | 89:15 124:20,21 | recommended 18:18 |
| presenting 45:19 56:6 Preservation 45:25 | prompted 120:9 proper 67:7 | purely 45:17 purpose 23:5 25:1,24 | raising 50:9 97:10 | 30:24 90:14 recommending 18:24 |
| 47:11 67:1 | properly 129:20 | 53:24 68:24 69:5 | 106:14 ranch 31:1 65:13 66:5 | 18:25 21:13 26:4 43:7 |
| press 7:5 | property 34:20 37:25 | 74:17 111:8,23 | 83:23 | 62:14 72:6 122:7 |
| presumably 87:21 | 38:20 39:16,16 | 124:10 143:16 | ranchers 83:12,17,19 | reconcilable 141:6 |
| pretty 4:2 31:11 34:12 | proposal 4:5,20 44:1 | purposes 3:21 28:11,21 | 83:21 | reconcile 127:3 |
| 44:6 88:3 116:4,5 131:22 | 45:22,22 53:5 54:17 54:22,23 57:2,3 70:2 | 29:18 68:22 put 4:17 5:18 10:4,12 | ratcheting 123:5 | reconsider 142:5,8 144:7,20 |
| prevent 53:11 | 70:4 97:16,16,19 | 26:12 36:18 41:5 | rather 34:17 103:10 123:1 145:4 | reconsideration 140:2 |
| previous 21:10 58:7,23 | 98:12,15,19 99:14,25 | 45:19 60:7 62:13 | ratio 73:9,13,15,23 | 140:5 |
| 59:2 70:14,20 71:19 | 111:8 113:6,18 | 74:16 87:1 95:19 96:2 | 75:15 | reconsidered 25:5 |
| 72:10,23 98:8 principal 94:10 | 116:16,17 119:3 124:19 125:20 130:7 | 96:4,5 101:24 102:12 102:16 109:11 113:21 | rationale 15:12,14 35:2 | record 10:10 14:14 15:4 15:25 17:1 18:7,14 |
| printed 88:3 118:12 | 132:19 134:4 135:21 | 117:3 124:14,16 | ratios 73:6 RCD 81:1 112:13 | 19:13 33:24 64:10 |
| printer 103:12 | 138:22 139:19,21,21 | 126:9 | 114:20 | 96:7 103:20 118:16 |
| prior 59:13 135:4 | 140:15,16,20,22,23 | puts 62:21 122:25 | reactionary 122:24 | 119:18 121:6,7,15,20 |
| prioritization 47:23 51:20 60:3 | 144:12 145:4 proposals 94:15,17 | 131:13 p.m 3:2 146:6 | read 8:1 10:5,8 28:7 | 121:22,24,25 122:1 146:5 |
| prioritize 14:7 38:1,22 | 99:20 109:25 111:18 | Pill 0.2 140.0 | 30:8 34:18,18 49:20 89:7 101:7 103:6 | Recreation 2:9 |
| 78:8,14,22 81:4 | 111:21 112:10,18 | Q | 110:5,7 127:11 | recuse 3:9 |
| prioritized 82:18 | 113:8 | Quail 45:25 | readable 103:11 | red 20:9 103:10 |
| priority 60:7 135:2 private 32:25 | propose 95:6 116:22 117:12 125:5 | qualifications 67:6 | reading 142:11 | redacted 32:23 reduce 36:10 46:3 |
| probably 26:11 86:7 | proposed 3:5 9:3,5,11 | qualified 66:22,23 67:9 | reads 88:5 92:16 110:16 | 86:11 115:5.5 |
| 120:4,8 123:3 132:6 | 10:13 11:12 16:17 | 67:12,13,20 68:7 Qualifying 68:19 | ready 17:25 136:6 real 131:12 | reduced 111:10 115:13 |
| problems 120:16 | 18:3 42:16 43:15 | quality 1:1 2:4,8 3:23 | realistically 115:5 | reducing 54:360:5 |
| 132:14 proceed 138:23 | 44:16,24 47:7 48:12 49:22 53:7 54:8,16,19 | 9:1,4,6,12,17 11:6,13 | realize 81:6 98:7 | 111:16 115:19 reduction 47:6 49:13,23 |
| proceeding 138:21 | 54:20 56:8 57:4 59:4 | 12:9,20 15:6 16:4 | really 4:22,23 5:18,19 | 50:15 52:12 60:2,12 |
| proceedings 142:14 | 62:20 63:4 68:23 77:6 | 17:11,16 28:11,21,24 29:19 31:21 32:1 | 12:4 23:4 24:23 27:1 33:21 34:8 37:23 39:5 | 104:23 |
| 146:6 | 88:16 89:1 91:17 | 36:10 41:17 50:5,8,15 | 44:25 45:21 54:23 | redundant 35:3 |
| process 4:15,21 6:2,5 | 94:25 95:11,23 97:1 | 53:9,10,15,16,22 54:2 | 58:10 69:5 77:14 79:6 | Reese 136:12 |
| 21:9 32:4 33:25 50:5 50:11 55:4,25 63:1 | 100:6 127:2 128:11 130:12,25 131:2,3,15 | 54:4,12,25 55:2 59:21 | 86:24 89:20 94:11 | refer 37:4 63:16 reference 7:5 |
| 86:22 94:14 99:13 | 139:11 140:17 | 64:21 68:25 69:1,7,16 74:2 92:17,22 102:7 | 97:2,12 99:3,4 116:6 117:9 123:7,8 126:18 | referenced 63:12 70:6 |
| 109:6,25 110:3 | proposes 47:8 | 104:4,7,9,13,18,20,21 | 127:1 128:5 130:2,4,7 | references 107:15 |
| 113:12 123:14 126:7 127:14 128:7 133:4 | proposing 5:14 18:20 | 104:23 107:15 109:19 | 131:11,13,21 134:11 | referred 114:17 118:25 referring 48:11,14 |
| 135:6,9,11,15 143:8 | 44:2 46:17 47:7 60:19 60:21 61:2 84:19,22 | 110:18,23 111:11 | 140:9 142:22 143:5 | 63:18 80:10 |
| 144:3 | 113:14,20 116:9 | 112:3,8,13 113:1,2 123:3,4 124:24,25 | 143:21 144:20 real-life 40:23 | refers 62:21 63:14,22 |
| processor 33:6 | 118:9 132:15 | 137:10,15 | reason 21:18 26:17 | 83:16 |
| product 100:7 145:20 | proprietary 32:14,19 | Quality's 68:14 | 29:5 34:18 44:5 48:3 | refinement 130:15 |
| production 112:9 productive 144:5 | 33:7,14,14,18 34:1,7 34:9 | quarter 119:25 | 77:12 80:11 114:12 | reflected 62:14 144:1 regarding 26:6 53:15 |
| professional 66:21,21 | pros 42:18,21 44:15 | question 6:13 22:6,13 29:11 34:7 38:25 39:4 | 136:6 reasonable 11:25 13:12 | 58:17,20 66:11,13 |
| 66:22 | 96:12,17,23 98:7 | 42:19,20,22,24 43:18 | 28:15 99:4 111:15 | 70:7 72:17 92:12 |
| professionals 66:17 | 143:9 | 51:5 59:5,7,19,20 | 115:2,17 141:4 | 103:21 106:11 138:8 |
| program 2:13 8:18 29:3 36:8 37:3 60:14 63:5 | protect 16:8 53:10 62:8 122:23 123:1 127:20 | 62:18 63:8 82:15 92:8 | reasons 26:15 58:23 | region 11:17 79:23 120:16,18 127:21 |
| 63:14,16,25 64:3,5,11 | protected 32:20 | 92:9 95:4,13,19,25 96:18 22 99:2 3 9 17 | rebut 7:3 rebuttal 3:14 7:1 18:19 | regional 1:1 2:4 5:24 |
| 68:23 69:19,22 77:23 | protecting 128:2 | 96:18,22 99:2,3,9,17 102:3,11 106:14 | 19:20 87:9 | 7:19 33:2 53:14 68:21 |
| 79:19 84:12 104:21 | protection 69:4,7 | 114:5,22 125:2 | rebutting 87:14 | 104:5 112:16,23 |
| 113:7,23 122:8,10 135:1 136:7 | provide 4:5,14 5:16 8:13 11:3 46:22 57:3 | 129:21 131:21 134:8 | recall 5:17 16:3 38:23 | regions 6:1,1,1 31:14 137:18,18 |
| programs 32:22 33:2 | 65:12 67:15 70:10 | 138:7 questioned 131:18,19 | 85:10 recalling 82:1 | region's 120:19 |
| 68:20,22 104:20 | 81:3 97:4 104:22 | questions 6:17,18 9:8 | received 32:15 | registered 20:12,14,17 |
| 105:4,16 106:4 | 113:14,15 126:1 | 14:19,21 28:8 39:19 | receiving 112:6,20 | 21:11,12,19,20,23 |
| 107:19 108:1 110:19 110:24 | provided 9:23 10:22 44:19 75:24 98:13 | 51:16 56:6,10,20 | recent 7:6 139:18 | 22:8,10,15,19,24 23:4 23:5,13,18 24:1,3,5,6 |
| progress 50:14 60:4 | 44.1975.24 98.13 107:19 111:1 112:1 | 97:18 125:25 144:13 | Recess 41:13 93:10 | 23:5, 13, 18 24: 1, 3, 5, 6 24:8, 17, 23 66: 17, 20 |
| 73:13,18,20 74:1,3 | provides 27:8 71:20 | quick 28:5 51:5 86:25 quickly 28:7 38:1,22 | recognize 85:12 137:23 recognized 100:18 | registration 21:25 |
| 75:25 76:2,25 77:4 | 83:19 85:4 | 62:17 84:9 138:1 | recognizes 78:11 | regular 33:3 120:4 |
| 85:24 99:1 104:25 | providing 45:2 107:17 | quite 32:21 33:19 95:19 | recognizing 135:8 | regularly 32:22 136:20 |
| 111:22 112:8 138:3 progressive 136:17 | provision 22:22,25 57:2 provisions 53:23 | 121:4 124:10 126:19 | recommend 57:8,11 | regulated 143:18 Regulations 127:23 |
| project 45:25 47:11,12 | 105:12,17,21,25 | 131:20 quo 71:13 | 58:21,22 92:25 recommendation 8:14 | Regulatory 2:13 |
| 47:14 111:1,5,19,20 | 122:22 | 4 | 9:15 31:18 34:17 | rejecting 96:25 |
| | 1 | 1 | 1 | I |

Page 11

relate 12:16 18:9 71:25 72:25 related 13:1 15:7 37:10 42:8 78:6 relates 16:2 28:17 42:7 68:13 70:6 73:6 relative 12:17 13:12.13 released 7:8 34:2 reletter 43:19 relief 132:21 133:6,21 relieve 131:18 relying 82:22 remain 115:12 134:2 139:17 remained 4:9 remaining 128:13 remains 50:22 145:17 remarks 98:4 remediation 126:21 remember 12:16 13:21 13:23 130:14 remembered 86:1 remind 6:25 11:7 33:9 reminder 82:10 101:5 remove 24:3 89:2 removed 24:1 removing 90:2 renew 48:9 renewal 117:24 130:20 renewed 48:3 renumber 43:19 110:14 repeal 142:10 replace 43:15,23 66:22 89:5 replaced 85:24 replacement 48:15 replacing 48:24 report 7:6,8,10,12,15,18 8:1 13:16 32:14,14,24 32:25,25 34:11 57:3 57:24 62:24 71:18,23 73:12.15.18 76:25 84:18 85:24 90:14 119:15 120:1 121:5 121:11.14 reported 1:24 50:12,13 50:18 **REPORTERS** 1:20 Reporter's 3:21 reporting 4:24,24,25 5:16,16 6:9 36:8 57:15 63:5,25 64:5 68:20 72:4,18,20 77:23 78:18 103:23 103:24.24.25 104:2 104:13,15,20,21,24 105:4,16 107:19,25 110:19,24 111:24 122:8,10 127:9 132:25 reports 5:23 31:18,20 31:24 32:5,21,23 33:9 57:7 119:21 represent 9:17 31:4 69:14 representative 105:1 112:2,6,14,14,16 representatives 3:15 represented 81:15 representing 3:23 129:8 request 30:24 32:2,6 33:24 57:4 87:16 90:22,25 104:11 105:7 143:10,11

requesting 13:15 require 13:18 21:24 31:17 32:5 39:3 41:9 53:8 54:25 55:6,13 70:9 84:14,18 97:15 119:1 required 4:8 10:1 22:7 22:15 26:10 48:4 57:24 76:24 138:10 139:23 requirement 5:2 23:15 38:7,9 51:21 53:16 54.24 76.1 requirements 1:10 13:13 26:18 29:4 52:1 52:13 57:15 58:1,2 60:12 61:8,12 70:11 74:6 86:12,19,21 92:18,22 113:1 117:25 requires 20:8,8 31:24 106:8 requiring 127:14 rescind 142:9 researchers 112:11 resolution 122:12,14 resolve 94:24 98:6 124:20 resolved 9:3 51:7,10 56:16 143:2 resource 14:7 78:21 82:5,7 83:17,18,20 resources 127:18 respect 4:4 5:1,3,15 6:8 6:13 7:18,22 34:25 42:11 121:25 respond 95:14 responded 11:2 responding 56:3 response 3:17,25 8:13 9:12,14,24,25 11:11 13:20 17:10 18:4.25 41:15 55:15 65:22 66:15 73:5 7 78:5 89:14 95:15 responses 9:8,11,16 10:13 20:5 responsibility 31:20 58:3,10 105:17 127:13,22 131:13,16 responsible 57:21 58:14 61:14 67:25 responsive 52:7 60:6 135:4 restate 13:4 restoration 28:11,22 29:20 result 41:16,19 61:21 99:10,20,24 112:3 143:10 resulted 54:9,11 results 5:11 47:16 87:3 102:9 103:25,25 106:11 107:1 112:21 123:13 124:23,24 resume 93:11 revelation 126.15 reverts 87:4 review 4:11 7:10,21 10:24 94:16 106:5 112:23 143:9 reviewed 6:3 9:5 118:2 118 10 13 revise 54:4 70:13,17 71:9 125:20

revised 48:20 134:4 139:20,21 145:20 revising 71:17 141:20 revision 119:5 revisions 29:24 91:17 117:13 118:1,5,6,13 118:15 138:19 revisit 95:17 rewrites 54:20 55:13 rewriting 54:19 right 3:13,15 6:25 8:10 8:12 13:8 17:6 19:11 20:9 21:25 22:13 27:3 27:10 31:2,6,11,19 32:17,18 35:5,16,18 36:1 40:7 41:2,11,21 42:3 43:11 45:9 62:5 62:11 65:10 70:23 71:9 76:5,20 77:1,5,9 77:19.25 79:14.17 83:4 84:16,21 85:1,7 86:2,7 88:5 93:6,8 95:13 96:10,13 98:11 99:21 100:7 101:23 110:12 114:10 115:11 117:1 119:11,19 120:22 123:8 129:17 131:4 132:11 136:17 136:22 144:16 145:1 145:10 146:2 riparian 37:20 39:15 risk 12:4,20,24 13:12,12 13:13 52:13 60:13 73:12 85:12 risk-based 47:23 51:20 60.5 road 94:20 95:3 120:11 roads 93:18 94:19 Roberts 142:12 Roger 2:9 9:15 77:11 93:18,25 114:8,9 115:22 119:10 128:15 129:4 Roger's 49:1 93:16.17 role 57:20 rolling 128:21 room 26:9,11,11 27:8,9 27:15 135:20 Ross 46:6.14 round 40:15 86:10,10 106:8 route 98:5 99:4 rubber-stamped 141:24 rule 125:9 rules 142:13 run 56:9,14,19 88:1 102:1 running 37:24 38:20 39:15 124:10 Russ 126:5 129:23 Russell 2:8 R3-2012-0011 118:1 122:11 S **S** 2:1,5,7 safe 9:19 21:25 Salinas 2:8 Sam 134:6 same 12:19 44:7,8 47:9 47:9 54:7,9 64:12 74:25 78:1 86:21 132:6 135:25 136:12 142:2.5

sample 68:2 samples 67:24 90:7 sampling 66:13,14,18 67:4,8,9,17 70:12 71:7,10,16 72:3 107:4 SAN 1:3 3:1 Sanchez 13:23.25 14:1 80:9 Sanchez's 78:5 Santa 2:5,9 Sarah 45:24 47:9,12 satisfaction 56:17 134.10 satisfied 134:24 143:11 satisfies 134:25 satisfy 55:10 56:18 144:22 sausage 138:22 save 3:16 savings 68:8,9 106:25 saw 99:10 101:17 saying 13:4 22:22,25 23:124:226:8,11 28:25 43:13 46:24 74:7 96:24 100:10,17 107:18 125:14 131:25 says 5:4,4,8 7:10 10:8 27:6 34:6 44:10 53:9 61:12 63:13 64:24 68:19 69:11 83:4 88.13 93.1.2 104.16 106:1 108:16,18 115:1,7,16,17 116:18 137:11 SBX2 121:14 scale 45:4 50:24 104:24 106:22 107:1 111:12 116:9.13 scaled 111:12 schedule 75:18 104:10 104:11 111:7 136:20 145:6 schedules 48:24 78:18 Schroeter 2:13 9:21 10:21 13:8,10,15 14:1 15:2,5,20 16:2,14,20 16:24 17:2,8,23 18:5 18:8 22:9,16 23:14,24 24:6.9.16 26:15 28:16 29:936:13,2337:8 38:10 39:11,20,22,25 40:5,16 41:6,14 42:7 62:12 64:18 65:7,9,11 65:24 66:10 67:7,14 68.12 71.2 7 14 72.14 73:21 77:10.19.21.25 79:3,17 80:1,6,21 81:11,25 82:5,10,14 82:20 83:3 84:14,17 84:22 85:1,4,8,14,18 87:7 90:4 91:7 103:2 124:2,4 138:13 science 47:15 scientific 7:14 scientifically 47:14 scope 22:25 23:6 116:20 120:18 screen 19:11 62:13 105:24 120:25 screening 39:11 40:1 scrutiny 127:6 137:23 second 12:14 13:15 16:2 17:22,25 22:2 37:13 57:14 62:16 65:22 68:13,18 89:3

89:13 114:18 115:10 118:23 123:17,18 134:3 139:20,22,24 secret 115:21 secretary 83:10 section 2:12 5:3 62:24 99:25 100:6 104:15 sections 66:20 see 5:21 10:19,20 11:8 19:6 24:13 38:19 41:3 41:11 49:3 51:19 56:21 57:10 61:17 62:25 63:11 70:2 75:25 89:2 94:25 101:18 114:13 120:2 123:12 124:17 135:1 135:12,22 136:2 137:10 138:21 140:12 143:1 144:4,5 seeing 25:25 63:2 124:19 137:14 seek 106:5 112:23 123:1 seem 87:1 seemed 134:7 seems 53:18 74:7 85:15 86:23 88:16 106:14 132:21 seen 126:6 135:11 seepy 41:3 segment 79:9 segments 100:5 selection 37:16 self-explanatory 20:7 Senior 2:8 sense 4:6 28:25 86:6 95:24 96:20 101:25 136:24 140:16,25 sensitive 135:5 sentence 16:15 17:5 36:20 68:18 92:16 108:18 sentences 84:11 separately 33:1 51:8 seriously 8:23 97:9,13 serve 136:8 Services 67:24 session 3:7 6:24 set 49:14.22 61:15 83:11 84:1 86:18.20 108:1 109:1,24,24 110:1,3 111:21 113:7 143:9.12 setting 94:13 seven 114:25 severe 120:15.17 shaking 24:14 shallow 52:960:10 shape 134:24 share 85:20 92:1 shared 94:6 sheet 16:17 17:6.9.17 17:20 18:22 19:6,7,15 19:16 20:17,20 25:25 41:19 64:19 90:19 119:15 sheets 62:15 shepherd 136:23 She'll 126:1 shield 57:16 shields 58:5 shifted 128:20 short 136:15 142:23.24 142:25 shot 134:1

show 10:12,15 12:22 76:1,4 showed 5:18 67:24 shown 41:18 shuffle 91:23 side 41:9 136:1.1 sideboards 141:23 142:2 sides 124:14 sight 24:21 significant 4:25 47:15 47:16 55:13 85:15,18 98:22 122:19,21 123:11,11 132:23 133:17 significantly 105:10 silver 116:2 similar 37:15 41:7 104:7 133:15 similarly 66:22 Simmons 3:22 simple 88:3 116:4 simplify 19:1 simply 12:13 24:2 34:6 38:17 41:10 77:11 95:3 since 15:20 19:14 96:2 107:22 single 26:21 38:19 91:15 sit 7:20 145:5 site 4:9 31:9 situation 86:18 106:18 130:22 131:6 situations 102:9 107:5 123:2 six 6:2 70:15 six-month 71:12 size 11:7 13:4,9,10 skilled 112:12 skip 36:3 41:12 skipped 29:7 sleep 8:19 56:3 slide 9:9 10:9,14 15:3 18:23 19:16 20:24.25 21:1,1,10 25:7,7,20 28:9 30:17 34:16 36:3 36:5 41:12 58:23 59:2 94:23.23 96:12 97:8 98:8 121:4,8,8,17 slides 10:3,18 15:21 17:15 18:18 21:2 121:5,7,9 slighted 82:16 slightly 50:10 81:22 slip 32:12 small 30:6 78:6 90:22 90:25 104:25 smaller 13:22,22 14:2 soaps 21:25 Socialize 83:14 socially 83:12 socioeconomic 83:8 84:1 solution 15:9 solutions 111:12,17 Somach 3:22 some 3:25 4:1,4,14 6:21 7:20 9:12,14,25 10:12 17:11,14 18:18,19,19 23:8 24:4,25,25 26:9 38:25 39:4,4,8 41:22 42.4 8 43.25 45.8 49:13,14,19 50:11 51:16 52:3,3 54:19,20

56:8,13,24 57:22,22 58:6,12,14 67:15,17 67:22 68:6 70:10 73:4 79:15 80:7,9,14,18,18 87:8 89:16 90:17 96:14.16 97:5 99:22 102:9,19,21 104:14 109:24 113:13,14 114:15 120:4,10 121:23 123:5,10,14 125:15 126:25 127:5 128:20.22 130:15 131:3,3,12 132:1,2,19 132:21,22 133:2,2,6 135:1,9,14,19 136:11 136:14 137:2,17,18 141:5,8,9 142:16 145.6 somebody 30:1 82:18 98:16 101:3.11 somehow 32:12 53:7 someone 33:23 67:2,8 70:2 79:15 88:22 something 4:19 6:12 24:19 26:19 29:16 37:2,5 49:23 53:20 62:1 63:2 75:12 77:3 77:18 81:22 87:2 88:3 93:5,17 95:1,9 96:6 98.1 99.6 115.6 116.8 119:10.25 125:6.13 128:13 132:1 133:3 133:14 134:12 145:16 sometimes 66:1 somewhat 58:8 106:12 127:6 soon 31:25 131:22 133:25 sorry 15:16 21:2,8 29:10 37:9 46:13 59:18 63:23 65:7 71:2 99:17 108:15 122:13 sort 50:6 57:22 75:1 95:23 97:3 102:3 sound 20:1 142:19 sounds 83:22 source 54:1 55:3 92:24 93:1 118:5,12,20 126:21 sources 11:16 54:1 69:4,8 127:15 south 79:24 106:22 space 86:22 **Spanish** 79:11,18,21,21 80.20.22 81.2 Spanish-speaking 79:14,23 80:5,24 speak 8:15 14:12 80:4 80:13 83:13 96:8 125:24 134:14,21 140:7 speakers 2:1979:6,11 speaking 78:7 79:2,4,18 81:17,18 128:10 138:20 specific 11:2,20 14:5,6 14:12 15:6 17:19 18:9 36:21,23 42:7 73:23 75:20 84:18 111:2 114:22 118:4 specifically 5:15 8:24 11:2,21 12:7,10 16:4 45.6 67.16 68.13 70.6 76:23,24 83:4 85:12 119:3 121:9

specificity 102:19 135:15 specifics 13:18 specified 84:23 specify 82:23 spell 114:20 spelled-out 117:7 132:24 spelling 62:25 spend 27:24 126:25 spent 145:22 spirit 136:13 137:4 spoke 89:19 squares 84:7 Staff 2:8,11 3:25 4:9 8:12 14:20 15:12 16:7 17:10 19:20,22 23:10 26:10 29:13 30:24 31.1 32.6 33.1 38.18 54:7 56:2 57:2.3 62:14 64:20 66:8 69:17 70:4 72:6 73:8 75:10 79:18,22 80:5 85.22 87.6 9 88.2 89:1 90:14 93:13 95:14,22 96:25 97:1 97:10,14 99:23 112:16 113:19 114:9 114:11 117:10 118:2 118:10.24 119:15:20 119:24 121:18 122:19 122:21 124:21,21 128:21 129:3 130:25 131:1,18,20 132:2 135:10 136:21 138:7 138:18 140:1.10 143:10 144:14 Staffs 12:8 19:19 20:5 52:20 89:15 94:22 100:2 117:19 119:3 120:24 stakeholder 66:16 135:6 143:7 stakeholders 34:22 137:1 143:19 144:2 144:11,23,24 145:8 stand 95:23 standalone 38:6,866:3 standard 5:16:2.14 16:10 31:13 52:16 55:1 79:19 82:25 standards 6:10 9:1 16:4 53:9,10,15,17,22 54:2 54:4,12,25 55:2 59:22 61:15 113:2 stands 45:13 129:22 start 6:16 15:6 64:24 71:22 72:3 86:1 134:25 136:2 144:24 145:15 started 78:4 137:4 Starting 15:5 starts 102:20 121:22 state 6:27:17,2333:6 34:24 53:25 55:1 66:20 111:8 126:4 127:21 147:6 stated 36:16 38:5 76:23 111:22 112:24 143:24 statement 11:4 23:21 24:2 39:2 75:8 100:20 122:24,25 137:6 states 20:8 67:16 73:25 78:10 79:20 81:16 statistically 47:14,16

status 71:13 83:8 84:2 120:1 statute 127:12 statutorily 127:19 stay 124:18 130:10 132:6 133:18.22 139:16 141:11 142:25 145:18 staying 134:1,10 step 80:10 95:8 140:5 sterilized 68:1 stick 18:22 19:10 still 46:23 47:573:15 74:283:2584:24 93:25 108:4 124:16 131:21 132:12 140:21 stop 18:24 21:5 27:24 122:16 132:16 stopping 27:16 straight 15:21 straightforward 34:13 strategies 104:5 stream 28:18 29:2 37:24 39:1 streams 37:20 38:14 39:14 strengthened 99:23 stricken 89:25 strict 59:11 strike 69:14.15 82:11 89:6 90:5.6.7 strikeout 68:19 69:17 85:23 103:11 stringent 86:7 87:4 123:14 stuck 61:24 study 39:3 stuff 42:5 56:4,6 83:6 87:24 94:10,21 113:13,15,16 119:1 Sturgis 142:13 stymied 140:20 sub 104:25 106:21 subject 75:21 84:7 91:11 111:3 submit 57:24 68:2 70:1 70:3,13 71:7,9,15,18 71:21 72:2,4 75:19,20 84:21 88:10 89:11 104:12.18 138:10 submittal 31:17 105:13 submitted 18:17 31:20 31:25 32:6,22,23 44:2 57:7 61:5 64:21 65:14 65:21 66:6 118:7.13 submitting 84:13 subregional 68:21 subsequent 37:1,6 120:22,23 133:24 140:5 subset 85:6,9,11 substantially 115:5 substitute 92:17,21 112:25 success 79:9 111:14 115:1 successfully 8:21 sufficient 104:25 sufficiently 105:1 144:21 suggest 10:21 14:18 20:21 29:22 56:4,19 66:18 72:11 117:13 138:14 suggested 9:12 11:1

15:3.22 17:10 23:25 36:6 37:10 49:4 68:16 69:9,15,25 70:5 72:25 87:7 136:19 suggesting 13:20 14:3 15:6 36:12 64:20 65:19 70:16 72:19 73:4,8103:17 suggestion 15:7,15 16:11 17:14 18:16 19:1 30:21 37:13,17 55:24 68:14 129:19 suggestions 14:3 55:9 74:6 suitcase 8:19 summaries 5:24 127:9 summarize 41:15 summarizes 16:17 summary 8:14 37:1.7 71:25 143:15 superceded 90:17 supplemental 16:16 17:9 90:19 119:15 SUPPLY 2:5 support 5:8 45:14,15 98:23 122:17 125:1 135:23,24 136:18 138:24 supported 135:10 supportive 46:5.15 suppose 125:5 supposed 80:12 128:19 sure 7:25 16:20,22 20:4 21:6 22:18 26:13 43:1 48.14 62.6 80.7 81.7 81:15 82:19 91:2 92:5 93:2 99:16 103:15 120:21 121:15,18 128:18,19,20 129:19 131:22 139:13 surface 12:6 37:15 40:15 67:2 70:18,19 71:18 72:1 88:9,14 89:4,10 105:2,11 107:5 111:17 115:14 127:20 138:2 surprised 86:25 surprising 58:8 suspect 56:3 96:8,11,19 116:10 suspecting 125:1 sustained 111:20 systems 46:7 136:3 т table 16:3,4,13 17:5 73:23,24,24,25 74:13 74:15 75:18 76:18,21 76:22 77:13 117:3 131:25 TAC 112:17 take 6:8,25 7:9,20 28:4 32:8 52:22,23 54:19 55:11 68:1 87:17 89:15 92:3 93:8 94:21 95:17 97:7,9 99:4 102:25 103:25 122:23 124:12 127:12 131:16 134:1 137:17 138:11 140:12,25 143:15 144:4 taken 41:13 93:10

Page 12

ATKINSON-BAKER, INC., COURT REPORTERS

111:19 113:19 118:16

134:24

| takes 127:5 | 66:11 68:16 72:16 | 25:13,16,19,22 26:1 | timelines 61:1 111:2,4 | 102:18 112:7,11 |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| taking 11:24 20:13 58:9 | 81:17 95:23 120:18 | 27:6,11,14,22 28:6,9 | tiny 103:6 | 119:14 124:12 141:3 |
| 67:23 101:16 139:20 | 128:1 143:1 144:12 | 28:25 30:17,21 31:3 | title 42:25 44:6,7,8,9 | type 12:14 13:5 22:10 |
| 141:2,10 talented 135:16 | themselves 17:13 68:6 theoretically 115:12 | 34:16 35:11,15,17 36:3 41:12 42:11,14 | today 4:18,23 6:7,16 7:16 8:19 53:20 71:11 | 22:11 24:24 46:4 80:15 114:16 130:5 |
| talk 9:23 21:12 23:15 | they'd 128:8,9 | 42:16,21,23 44:15 | 72:5 95:12 99:10,15 | 131:6 |
| 37:11 54:22 56:12 | thing 4:22 6:20 7:4 | 46:12 51:9,14 52:6 | 99:19,20 101:12 | types 14:8 39:15 46:19 |
| 62:15 87:17,23 88:18 | 22:11 36:18 41:6 | 58:17 59:8,15,17,19 | 113:7 118:2,11 | 50:9 51:1 78:9,22,23 |
| 89:1,12 97:13 123:14 | 44:17,20 47:9 52:6 | 62:6 86:9 87:11 89:21 | 119:14,20 121:23 | 81:13 trme 50:00 114:16 |
| talked 13:22 45:11 46:6 52:16 57:1 61:19 | 55:16 74:12,25 75:14 76:8,16 89:13 90:11 | 90:1 91:24 108:13,15 109:1 120:25 121:2 | 123:15 126:8 129:14 130:12,25 131:24 | typo 59:22 114:16 T-e-s-s 3:21 |
| 108:11 134:5 | 108:24 109:5 110:5 | 121:14 122:4,6,12 | 133:16 134:12 | |
| talking 4:23 5:15 13:16 | 116:20 118:17,23 | thorough 66:9 | together 74:16 | U |
| 19:16 43:2 45:16 | 121:21 136:12 | though 46:23 47:8 | told 45:13,16 | Uh-huh 27:11,14 |
| 46:14 51:1 59:25 71:6 88:18 96:3 129:4 | things 5:4 12:19 18:19 19:8 20:4 21:23 22:1 | 87:16 91:1 95:25 thought 19:3 21:19 | tomorrow 53:20 55:6 tonight 56:1 97:22 | ultimately 57:21 58:13 |
| 140:10,13 141:12 | 22:24 23:2,12,13,22 | 25:10 30:5 44:18.20 | 124:13,18 133:18 | 62:2 101:21 unacceptable 48:12 |
| talks 64:1 85:23 107:11 | 23:22 26:9 28:18 | 49:4 70:25 81:21 94:4 | 134:1,4 139:16,20 | unanimously 139:10 |
| tapped 69:21 | 35:19 39:1 51:1,9,17 | 94:18 122:13 129:6 | 142:25 144:10 145:15 | unanswered 134:8 |
| target 49:9,10 50:2,4,5 | 55:14 58:13 59:25 | 142:16,18 145:22 | 145:18 | unclear 50:22 |
| 50:5 73:6 74:13 75:14 76:7,8,11,15 77:12,17 | 61:23 75:2 88:1 94:11 116:8 119:13 120:2,3 | thoughtful 143:8 144:5 threat 11:6,13,14,14,15 | tool 40:1 tools 123:11 | under 4:10 6:5 23:23 |
| 78:1 85:3 | 121:23 129:19 135:10 | 12:9,17,20 52:7,10,14 | top 41:4 69:10 79:20 | 24:8 31:16 35:3 36:16 48:20 57:23 58:4 |
| targeting 116:6 | 136:17 138:6 141:6 | 60:7 | 84:10 | 147:1,5,5 |
| targets 47:25 49:3,7,15 | 143:25 | threatened 62:9 | touch 4:22 | underline 68:17 103:10 |
| 50:9,12 52:11 60:3,11 74:5,8,14,20 75:2,9 | think 4:1,3,16 7:7,16,20 9:21 12:2 14:9 16:21 | threats 120:17 three 5:14 27:19 32:2 | toward 101:8 130:7 133:13 | undermine 57:10,11 |
| 76:6 | 18:11 19:5,8 20:6 | 61:22 71:25 79:22 | towards 50:15 73:13,19 | undermines 60:8,9 undermining 57:6 |
| target's 76:12 | 24:23 25:1,22 26:10 | 86:1 94:10 97:12,17 | 74:1 77:4 85:25 | understand 3:18 7:7,21 |
| task 128:17 | 26:23 27:15 28:3,14 | 101:1 112:7 123:24 | 111:22 112:8 116:1 | 19:24 20:2,3 30:9 |
| technical 7:14 31:17,20 32:5 57:7 59:3 78:16 | 32:11 33:18,22 34:1,9 40:5,23 41:4 44:20 | 123:25 127:25 143:24 through 4:12 8:22 9:22 | 137:14 toxic 21:24 | 43:2 50:19 51:11 56:5 |
| 82:17 94:15 95:4 | 45:3 46:2,3,10,16,16 | 9:22 11:1 14:22 17:15 | toxicity 11:18,20 12:7 | 56:7,11,20 62:11 |
| 110:1 112:10 113:10 | 46:20,21,23 48:18 | 27:23 37:3,25 38:20 | 12:10,13 111:15 | 66:19 70:8 75:6,7,22 79:12 80:19 109:3 |
| 113:11 114:15 128:22 | 49:1,6,15 51:25 52:1 | 39:15 44:11 51:16 | 115:2,4,9,12,14,18 | 114:7 143:5 145:21 |
| technician 66:23 technology 116:5 | 52:2,7 54:23 55:19 56:8,14,15,24 57:18 | 56:9,15,20 64:23 80:8 95:10 101:15 107:7,8 | 116:3,6120:15 track 62:20104:25 | understanding 24:9,12 |
| tell 14:20,20 18:1 19:15 | 58:8,12 59:2 62:7,10 | 109:6 111:20 121:22 | 135:10 | 74:18 136:2 understands 20:5 |
| 30:16 39:5 42:25 | 63:4,21 66:1,9 74:12 | 123:13 124:10,19 | tracks 124:8 | understood 8:7 38:12 |
| 48:17 50:14 55:19 | 74:15 75:17 76:17 | 125:19 126:5,23 | train 68:5 124:9 | 75:9 99:16 |
| 84:9 88:25 127:25 128:4 132:9 | 79:22 80:2,9 88:20 89:2 92:1,24 93:2 | 127:8 throughout 26:24 27:3 | training 68:6 translation 79:21 | under-represented |
| telling 83:9 | 95:2,7,22,24 96:1,18 | 74:24 79:23 120:16 | transparent 15:13 | 81:14 unfair 144:23 |
| template 33:9 | 96:22 97:6,10,12,13 | throw 139:13,14 | 127:13 | unfavorable 23:21 |
| term 26:17 47:25 48:2 | 97:17 98:4,6,7 99:2,3 | thumb 102:14 | traps 22:18 treated 11:5 | unless 21:5 115:8 |
| 48:13,25 49:21,25 50:12 60:4 75:14 | 101:6,7,17,20 102:2,3 103:7 106:16 113:18 | THURSDAY 3:2 tie 124:8 | treatment 11:5 46:7 | 117:15 |
| 111:16 115:3,7 | 113:19 114:16,18 | tier 11:13,14,14 12:1,2,4 | 104:5 105:8 106:4 | unlikely 145:22 unprecedented 120:18 |
| terms 11:17,24 13:16 | 119:12,23 120:5 | 12:17,18,23,24,24,25 | trees 24:20 | 120:19 |
| 13:19 33:15 37:24 | 123:2,9 124:16 | 13:2,11,11,17,17 | tremendous 56:3 | unquote 25:23 |
| 49:23 96:16,16 98:18 100:12 101:16 120:3 | 125:25 126:25 127:2 127:4 128:8,9,12,23 | 14:17 39:23,25 44:10 44:11 64:1,3,6,11,14 | tremendously 44:25 tried 11:24 60:22,23 | unregistered 22:11 |
| 124:24,25 126:20 | 129:17,18 130:24 | 65:9,14,18,20 66:6 | 135:3 | 23:1 until 18:12 30:8 34:3 |
| 127:14 128:17 138:1 | 131:2,6,7,10,12,14,15 | 77:24 85:7,9,13 | tries 116:20 | 119:20 133:22 |
| Tess 2:20 3:18,21 23:25 | 132:5,5 133:12,23 | 107:24 110:25,25,25 | trouble 83:23 | unusual 61:9 |
| 26:4 35:2,7 38:5 54:16 56:14 65:16 | 135:12 136:1,7,12 137:23 138:13,14,22 | 111:1,1,3 116:18,18 116:18,19,19,21,21 | true 49:19 81:23 135:23 147:6 | un-fleshed 96:14 |
| 95:15 127:7 139:19 | 140:9,11,16,24,25 | 133:5,5 | trust 4:3,6,15,21 31:8 | updates 136:20 uppermost 69:16,19 |
| testimony 130:2,3,4 | 141:3,5,16 142:23 | tiering 11:913:19 | try 4:14 19:1 58:7 95:17 | up/down 106:23 |
| text 20:9 34:17 | 143:8,11,23,25 | tiers 11:10,12 12:16 | 99:18 136:8 138:21 | urge 136:18 144:7 |
| thank 3:12,20 6:20 8:8,9 15:1 30:15 42:10,15 | 144:19,22 146:3 thinking 22:17,20 23:17 | time 3:10 7:9,20 9:13 14:4,9 15:20 26:23 | trying 3:25 10:12,20 18:20 19:3,7,8 45:18 | urgency 120:15 |
| 52:4 59:16 62:19 64:9 | 132:6 | 27:25 45:8 47:25 | 45:19 46:25 47:1,19 | USDA 14:678:2081:21 use 10:14,2111:1912:5 |
| 64:16 71:3 89:24 | third 4:12 44:1,12,13 | 48:21,24 49:3,4,9,11 | 49:10 50:8 56:12 | 12:10 21:24 22:1,7,12 |
| 90:10 93:7 106:1 | 57:20 58:5,9,25 61:5 | 49:15 69:25 70:9,10 | 62:20 79:7 82:1 86:19 | 22:14 29:21 50:12 |
| 109:12 122:17 123:16 132:4 135:20 136:10 | 61:17 63:1,11,13,17 66:23 67:18,20 69:10 | 75:3,18 78:18 80:6 86:5,7,15,21 87:3 | 86:20,20 95:10 98:18 99:2 101:15 123:8 | 75:14 76:8 77:25 88:7 |
| 146:4 | 70:8 73:2 94:14 95:5 | 100:1,1 104:10 105:7 | 126:23 128:6 132:9 | 88:14 89:8 95:11 97:2 97:15,20 113:6 138:9 |
| thanks 101:13 | 97:3 104:6,17 108:17 | 105:8 111:20 117:10 | 145:22 | 143:16 |
| their 3:16 8:13 15:3,7 | 109:7,24,25 110:17 | 120:20 126:25 127:15 | Tuesday 7:8 121:5 | used 21:20 22:10 23:24 |
| 24:14,15 31:10 37:21 38:20 39:23,25 40:25 | 110:21 112:23 113:3 Thomas 2:12 14:13 | 130:19 131:6 134:13 134:25 135:25 136:15 | tweak 95:18 two 26:15 27:18 32:23 | 67:23 74:1 76:7,13,13 |
| 43:10,15,24 44:1,1,6 | 18:2,16 19:5,12 20:6 | 141:1,2,11 144:5 | 49:7 71:20,21 72:5 | useful 107:2 uses 53:11 128:3 |
| 44:9 45:3 46:2 48:23 | 20:19,22,24 21:1,15 | 145:6,22 146:3 | 79:17 82:3 87:5 94:8 | using 13:6 24:15,17 |
| 53:4 56:4,9 57:3 | 21:18 24:18 25:7,10 | timeline 48:15 85:3 | 94:13,19 101:4,22 | 39:12 49:6 114:20 |
| | 1 | 1 | 1 | |

Page 14

| | | | | 1 480 1 |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| | | | | |
| | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 131:14 | 34:23 35:1 70:3 86:22 | 136:4 140:3 | wish 95:1 128:15 | 60:1 61:10,11,22 |
| usually 30:9 | 114:13,16 121:3 | wells 52:10 69:21 | wishy 75:4 | 70:20 71:20,21 72:5 |
| utilize 51:7 | 129:12 133:7,14,14 | 105:11 106:24 107:4 | withdraw 145:14 | 86:1 111:16 115:3,18 |
| U.C 7:6 121:14 | wanting 4:3 | well's 106:13 | withdrawing 145:24 | 115:21 123:12 127:4 |
| | wants 6:12 16:23 62:3 | well-defined 117:7 | WITNESS 129:10 | 137:11,18,18,19 |
| V | washy 75:4 | went 64:23 86:24 90:18 | Wolff 3:8,966:16 | 143:24 |
| | wasn't 28:23 38:24 | 124:16 | 128:14,24 129:2,13 | yellow 17:6,17,20 19:6 |
| Valley 6:4 31:24 54:7,10 | 43:22 50:8 69:3 77:14 | were 5:15 9:6,14 10:13 | wondered 115:3 | 19:7,15,16 20:17,20 |
| Valley's 57:9 | | | wondering 14:11 63:15 | |
| variety 116:8 | 100:15 119:3 126:13 | 11:1,12,19,20 14:2 | | 25:25 41:18 62:15 |
| various 9:7 | 133:1 134:15,18 | 17:12 18:17 19:3 22:9 | 85:16 | 64:19 91:12 |
| vegetative 26:6 | 141:21 | 22:20 34:5 38:15 | wood 116:4 | yesterday 3:18 4:2 6:22 |
| verification 4:6,15,21 | waste 1:9 23:3,3 24:22 | 47:11 52:2 55:9 59:22 | word 20:13,17 21:11 | 8:13 9:7,23 10:22 |
| 5:21 | 24:24 57:24,24 58:1,1 | 73:1 74:8 75:2,3,3,10 | 23:18,18 24:3 65:5 | 14:23 17:13 23:25 |
| verify 4:3 5:10,16 112:7 | 88:8 89:10 112:8 | 81:25 82:3 85:21 | 69:14 74:13 76:7,8,16 | 34:25 38:12 45:20,24 |
| version 56:13 57:19 | 117:24 | 86:19 87:11 90:1 98:8 | 77:17 78:1 86:8 89:2 | 52:18 56:13 59:5,20 |
| 58:7,12 139:18 | water 1:1 2:4,5,8 3:23 | 99:19,22,23 104:4 | 89:5,6 103:24 105:20 | 64:22 73:5,8 76:15 |
| versus 73:7 77:15 | 5:3 6:3,5,10 7:17 9:1 | 116:10 121:4,7 | 105:24 | 85:10 87:12,25 89:14 |
| very 18:10,12 33:6 | 9:4,6,11,17,19 11:6 | 131:24 133:4 134:6 | worded 81:22 | 94:21,25 99:24 121:4 |
| 34:23 36:21 44:21 | 11:13,14 12:6,9,12,20 | 134:16 135:19 138:20 | wording 77:12 99:12 | 124:16 130:2 131:19 |
| 46:5 55:6 56:3 67:16 | 15:6 16:4,7 17:11,16 | 141:19 143:2 144:19 | 100:19 | 131:24 133:9 134:5 |
| 69:18 81:14 82:20 | 23:16 28:11,21,23 | 146:6 | words 26:4,24 38:7 | 139:19 145:4 |
| 85:18 97:1,9 102:7 | 29:19 30:23,25 31:16 | west 106:23 | 39:17 49:8 74:9 82:3 | yesterday's 3:7 |
| 115:25 116:19 117:7 | 31:21 32:1,13 34:22 | wetland 37:21 39:2,13 | 83:15 89:4,6 92:15 | Young 2:5 3:4,12 6:18 |
| 126:7 134:22 135:16 | 34:24 37:15 40:15 | 39:15 40:2,9,14 41:4 | 140:20 | 6:20,24 7:25 8:2,4,8 |
| | 41:3,17 44:22 50:5,8 | 41:10 46:7 | work 6:7 9:4 44:18 46:2 | 8:10,15 13:25 14:18 |
| 136:14 141:3 146:4 | 50:15 53:8,10,15,16 | we'll 7:18 11:1 12:22 | 46:4,14,17 63:1 86:1 | 14:25 16:1,22 17:25 |
| vet 114:13 | 53:22,25 54:1,4,12,25 | 14:21 18:24 19:1.10 | 94:20 95:5,10 101:15 | 18:3,6,15 19:3,10 |
| Vice 2:8 | 55:2 57:23 59:21 | 41:19 42:9 50:11 61:2 | 122:22 123:11 124:15 | 20:25 21:6 22:2 24:19 |
| view 10:9,15,18 53:19 | 64:21 65:12 67:2,24 | 81:7 104:14 121:9 | 124:15 131:23 132:1 | 25:6,12,21 27:21 28:3 |
| visit 31:5 | 68:14,24,25 69:4,8 | 131:16,16 134:25 | 135:21 137:14 140:10 | 28:7 29:14,16 30:7,13 |
| volume 56:4 | 71:18 72:1 74:1 78:11 | we're 3:4 7:12 9:10 | 141:20 142:25 | 30:16,18 31:2,6 32:9 |
| vote 29:16 30:12 123:20 | | | workable 55:9 | |
| 125:12,18,20 128:11 | 78:14 88:9,10,12,14 | 10:11,19 13:20 17:21 | | 32:17 33:4 34:15 |
| 134:4 137:7 139:20 | 89:4,10,11 92:17,22 | 19:16 20:10,14 21:4 | worked 81:2 94:7 | 35:23 36:2 38:4 39:7 |
| 142:4 | 102:7 104:4,7,9,13,18 | 24:19,21 25:13,19 | 101:17 120:6 | 39:17,21 40:8,12,18 |
| voted 108:12 | 104:19,21,23 105:11 | 26:1 27:1 28:25 30:16 | working 5:20,22 45:8,9 | 40:22 41:21 42:2 |
| votes 138:21 | 105:11 106:6 107:5 | 34:4 36:4,5 37:10 | 54:24,24 59:22 79:5 | 48:11 51:4,22 52:5 |
| vulnerable 69:20 | 107:15 108:19,23 | 39:12,14 41:14 43:2 | 86:19 124:19 136:22 | 55:23 56:23 57:13 |
| | 109:5,19 110:18,23 | 47:5 49:6 50:14,25 | 136:25 | 58:16 59:6 62:1,11,16 |
| W | 111:11 112:1,3,6,8,8 | 61:24 71:17 72:19 | works 55:20 102:1 | 65:5,10 67:22 68:9 |
| W 2:9 | 112:12 113:1,2 123:3 | 74:2,7 79:6 87:14,22 | workshop 7:17 45:21 | 74:11 79:11,25 80:4 |
| wait 44:13 94:4 103:3 | 123:4 124:24,25 | 93:8,11,24,25 95:2 | 67:15 | 81:9,19 83:13 84:5,8 |
| Waiver 1:9 3:6 5:5,9,17 | 126:20 127:12 136:4 | 96:3,13 97:15,19 | workshops 79:23 80:17 | 87:6,9,20 88:20,24 |
| 5:22 6:4 22:23 23:2,6 | 137:10,15 138:2 | 100:9 103:2 107:10 | 135:9 | 89:23 90:12,24 91:5,9 |
| 23:23 35:4 37:1 43:24 | waters 127:20 | 107:17,18,22,24 | worse 86:5,7 | 91:13,15,19 92:8,14 |
| | watershed 4:24 5:7 | 109:6 113:22 115:20 | worsen 86:3 | 93:8,11,19,23 95:13 |
| 54:10 58:1 117:24 | 46:11,12 104:6,17 | 120:11 122:17 123:8 | wouldn't 29:21 55:10 | 95:21 96:2,5,10 97:24 |
| Waiver's 5:10 | 106:21 | 123:20 127:2,20 | 75:21 95:19 99:11 | 98:2 99:7 100:12,14 |
| walk 51:15 | watersheds 136:3 | 128:6,10 132:2,14,15 | 145:14 | 100:22 101:14,23 |
| want 9:16 10:11,14 | Watsonville 2:6 | 133:25 136:1,22 | write 14:19 54:18 | 103:5,7 105:20,23 |
| 14:20 15:23 16:25 | way 9:17,21 10:9 25:18 | 137:3,14,20 143:25 | 113:24 | 106:2 107:7 108:14 |
| 17:4 19:21 20:16,21 | 27:10 30:13 31:12 | 144:13,14,15 | writing 113:21 | 110:9,12 113:18 |
| 21:21 24:3 26:3,12 | 36:15 37:4 49:8,25 | we've 9:8 30:14 34:2 | written 30:14 36:15 | 114:1,3,7,10,23 115:9 |
| 27:2 28:3 31:8 43:3 | 54:16,18,24 55:21 | 45:11 59:25 61:8,19 | 38:15 50:1 58:7 59:14 | 116:24 117:1,18 |
| 45:21 49:11,12 51:15 | 59:14 61:20 75:22 | 76:23 77:2 79:9,22 | 118:13 119:20 | 118:18 119:9 121:11 |
| 52:25 53:3 54:21 | 77:6 83:7 88:5 95:7 | 81:1 92:5 96:5 98:14 | wrong 72:24 80:2 86:17 | 121:15,19 122:2,5,15 |
| 55:18,19,25 56:12,18 | 95:20 96:23 107:18 | 98:18,19,22 108:9,11 | wrote 114:6 | 123:17,20 124:6 |
| 56:21 58:9,24 61:7,7 | 109:1 113:15 125:5 | 109:5 120:9,10 | www.depo.com 1:21 | 125:24 126:3 129:1,6 |
| 61:17 62:17 63:2 65:5 | 125:17 126:2 134:24 | 126:12,15 127:4 | | 129:9,11,14,18 132:8 |
| 70:9 75:15 79:13 | 136:21 138:23 141:10 | 133:15 135:11 139:25 | v | 132:11,17 134:16,19 |
| 80:13 81:12 82:18 | 144:5 | 143:24 | X | 135:7 137:7 138:16 |
| 84:6 86:17,18 87:24 | ways 54:18 58:6 135:9 | while 110:11 | X 26:5 | 138:25 139:9,14,22 |
| 88:17 89:2,4 91:2 | WDRs 3:6 | whole 55:16 56:9 110:5 | | 139:25 140:3,8 141:5 |
| 92:5 94:19 95:3,11 | | 126:7 | Y | |
| 96:8 97:22 102:12 | weary 135:19 | | Y 26:6 | 141:8,15 142:11 |
| 107:21 109:10 117:2 | week 94:8 | wholesale 117:13 | yada 89:12,12,12 | 143:3 144:8,17 145:1 |
| 117:16,23 119:4,16 | weigh 62:3 120:14 | wholesaley 27:2 | yeah 8:8 25:6 30:3 34:8 | 145:10,24 146:2 |
| 119:22 120:21 121:6 | welcome 60:24 | widespread 126:19 | 40:18 46:10 48:19 | |
| 121:15 122:18 123:23 | well 5:3 7:20 8:13 11:11 | wiggle 26:9,11 27:8,9 | 52:5 84:4 89:23 | Z |
| 124:9 128:23 132:7 | 11:18 17:11 18:9 34:4 | 27:15 | 102:17 103:5 105:22 | Z 26:6 |
| 133:8 134:16 135:20 | 36:9,14 40:4 64:21 | wiggles 27:18 | 107:8 108:22 126:3,3 | zoom 103:19 |
| | 67:7 80:3,25 81:14 | Wildlife 2:9 | - | |
| 135:25 136:10,23 | 85:21 87:23 94:10 | willing 85:22 87:14 | 129:16 144:17 | 0 |
| 137:8,19,24 144:4 | 97:18 99:3 106:18 | 130:10 133:22 141:11 | year 70:3,14 71:11 | |
| | 107:3,6 109:18 | 143:1 144:11 | 72:21 137:4 | 01 124:2 |
| 145:5,14 | | | | |
| wanted 4:22 6:15,25 | 113:16 115:25 117:6 | window 84:20 | years 32:2 34:10 48:3,6 | 02 124:2 |
| - | | window 84:20 win-win 130:22 131:6 | years 32:2 34:10 48:3,6 48:16,25 49:1,16,16 | 02 124:2 03 124:2 |

| <u> </u> | · . |
|--|--------------------------------|
| 1 | 4 |
| 11:13 12:18,23,25 | 4 3:5,10 73:24,25 74:13 |
| 13:11,17 62:25 70:21 | 102:21,22 |
| 71:20 72:10,22,23 | 40 28:18 |
| 73:11 77:7 103:1,1 | 401 28:19 29:3,3 |
| 111:1 116:18,19 | 43 30:19 |
| IA 16:3,13,15 17:5 | 46 34:16 118:25 119:2,7 |
| B 15:8,8,9,10,15,17 | |
| 16:3 92:11,12 | 5 |
| 1st 70:19 72:3 108:5 | 5 87:17 |
| 1.2 77:7 | 50 12:18 |
| 1.5 70:20 | 50-acre 12:21 |
| 10 63:12,21 93:9 107:10 | 500 12:15,18 |
| 10-minute 87:17 | 500-acre 12:21 |
| 11 63:22 102:21,22 | 52 36:5 |
| 107:20,20 108:1,1,3 109:22 110:10,14 | 56 65:1 |
| 114:24 | 58 64:25 65:3 |
| 11 4:24 12 91:20 108:5 110:15 | |
| 13 107:10 | 6 |
| 1300 7:8 | 6 64:8,12,13 91:20 |
| 13269 5:3 | 92:11,12 120:7,7 |
| 140 15:8 | 6th 91:5 |
| 15 1:4 3:2 49:1 71:1 | 6:09 146:6 |
| 72:4 | 60 3:16 |
| 15th 70:14 71:10,19 | 61 41:23 85:10 |
| 72:2 | 66 15:21 18:17 |
| 18 15:5 | . <u> </u> |
| 19 29:8 | 7 |
| | 7 88:4 138:8 |
| 2 | 72 107:22,24 |
| 2 11:14 12:24 13:11,17 | 73 107:23,24 |
| 44:10 62:25 64:1,3,6 | |
| 64:24 65:3 110:25 | 8 |
| 111:1 116:18,19,21 | 8 91:14 |
| 133:5 | 8-15 48:18 |
| 2A 42:6 | 800-288-3376 1:22 |
| 2B 63:24 | 8885 1:24 147:13 |
| 2:15 3:2,4 | |
| 20 50:3 92:11 | 9 |
| 20th 92:12 | 9 64:1,3,4,7,13 |
| 2004 6:3 44:23 48:2 | 95 83:24 |
| 119:19 121:22,24 | 33 03.24 |
| 122:1 | |
| 2010 133:15 | |
| 2011 11:12 | |
| 2012 1:4 3:2 44:24 | |
| 70:21 147:8 | |
| 2013 70:19,24 71:10,20 | |
| 72:2,3,10 | |
| 2014 70:14 71:1,19 72:4 | |
| 72:22 | |
| 2015 48:12 72:23 73:11 | |
| 21 34:16 54:17 119:6 | |
| 22 36:5 54:17 | |
| 23rd 7:18 | |
| 24 64:25 | |
| 25 34:10 41:24 64:25 | |
| 26 43:6,14 | |
| 27 88:4 138:8 | |
| 28 21:1 25:7 | |
| 29th 147:7 | |
| | |
| 3 | |
| 3 2:20 11:14 12:2,4,17 | |
| 12:24 13:2 44:11 | |
| 62:25 75:18 77:24 | |
| 85:7,9,13 107:24 | |
| 110:25 116:18,21 | |
| , | |
| 120:7 133:5 | |
| 300 13.23 | |
| 300 13:23 31 30:17 17 | |
| 300 13:23 31 30:17,17 35 29:8 | |